

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

TUESDAY

9:00 A.M.

JANUARY 28, 2025

PRESENT:

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

Janis Galassini, County Clerk
Eric Brown, County Manager
Nathan Edwards, Assistant District Attorney

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners convened at 9:03 a.m. in special session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, County Clerk Jan Galassini called roll, and the Board conducted the following business:

* * * * *

Chair Hill announced that Commissioners Garcia and Clark had communicated that they would be late. She said the Board would recess before beginning Agenda Item 6 to wait for the absent Commissioners. She mentioned that Agenda Item 6C would be heard after all other items in Agenda Item 6.

* * * * *

25-0047 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

9:06 a.m. Commissioner Garcia arrived at the meeting.*

Ms. Cassandra Potts stated she lost her home in a fire and explained she thought it had started behind her home and moved over the top of the hill near Callahan Ranch. She felt the loss of her home was not because of the fire but because the fire crews had not done their jobs. She said she asked the power company when the power had been shut off because her home was at the top of Galena Canyon, which was near Pleasant Valley. She felt her house was the first house in the line of fire. She said she received information from Program Coordinator Sabrina Brasuell from the Emergency Management Team regarding whom she could speak to. She said she called 12 individuals but never received a phone call back. She felt that her issue went unresolved, and she did not receive help. She stated the power company would not speak with her when all she had done was

ask them what time the power had been turned off. She said NV Energy had a natural disaster protection plan with both new and old rates. She mentioned she placed a call to everyone on her list, and one person she called told her she was not eligible to receive the rebate because her property taxes had been paid in full in August, and she lost her home in November. She felt she should have been able to receive the rebate. She said she had previously spoken to the fire department, but she never received a call from them to tell her that her home had been burned. She noted that when she finally reached someone at the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) four days after the fire, the TMFPD representative stated that he did not have time to look for the individual names of whose homes had been burned. She felt TMFPD should have been able to provide her with that information. She opined she had not received the information she needed from the TMFPD or the power company. Chair Hill said she would follow up with Ms. Potts and asked her to leave her contact information with the staff. She mentioned they would have the Washoe County Assessor follow up with Ms. Potts regarding the rebate for her property taxes, and the Board would try to assist her with contacting NV Energy and the TMFPD. Chair Hill apologized for the loss of Ms. Potts' home and thanked her for bringing the matter to the Board.

Ms. Heidi Soper, Vice Chair of the Sun Valley Citizen Advisory Board (CAB), stated she thought there would be negative comments about CABs from the commission support staff, and she hoped positive comments would be shared from the December reimagined meeting. She said she wanted to share positive information. She summarized an online description of CABs and felt it was hard to add to that standard description. She asked to have CABs returned to be advisory boards and not just information boards. She recalled that a few years prior, CAB members had a voice in the Master Plan, development of the valley, and developer meetings. She thought CAB members were allowed to vote on developer plans for schools and roads and mentioned that she had forwarded information that had been gathered to the County Commissioners, Planning Commission, and the Board of Adjustments. She felt CABs could create a venue for citizens that allowed for the review of certain development projects so that feedback could be provided. She believed CABs had allowed the community to gather and motivated people to become active, drove positive change in Sun Valley, and brought ideas that would improve their way of life. She expressed that CABs allowed face-to-face conversations instead of impersonal Zoom conversations. She said she worked hard to find topics for discussion at the meetings and believed that when a citizen requested topics, those suggestions should be honored, even if they had been previously discussed in another CAB. She mentioned that communication with citizens regarding the CAB meetings was very important, and mentioned she would try to come up with ways to communicate other than electronically. She discussed distributing printed agendas to various popular locations in the valley. She said that, despite popular belief, not everyone had a computer or cell phone. She believed it would be detrimental if the meeting dates were changed because people already knew where and when the CAB met. She said she was honored to be a member of the CAB and mentioned it gave her a voice and helped her stand up for her community. She mentioned that since taxes were paid for by the CABs, she hoped their opinions would be listened to and considered seriously before a decision was made. She stated it would be a loss to lose something so simple that kept the community engaged.

Ms. Alanna Fitzgerald displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She thanked the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for allowing her to speak. She said she was a constituent in District 1 and thanked the BCC for the work that had been done in her district and the County. She believed budget discussions would be taking place soon, and she briefly discussed some of the services that the libraries provided that were specifically tied to the Washoe County Strategic Plan. She felt one specific example spoke directly to the strategic objective of vulnerable populations, specifically seniors. She said she felt the branches had done so much and went above and beyond by lending books and videos that it could be overwhelming. She shared a story that she believed could raise awareness and education and spoke about a friend who was in the early stages of dementia and had been in a group home under 24-hour care. She said her friend received a home delivery from a library branch, which prompted her to visit a branch near her residence, the Sierra View branch. She inquired at the branch if they provided home delivery and how it worked. She said her conversation led her to a display of memory care kits. She noted that signage informed that kits were designed for individuals experiencing memory loss or other cognitive issues related to dementia, Alzheimer's, or other memory disorders. She thought the kits could also be used for individuals who wanted to keep their brains sharp and be shared with caregivers of people who needed help. She mentioned that she took a kit with her when she visited her friend and shared it with the caregiving staff, who provided books and games to other residents. She said it was a gift that those kits were available and were free to the community. She stated she brought it up to raise awareness about the wonderful services libraries could provide. She said she hoped that her comments would be remembered as budget discussions occurred.

Mr. Deandre Burleson said he was homeless and a client of the Reno Housing Authority (RHA). He explained he was a resident of the Park Manor Apartments, and after a trip to Walmart, he ended up being incarcerated for over a year. He said he had not been reinstated and had not received an explanation as to why his Section 8 and public housing vouchers were revoked. He stated he went to the RHA and they told him that their decision was final. He said he was unclear what their decision was. He commented he was not sure where he should go or do, and he assumed there were no other options, even though he thought he was in good standing. He said when he returned to the RHA, he believed he had recourse and felt the answer he was given was unacceptable. He felt dissatisfied with their decision and wanted to respond and wondered what his rights were. He mentioned he had watched a prior BCC meeting, and he recalled the last information he had heard was that he had possibly been reinstated. He said he would provide additional documentation later. He commented that he was at a loss for what to do next, and he was tired of being homeless and carrying his bags. He mentioned he had a public housing voucher with the RHA. He said he was unsure what the next steps would be and had come to the Board to see if his housing could be reinstated and to ask for guidance and assistance. He added that he did not want to be on the streets any longer. Chair Hill let him know that there were housing staff at the meeting, and they would connect with him to see what they could do to help.

Mr. Lawrence Dodson, Lived Experience Advisory Board Member, said he supported permanent supportive housing. He commented that the importance of permanent

supportive housing had become increasingly evident over time. He said permanent supportive housing was essential because it provided stability, which had been proven to help clients move forward in their lives. He believed permanent supportive housing started with a roof over a person's head so they could seek a decent job. He noted that it might not completely lift them out of poverty but could at least enable them to contribute as a productive member of society. He mentioned that without stability, clients feared losing their housing. He said research indicated that providing permanent housing support was more cost-effective than incarceration. For example, four months in jail could be equivalent to one year of permanent supportive housing costs. He added that the expenses incurred by clients who frequently visit hospitals instead of having stable housing could be significantly higher. He said the method of offering housing alongside supportive services proved effective, and he felt it would alleviate the fear and financial burden associated with unstable housing and would allow clients to focus on improving their lives through employment and family connections. He mentioned the holistic approach provided them with a clear direction for personal growth and stability. He believed permanent supportive housing was crucial, and studies showed that with permanent supportive housing, clients gained stability from having a consistent place to live, which enabled them to search for better job opportunities and actively participate in society. He said the financial implications of providing permanent supportive housing far outweighed the cost of incarceration or frequent hospital admissions, which made it a sensible and humane solution for addressing housing and stability.

25-0048 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meeting of December 17, 2024. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

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

There was no response to the call for public comment.

25-0049 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Strategic Planning recap and updates to the Board: This is a workshop item. The purpose of the Strategic Planning Workshop is to discuss matters from previous Workshops. Topics of discussion include the following from previous Strategic Planning Workshops: infrastructure updates, updates on senior services enhancements and facility improvements, behavioral health, an update on the regional economy in relation to housing including the current housing inventory and services.

County Manager Eric Brown introduced Ms. Erica Olson, Chief Operating Officer and Co-Founder of OnStrategy, the long-term partner in the strategic planning process. He said OnStrategy was engaged throughout the year to work with County departments and strategic plan goal teams, and they would ensure the County was objective and productive in creating processes and following the proper actions to meet the goals reviewed at the workshop. He stated Ms. Olson's job would be to keep the strategic

planning process on track. He considered the conversation one of the most important of the year. He added that the strategic planning workshop was a rare opportunity to step outside the normal Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting format to have conversations about the Board's key priorities. He believed it was an opportunity for staff leadership to hear what the Board had to say. He said many department heads would be present throughout the day, with some presenting to the Board. He noted it provided an opportunity for the BCC to hear from elected officials, the individuals who represented the people, regarding what the Board saw as key priorities. He noted he would review what had occurred since the prior year's workshop.

Manager Brown conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He reviewed slides with the following titles: Accomplishments since last retreat, Seniors, Mental Health; Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) Priorities; Fiscal Sustainability; Economic Impacts; Vulnerable Populations; and Innovative Services.

Manager Brown reviewed the slides and noted that the left of the slides showed notes from the previous year regarding the BCC's direction to staff on observations and what they wanted to see happen. He indicated that the right side of the slides showed the list of achievements that occurred. He said he would not discuss specific details because the presentations that day would provide a better understanding of particular details. He addressed the slide titled *Seniors* and believed everyone was aware that the Senior Center upgrade was in the first phase. He said an activities coordinator was hired in response to feedback received from the Board, indicating that they wanted to see improvements to programming in addition to the facility. He said safety improvements were put in place regarding the homeless population and the impact on the environment, particularly at the 9th Street location.

Manager Brown reviewed the slide titled *Mental Health* and said the community inventory had been completed, and a strategic framework was done for how to proceed with the Sequential Intercept Model (SIM). He mentioned that at the Board's direction, they hired a full-time Behavioral Health Administrator, Ms. Julia Ratti. He added they retained a Management Analyst to assist with moving the Board's initiatives forward. He said West Hills had been renamed and would be referred to as Washoe Behavioral Health Center. He stated a lot of work had been done with the provider, community, and the facilities team to prepare to move forward.

Manager Brown reviewed the slide titled *CIP Priorities* and stated that the Board provided clear direction the previous year regarding what they felt the key priorities should be. He mentioned the funding of the downtown judicial center and said there had been valuable work regarding funding mechanisms. He noted there would be compelling arguments on how to approach funding through a Public Private Partnerships (P3).

Manager Brown mentioned the last few slides of his presentation were a recent update that may not have been addressed a year prior. He said they were items that the goal teams had worked on over the past fiscal year. He commented that a risk portfolio

would review funding sources for staffing, which had occurred in advance of knowing the election outcome. He felt many people were concerned about the executive orders that announced the freeze of grant funding, and noted that in advance of those orders, the County was in the process of evaluating how county staffing positions were set up. He said it would need to be determined which ones were grant-funded versus other sources of funding. He noted that the process was in progress and would be continually monitored. He acknowledged that various department heads were checking in to find out the status of their departmental grants, and he explained that information would be provided as soon as it was available.

Manager Brown reviewed the slide titled *Fiscal Sustainability* and said the County submitted over \$4.6 million in grant applications, year to date, from the Community Reinvestment Team led by Community Reinvestment Manager Gabrielle Enfield. He mentioned that the P25 radio addendum was approved by the Board and was working through partner agencies to obtain approval.

Manager Brown reviewed the slide titled *Economic Impacts* and said the Board would recall that staff had been working on the zoning amendment packages to address the need for more affordable, middle housing options. He said the climate action plan was completed and under soft release. He said a committee was formed to address policy-practice variances and a statutory service survey to look objectively at whether policies and practices were adhered to by County employees and agencies.

Manager Brown reviewed the slide, *Vulnerable Populations*, and said the high-demand winter capacity at the shelters was being addressed. He stated permanent housing exits continued to be a significant challenge and added that there were many individuals who were ready to go to permanent housing; however, there was a lack of affordable housing options to address those needs. He indicated that the issue would be included in a presentation during the meeting. He explained that supportive housing and tendency support programs delivered lower recidivism, which showed promising results, but the region lacked enough supportive housing to meet the needs.

Manager Brown reviewed the slide titled *Innovative Services* and said that from the two graduating classes of the Washoe County Leadership Academy, about one-third of them applied to participate in Washoe County boards and committees, which was one of the primary reasons for creating the academy. The intent was to create a pipeline of informed citizens who could apply for boards, committees, and Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs). He mentioned there would be an update on CABs. He mentioned an ongoing space study and master plan update, and said that was on track and would start with the Edison Way building. He noted staff would work on a Request For Proposal (RFP) for Building C. He stated that Language Access resources were implemented and indicated more work was forthcoming on the Title 6 plan compliance.

Ms. Olson asked if there should be a break until all Commissioners were present for the discussion. Chair Hill agreed to wait until Commissioner Clark was present and noted there was confusion about the meeting start time.

Commissioner Andriola asked for clarification on the *Economic Impact* slide regarding the committee that was formed to address policy-practice variances and the statutory service survey that was scheduled for launch to department heads. She asked for clarification on the process behind the committee, what was next in the process, and how it would be vetted. She asked if the District Attorney (DA) would review the details. Manager Brown explained that the legal team was a participant in the process to ensure, from a legal standpoint, that statutory requirements were being followed according to policy. He mentioned it was an opportunity for department heads to participate in the discussion for the awareness of any policies not being followed. Commissioner Andriola wanted to discuss the slide titled *Accomplishments* and recalled a public commenter, Ms. Alanna Fitzgerald, mentioned memory care kits. Commissioner Andriola felt it was a good opportunity to discuss how information about memory kits could be shared and made available to the Senior Center. She thought there were opportunities to reach more seniors in the area.

Chair Hill commended the team and shared her excitement for the work being done on new projects for Washoe County. She thought the County was being innovative in areas where no one in the community had helped previously. She stated that the County had stepped into the mental health field because the community had provided feedback that there was a need for that type of work. She said she was proud of the team and was excited about the work that would come.

9:41 a.m. **The Board recessed.**

10:00 a.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present. ****

* * * * * * * * * *

Chair Hill announced that Item 6C would be heard after Agenda Item 6F

* * * * * * * * * *

AGENDA ITEM 6 Washoe County Strategic Planning priorities workshop, including but not limited to Board discussion and input on the following matters:

25-0050 **AGENDA ITEM 6A** Capital facilities update and presentation on the County's infrastructure scorecard and state of infrastructure. The infrastructure scorecard is a color-coded visual representation of the status of the various types of County buildings, facilities, and other capital assets.

Ms. Erica Olson, Chief Operating Officer and Co-Founder of OnStrategy, explained how the discussions for the PowerPoint presentations should flow. She explained the items were styled for a conversation because of the amount of information that would be presented to the Board, and the items did not necessarily require action or decisions. She noted that time would be allowed for in-depth discussion and questions. She said it

was a continued conversation from the previous workshop, from which she reminded that three topics were identified: Capital Projects, Seniors, and Mental Health. She mentioned the morning discussion would provide updates on progress from each of the respective project leaders. She added that the afternoon portion of the workshop would be an in-depth evaluation of Public Private Partnerships (P3) and housing. She said the intention was to explore strategic conversations where there had been energy and intention from the Commissioners on how to move forward. She detailed that for each item, there would be a clear outcome, which would allow the Board to provide direction.

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro, reviewed a PowerPoint slide with the following title: Capital Facilities Update.

ACM Solaro explained that there would be detailed discussions regarding some of the capital projects. He said the focus in the morning was to provide an update on the Infirmary Project. He mentioned there would be a presentation for the Infrastructure Scorecard, which had been a powerful tool that helped staff understand the health of the County's assets. He added that when budget decisions were made related to those assets, it could help determine the most significant judicial outcome. He said assets were valued by the taxpayers and provided services to the community.

ACM Solaro said the detention center at 911 Parr Boulevard was originally constructed in 1988, with the first expansion occurring after ten years and a second expansion ten years after that. Over the years, master planning was done with consideration for the overall population and the growing community's needs. He explained that a space study was conducted in 2017 that identified the highest priority need for the detention center was an infirmary to keep up with the medical needs of the population within the jail. He mentioned that planning and work were done around the infirmary, and in October 2022, the Board accepted a community project funding grant from the United States Congress through the Department of Health and Human Services Administration for \$2.335 million. Those grant funds helped initiate the design process to decide where to place the infirmary. He explained that the Board had taken tours of the jail and may have noticed that, after entering through the front door, the jail was a maze. He thought what had been missed was understanding the property's topography, which was quite constraining due to multiple project expansions. He said part of the work included identifying the new expansion location, which was completed, and he added that the design of the project was progressing. He mentioned that in November 2024, the Board approved the design contract, utilizing federal funds, for Arrington Watkins so that the design process could begin. He added that the construction documents were nearly complete due to a building code change. Staff wanted to ensure that the most current building code was used, which would allow time to sort through funding and understand how to pay for and sustain the new building. He mentioned that the new building would also need staffing, and a staffing study component was put in place to ensure there were an appropriate number of deputies. He mentioned that sustainable funding would need to be put in place for ongoing maintenance and operations. He said the core of the project included architectural and engineering services to develop a 225-bed infirmary in a roughly three-story facility with locations for other necessities to operate. He added there was a kickoff meeting in

December 2024, with the consulting team, internal capital project staff, and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) to initiate the project. A Geographic Information Systems (GIS) drone survey was conducted in December to help understand the site's topography needs. He mentioned a location had been chosen for the infirmary that would allow full access around the exterior of the building to ensure the Reno Fire Department (RFD) and the WCSO could safely access the building and not impact other exterior operations of the facility. He said that in January 2025, Washoe County was provided with an interior layout, which was the space planning portion, to review. He mentioned geotechnical work was being conducted to ensure there were no clay or rock surface issues, which that area was known for, that could create potential problems. He hoped the project would last well past the staff's lifetimes. He said June 2025 would be the targeted completion date for the design phase and noted that was when the funding source was expected to run out. He explained the County wanted to ensure they were fully expended on that. He said a 40 percent completed construction document package was expected by June 2025 and would include current code changes. He said that would allow a six-year window with the current design and provide the balance of funding and operations for the facility. He stated progress was being made and the consultants and staff understood that, per the Board's direction, the project was a priority.

Commissioner Garcia asked for details regarding the new facility's location on the parcel. ACM Solaro detailed that the location of the new building would run to the north of where the housing units were located and would back up to the freeway. He mentioned he would send documentation to the Board for clarification.

Commissioner Andriola thanked ACM Solaro for the update and asked for an estimated cost for the project. ACM Solaro said he did not have that information and added that they were doing what was programmatically necessary in the facility. He explained that having an efficient building was a top priority, and various options were being explored, such as prefabricated cells. He expressed caution in giving a cost because he wanted to ensure the needs within the building were fully understood. He added that the space plan included several different figures; however, costs for materials and construction had increased significantly since the space plan was completed. Commissioner Andriola inquired about a possible time frame for estimated costs. ACM Solaro stated there would be a figure available by June 2025.

Chair Hill assumed it would be around \$50 million since everything seemed to cost around that. ACM Solaro confirmed it would be north of \$50 million. She asked if there had been discussions regarding hosting vulnerable populations of the general public in the infirmary who could not afford or could not fit into the new Washoe County Behavioral Health Facility. ACM Solaro confirmed that those discussions were taking place and noted that part of the discussion included access to the facility and the building location. He said now that the building had been sited, it could be decided how to accommodate the public, so it would not be in a detention setting. Chair Hill asked if there were thoughts on the current infirmary and the cost associated with transitioning it into a dorm-type facility. ACM Solaro confirmed that concurrent discussions were happening and had been included in the space plan that was completed in 2017. Discussions included

what would happen with the ancillary parts needed to support the new facility, including parking, locker room space, and more. Chair Hill wondered if more could be done for the rehabilitation of people in those spaces. She inquired if the competency court would occupy the third story of the new facility or if that was part of a different discussion. ACM Solaro replied that it was part of the ongoing discussion and that figuring out the location and how the competency court would be accessed was being considered.

Mr. Eric Crump, Community Services Development (CSD) Director, reviewed a PowerPoint slide with the following title: Infrastructure Scorecard.

Mr. Crump explained the infrastructure scorecard as a tool used Countywide to illustrate the state of public infrastructure by assigning a letter grade based on various criteria. He said the scorecard was designed by the American Society of Civil Engineers, which applied objective benchmarks and metrics. He mentioned Washoe County adopted the scorecard methodology several years ago to reflect the state of various asset types that were maintained, specifically road pavement, stormwater, parks, facilities, fleet, sewer collection, reclaimed water, and sewer treatment assets. He added that those assets represented a value of approximately \$3.6 billion. He stated that each year since the scorecard was adopted, the updates were based on the most recent decisions and budget policies that had been handed down from the previous fiscal year. He mentioned that based on the strategic direction received the last time the scorecard was presented, the result, and budget policies, County staff had worked on making significant progress. He said that he would provide an overview of the scores, highlight changes to the scorecard based on prior direction, and note trends that policymakers needed to know.

Mr. Crump discussed the first asset classes, which were parks, buildings, and facilities. He said the overall grade for both asset classes had improved slightly over the past two years based on budget policies that had been put in place. He said the overall grade for parks improved to a C based on additional staffing resources and investment in capital replacement, primarily playgrounds. He mentioned there were a lot of very old playgrounds that typically could not be rehabilitated for under \$1 million and added that the County had done a good job replacing many old playgrounds. He indicated that although work still needed to be done, the park's operations & maintenance budget had not fully recovered since the cuts of The Great Recession and were roughly 65 percent of pre-recession levels. He said the park's budget represented incredible value for the community at approximately \$18 per year, per citizen. He added that citizens could access trails and parks for nearly the cost of watching a movie, and that a dedicated parks team could be thanked for that.

Mr. Crump mentioned that the score for Washoe County buildings had improved slightly, primarily due to investment in the capital investment program, such as replacing roofs, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning, which were high-dollar infrastructure. He noted the Facilities Team continued to focus on sustainability measures to reduce the overall operational cost for the buildings.

Mr. Crump explained the next group of assets were road pavement and stormwater infrastructure, and felt it was important to note that both asset classes were funded primarily by fuel tax from the Roads Fund. He mentioned some vital statistics about the fuel tax over the last ten years, such as an increase in fuel tax of roughly 5.8 percent, which meant it had been relatively flat. He mentioned the cost of materials had increased by double digits, which was unsustainable. He said both assets' overall grades had declined over the past few years, and the root cause was the flat revenue source and the age of the infrastructure. He mentioned that over half of Washoe County roads were constructed more than 25 years ago, and the average stormwater pipe or culvert was roughly about 50 percent of its useful life. He added that both asset classes scored an F for future funding. He said the current funding stream and strategy, which was fuel tax, was insufficient to keep pace with current service levels and, more importantly, future needs. He said the challenge was not unique to Washoe County; it spanned across the Nation for agencies that funded road maintenance primarily through fuel tax. He stated vehicle miles traveled could be seen, but the fuel tax was flattening, largely due to the number of electric vehicles (EVs) and more fuel-efficient vehicles. He said it was a great thing, but the way the road system was currently funded was an antiquated system. He added that, compounding the problem, the status quo, or doing nothing, would result in near-term safety issues and a decreased level of service and would cost more money later on. He said maintaining good roads in good condition would be far less expensive than maintaining roads that had completely failed. He felt it was important to note that all the activity within roads was primarily funded through the Roads Fund. That activity included everything that occurred in the right-of-way, such as sidewalks, storm drains, pavement maintenance, signs, striping, snow removal, ditch cleaning, street sweeping, and compliance with the Lake Tahoe Clarity Program.

Mr. Crump said the last four asset classes were fleets, sewer collection, recycled water, and sewer treatment, which all shared high grades due to how they were funded. He explained that each of those asset classes had dedicated funding sources paid directly by their users. He said it was an internal service fund, and there was currently a pilot for a fuel type diversification program where staff were piloting the use of different types of EVs and tracking the cost over time to see if there was truly a return on investment. He said signs so far have shown promising information about lowering life cycle costs for certain types of fleets. He discussed sewer and reclaimed water facilities, such as the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (STMWRF), which was wrapping up a multi-million-dollar expansion that would address the region's needs out to 2040. He detailed the expansion of the use of recycled water to areas such as Hidden Valley and the investigation of what they called the *westward expansion* to bring effluent into the west, inside the McCarran loop. He said many people within the County used the scorecard daily to determine how to allocate the resources available, and he hoped that it would provide the BCC with information.

Commissioner Andriola thought it was great to have a scorecard benchmark. She recalled how Mr. Crump had highlighted the instability regarding the sustainability of funding for roads and thought it would be interesting to see what happened in the Legislature regarding the matter. She asked if Mr. Crump had noticed any national

trends in how other entities fought against the matter. Mr. Crump said there were agencies that were trying other things. One example was in California, where they looked at vehicle miles traveled in both commercial and residential vehicles. He said it was unknown if there were any agencies that had completely gone away from fuel tax. He said that in 2017, the Legislature directed the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and a committee to research how the State funded its operations and maintenance. He noted there were recommendations in the report. He was hopeful that it would gain traction and recalled some of the recommendations were starting to assess a fee for electric vehicles, which currently paid nothing for the use of County roadways. He mentioned another recommendation was slowly transitioning from a fuel-tax-based environment to a vehicle miles traveled environment, and he added that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) was already set up for that, but it would require a little political will. He explained that what had been presented were real numbers and were a cause for concern.

Commissioner Andriola recalled she had brought up sewer and wastewater treatment opportunities since 2023 and added she would continue to bring it up. She felt there were opportunities for regionalization and consolidation, and she looked forward to future discussions. She mentioned the fact that there was a new administration and wondered what that may look like regarding land opportunities becoming available, and said she would address it later. She hoped that discussions with other jurisdictions would be useful for efficiency, capacity building, and getting ahead of what could come. She noted it was difficult to balance assets and maintain needed funding and staffing, and she thought it was time to look at building efficiencies and working with other jurisdictions that could be facing similar challenges. She thanked the team for providing the scorecard information and said she would appreciate future updates, especially as dollars grew tight. She thought those issues should be more at the forefront rather than waiting for a strategic planning meeting.

Commissioner García thanked the team for the presentation on the scorecard and emphasized the importance of having the scorecard. She explained that it was easy to follow and was a great tool that provided a common language when she spoke with constituents and could be used by everyone. She noted that there was a direct correlation between the dedicated funding sources the County had and the health of its assets. She stated it was clear that if funding was sustained, the grade was healthy. She stated that parks were extremely important to her, and she felt they had a high return on investment and contributed to the overall health and wellness of the community, as well as being an economic driver. She asked to continue to explore the possibility, as consolidation conversations emerged, of exploring the parks district and working with other jurisdictions to improve efficiency. She said she realized that in the past, she had not correlated the scorecard with safety; however, as she looked forward to future needs for roads and stormwater, she believed safety should be the number one priority. While she did not want to take away from the things she valued, such as parks, she felt that dedicating time and attention to roads and stormwater was a valuable effort.

Commissioner Clark focused on roads and pavement and asked for clarification on the flat fuel tax and wondered if it could be measured. He was concerned

about the increased number of cars on the roads, not just EVs. He felt that more gas was being consumed and wondered how the fuel tax remained flat. He asked if there were studies that backed up that information and noted the State could be questioned about how much fuel tax they collected. Mr. Crump mentioned the matter was also perplexing to him and recalled a graph from a report that came out of the Committee based on the Legislature's action in 2017. He said the report showed vehicle miles traveled mentioned that there were far more cars on the road, and the fuel revenue was increasing, but not at the same level. He believed there was a disparity between vehicle miles traveled and the amount. He said even vehicles that were not EVs were more fuel-efficient than they used to be. He acknowledged there was more fuel being bought, but it had not kept pace with the vehicle miles traveled. Commissioner Clark asked how Washoe County compared to the surrounding counties, and thought people traveled outside the County to fuel up their cars. He wondered how that impacted local fuel tax revenue. Mr. Crump said he had not seen a study or report that reflected how many Washoe County residents fueled up outside of Washoe County. He said it was known that Washoe County's fuel tax was higher than that of surrounding counties, and he believed that had an impact. Commissioner Clark proposed comparing different counties' revenues over the past years to see if they received more money. He stated his concern was escaping revenue in addition to flattening revenue. Mr. Crump said the State report he mentioned earlier was conducted Statewide. He noted previous meetings with representatives from other counties who also felt the decline of the fuel tax. He mentioned Carson City did not index its fuel tax like Washoe County did which helped Washoe County.

Chair Hill stated that when she brought her constituents' safety concerns regarding County roads to ACM Solaro's team, the constituents were required to fill out a form, which she thought was great. She recalled that part of the matrix for future needs included making roads safer. She felt that the old roads were redone and made safer for pedestrians, and asked if that was built into the future needs column, as requests for safety improvements were made. She wondered if that was thought of when the matrix was created. Mr. Crump replied that future needs scored low because it reflected current funding, knowing that there was deferred maintenance and that many roads were 25 years old or older. He noted an example where surface treatment road repairs would cost pennies per square foot as opposed to reconstruction, which would cost \$6 per square foot. He said that example was an inequity, and there was no identified funding source for future reconstruction. Chair Hill stated it would be helpful to understand if the public safety requests that the community had brought forward were warranted and would be addressed, or if the County lacked funding and the issues remained on a list. She wanted to ensure that the County did what it could for the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and that safety concerns were addressed for regional roads. Mr. Crump mentioned that there were current funds allocated for road safety concerns, but they may not be sufficient to cover all the costs. He said that as requests were made, they would be evaluated to determine if they were warranted based on studies that were conducted. He explained that a few projects could be completed each year within the budget, which was helpful for challenges in residential neighborhoods with older street designs. He mentioned that generally, safety requests were being maintained. Chair Hill reiterated a prior comment made by Commissioner Garcia, saying that when there was a dedicated funding source, there would

be a higher grade for the asset. She mentioned that the Legislature provided the Board with an opportunity to enact a tax, which she noted was not something that would be addressed in the current meeting. She said the tax was the Supplemental Governmental Services Tax (SGST) and was for roads. She added that the Board had not enacted the tax, but it could be a potential future discussion or agenda item to understand what it would entail.

Chari Hill asked for clarification regarding the Hidden Valley recycled water grant request, which would allow recycled water to be piped to Hidden Valley. She wondered if it was tied up in appropriations and what the estimated timing would be. ACM Solaro stated that they were still moving forward with the funding source out of the sewer utility. He believed the pipeline was under construction, and details regarding storage were being evaluated. Given the prior year's thunderstorm, he explained that staff were working with the residents and having further discussions to ensure the committee understood the plan. Chair Hill asked about the westward expansion and wondered if that would be something that would be completed in the next four years. Mr. Crump said Hidden Valley was a work in progress. He explained that easements had been secured to be able to move through the private property to bring the effluent line into Hidden Valley, and evaluations were underway to determine tank and pipe size. He noted that initially, there were recommendations to do Rapid Infiltration Basin Systems (RIBS); however, an analysis determined that it might not be the best approach. He said there would be effluent to irrigate Hidden Valley. He added that the next piece would be what was called the *westward expansion* phase, which would benefit a whole host of potential customers as well as parks and the Washoe Golf Course. He said a team was looking at ways that it could be brought in, and mentioned there could be challenges because it would be brought in through a highly built-up environment versus Hidden Valley, which had not been built up yet. Chair Hill requested a future presentation when more information was available. She asked if there was a study for the parks district and if it was moving forward regionally. Mr. Crump said the City of Reno's staff had solicited a study, and Washoe County wanted to partner with them. He clarified that the legislation that was enabled to allow for park districts required a completed study, so the City of Reno and Washoe County were moving in that direction.

Commissioner Clark asked for clarification on the road projects scorecard and noted the County received an A for capacity, but an F for future needs. Mr. Crump explained that capacity was based on the current state and whether current capacity needs could be met. He stated it was specifically for Washoe County unincorporated roads, excluding freeways and Pyramid Highway. He noted that many roads in Washoe County were residential in nature. He said future needs referred to the funding source, and it was known that there was a future need in deferred maintenance, operations and maintenance, and reconstruction. He noted that the current funding mechanism would not meet future demands. Commissioner Clark asked if it was primarily paving the roads and if future needs included infrastructure for new subdivisions, widening of roads, or other various projects. Mr. Crump said developments paid for the initial development of roads, and approximately 35 years after the road was built, it would require reconstruction. He said if it were a commercial area and roads needed to be widened based on traffic studies, that would be a condition of that development. He explained the developer would build the

road, Washoe County would accept it and would be responsible for future maintenance. He noted that what was being seen was that many roads were accepted years ago and were requiring reconstruction. Commissioner Clark requested confirmation that the developer would develop the road initially, and when there were potential issues ten or 15 years later, it would be the County's responsibility to widen the roads. Mr. Crump stated that it would be rare that Washoe County would be responsible for widening a road. He added that if there were a new use requested in a particular area, typically, a condition of the development would be for the developer to make those improvements to the roadway. He said that based on what the developer planned to do in that area and the impacts of that development, they would be conditioned to pay for improvements. Commissioner Clark recalled driving by Mount Rose and South Virginia, which was widened for about half a mile, but constricted back down to what it used to be later down the road. He opined that it just moved the traffic jam down the road. Mr. Crump said a lot of what had been seen was at an intersection that might be an RTC or State road, and the County would work closely on impacts to roads that were multi-jurisdictional, and a set of conditions would be discussed. He said RTC and NDOT were slightly different in the sense that they looked at the capacity and what the traffic pattern would look like based on build-outs, and they planned for those, so they were styled differently from how Washoe County roads were developed. Commissioner Clark mentioned that when a bottleneck moved back, it affected County roads. He wondered how to keep the constriction from happening on County roads. Mr. Crump said Washoe County partnered with NDOT, the Cities of Reno and Sparks, and RTC to identify those concerns when there were impacts to any jurisdiction. He acknowledged it may not always work.

Commissioner Clark requested information regarding the road tax and the County's ability to increase road taxes, as mentioned by Chair Hill. ACM Solaro questioned whether the direction and theme of the Board was to raise the grade of that asset class. The Board acknowledged that the intent was to raise the grade.

25-0051 **AGENDA ITEM 6B** Update on senior programming and facilities enhancements and upgrades during the past year and updating the Board on upcoming enhancements and upgrades.

Mr. Ryan Gustafson, Director of Human Services Agency (HSA), conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He reviewed slides with the following titles: Discussion Flow; Top Priorities for Services to Seniors (Oct 2023); Trends we are seeing in the data from Fiscal Year FY23 to FY24; Work To-Date and Programming Updates; Work To-Date and Future Opportunities; Nutrition Contract; 2024 Health and Human Services (HSA) Community Outreach and Engagement Program Report; and Senior Services Grants.

Mr. Gustafson introduced his team, which included HSA Division Director Cara Paoli and HSA Senior Services Coordinator Abby Badolato. He reviewed the slide titled *Discussion Flow* and said the presentation would provide a brief overview of what was discussed in October 2023 and would include updates on senior services, current

programming, share data and projects, and program updates. He hoped to receive feedback to ensure that the programs were moving in the appropriate direction.

Mr. Gustafson reviewed the slide titled *Top Priorities for Services to Seniors (Oct 2023)* and recalled discussions from 2023 regarding a significant focus on how the increased senior population could be addressed for the next 5 to 10 years. He added that Washoe County was growing faster than the national data had shown, which required preparatory work regarding mental health needs, isolation needs, transportation, and potential legislative action. He noted there were additional topics presented on the slide that tied into the facilities, and some items that were easily achievable, as well as larger projects that would take more time.

Ms. Badolato reviewed the slide titled *Trends we are seeing in the data from FY23 to FY24* and mentioned that there had been a significant increase in the congregate meal usage, and that it continued to increase each year. She explained there had been a large decrease during COVID-19 (C19) because they were closed, but since the first year they reopened, the numbers increased, as did the participation of clients who were new to the program. She said home delivery meals had not grown the same way after the reopening and had decreased. She stated many individuals had been on congregate meals and then transitioned to home delivery, which could be why those numbers had not seen the same increase. She highlighted that 21 percent of meals were delivered by volunteer drivers, and that number represented the cost savings. She said approximately two years ago, homemaker services had a waitlist of over 400 seniors, and once the in-house list of homemakers was added, that figure dropped. She said there were currently 214 vetted seniors on the waitlist who were in regular contact with staff. She said the representative payees increased from 40 to 80 slots in the last fiscal year. She added that a waitlist was formed for representative payees. She mentioned the program had grown, and in 2020, there were more meals served, with more seniors being placed on home delivery. In the last four years, the trends increased again. She highlighted the newly created homemaker program and noted HSA had 10 in-house homemakers. Previously, HSA served approximately 120 seniors, and they were currently serving approximately 342 seniors. She anticipated that the number would flatten out over the next few years.

Ms. Paoli mentioned that transitioning from temporary food had been difficult and was excited to share that hot meals and soup were being served again at the Senior Center. She reviewed the slide titled *Work To-Date and Programming Updates* and noted that the dining room would have more of a warm and welcoming feel. She said there would be improved signage and a new stage, since the current stage was outdated and no longer sturdy or safe. She said the bathrooms would be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant and would also receive an update. She explained the other updates would create better efficiencies and safety. She mentioned that a grand opening to showcase the improvements was planned for April and was in conjunction with their partner, the Nevada Arts Council, who was loaning artwork that they had from individuals throughout the State. She added they were excited to launch the program with the Nevada Arts Council and would keep the Board updated on an opening date. She said the groups noted on the slides were just a few of their partners. In response to a previous comment made by Commissioner

Andriola, she said memory care kits were available in the Senior Center's library. She said the Washoe County Library Systems (WCLS) had been an excellent partner regarding technology and noted that they helped the Senior Center offer computer classes. She mentioned it was nice to have a library on site, and the seniors loved going to it. She commented on the outstanding work done by Senior Activity Coordinator Bill Sero who was funded through American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). She noted he worked 20 hours a week and referred to the slide for a list of activities that had been initiated by him. She said his focus included the outlying sites, not the Reno and Sparks senior centers. She mentioned that Mr. Sero had been working with Paws 4 Love to offer pet therapy when the Senior Center reopened.

Ms. Paoli reviewed the slide titled *Work To-Date and Future Opportunities* and discussed the mental health program that HSA piloted, the Program to Encourage Active, Rewarding Lives (PEARLS), and said it was an evidence-based program offered through the University of Washington. She explained the focus of the program was to reduce isolation and depression. She noted the program was implemented in 26 states across the Country and research had shown it to be effective. She said they have several individuals trained in the model, including herself, and they were the primary people who administered the program. She added that 40 people had been referred to the program without the program being advertised within the community. She explained that it had not been advertised to the community because there was only a small number of staff who could provide the service. She said some people had declined the services because it was not home-based, and others were eliminated because they had significant mental health concerns and were referred to mental health providers. She explained it was not a clinical therapeutic program but focused on problem-solving techniques, which would make it more sustainable because more people would be able to provide the service. She added that there was monthly oversight by a Registered Nurse (RN), herself, and a Task Supervisor. She felt optimistic about continuing the program and said that they were working on being able to offer shift work, which would allow in-home sessions since leaving the home could be difficult. She noted that she had sat in on sessions and thought it was cathartic for seniors because they often did not have people to talk to. She thought it was beneficial for the seniors to have someone to talk to confidentially.

Ms. Paoli mentioned the OnMed Care Station which they hoped to offer at the Senior Center. She explained the care station was a private setting where someone could go in and have various tests done. In the care station, someone would appear on the screen within 90 seconds to conduct a brief assessment to provide care with prescriptions or refer the person to a provider. She mentioned she was hopeful to offer it to seniors because they were a vulnerable population. She was hopeful it would reduce calls to the Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority (REMSA), who they had to regularly call to the Senior Center. She said they worked with the Governor's Office of Science and Technology to explore digital navigation. She noted that there were costs involved, so currently, they were pursuing digital navigation through partnerships with the library and other programs. She said HSA saw the value in the program and hoped they could provide the service to seniors through partnerships. She mentioned that various recognition events were already in place. She said recognition of the veterans was important to HSA, and her team felt that

more could be done for them. She reviewed several pictures of improvements that had already been completed and added that they had received positive feedback from seniors.

Ms. Paoli reviewed the slide titled *Nutrition Contract* and mentioned the recently completed Request for Proposal (RFP), which was approved by the Board in December 2024. She thanked the Board and explained they would be able to provide higher-quality meals for seniors.

Ms. Paoli reviewed the slide titled *Work To-Date and Programming Updates* and said that they would need to advertise to the public to increase programming. She mentioned they were trying to find as many venues as possible to reach seniors, and the slide reflected some of the ways they were doing that. She said they worked with community partners such as Senior Spectrum to advertise.

Ms. Paoli reviewed the slide titled *2024 HSA Community Outreach & Engagement Program Report* and said Senior Services included over one-third of the media metrics HSA provided.

Ms. Badolato reviewed the slide titled *Work To-Date and Programming Updates* and said HSA would get five new meal trucks and would take that opportunity to rebrand. She showed a photo of what the new trucks would look like and indicated that the trucks would include people of different ethnicities and the Senior Center's phone number.

Ms. Badolato reviewed the slide titled *Senior Services Grants* and said four of the new trucks were grant-funded. She mentioned most of the grants were through the State, and many were trickled down through Title III money. Ms. Badolato mentioned the slide with photos showing various activities offered, including a community fan drive, ice cream Fridays, a cake walk, and a band called *Grumpy Old Men* that played on Wednesdays.

Ms. Paoli hoped the Board would recognize some of the new programming efforts and the engagement with community partners to offer Washoe County seniors as much as possible. She noted that she was open to feedback.

Commissioner Andriola asked if there were opportunities to bring in veteran representation, specifically with the United States Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), to inform them of the opportunities and programs offered. She thought getting feedback from veterans on what they believed would be beneficial would be a good idea. She opined that veterans could assist with the volunteer aspect of the homemaker program. She thought there was a special connection when veterans assisted each other. She thought HSA was doing a great job and acknowledged that the transition had been difficult for staff. She asked how old the Senior Center was, and Ms. Paoli informed her it was built in 1978. Commissioner Andriola noted the building was in need of attention. She said she looked forward to sharing the presentation information with her constituents. She wondered what the number of volunteer service hours was and thought those people should be recognized. She looked forward to further discussions on future opportunities.

Mr. Gustafson thanked Commissioner Andriola for advocating for veterans and said it was honorable. He said he agreed it was necessary to find ways to increase veteran involvement. He stated he loved the idea of investigating what the volunteer commitment looked like. He acknowledged the volunteers and staff and said they had done a fantastic job. He noted that it was rewarding and difficult work, but it was appreciated. Ms. Paoli thanked the Board and mentioned she took notes. She said there were potential ideas to increase veteran recognition and involvement. She noted HSA had several veterans who used services and gave valuable feedback. She said they had met with the Senior Advisory Board, and those members were committed to doing taste testing. She said there were plans in place to get immediate feedback from seniors receiving meals. She hoped to have more data on that feedback for the Board in the future. Commissioner Andriola said she looked forward to the immediate response and feedback. She mentioned she was an alternate on the Senior Advisory Board; however, Commissioner Clark was dedicated to attending those meetings, so she had yet to participate on the board.

Commissioner Clark said he was happy to hear that hot meals were being served and wondered how many days the portable kitchen was non-operational. Ms. Paoli said the portable kitchen did not operate for 11 days. Commissioner Clark commented that when the Board awarded the contract to the mobile kitchen, a lot of money was spent. He asked if the County would receive reimbursement for the time it could not be used. Ms. Paoli mentioned staff could research that and added that part of the problem was adaptive issues based on the equipment used to make the meals. She said it was unclear if it was the fault of the temporary kitchen, but noted there were other issues that had not been communicated to the staff or the Community Services Department (CSD) that could be looked at further. Commissioner Clark felt that staff had known for several months that the Senior Center was going to be shut down, and he wanted to understand why no one had tested compatibility with the County facilities. He wondered what the real reasons were that the temporary kitchen did not work. Mr. Gustafson stated the mobile kitchen was not functional because, within the first week, the temperatures were very cold, and the pipes froze. Mr. Gustafson said there were compatibility issues with the gas hookup, and parts had to be ordered, which created delays. He added that the team was able to pivot and offer a variety of food options, some of which were a nice alternative, and received positive feedback. He mentioned that the last thing HSA wanted was not to be able to feed the senior community, and even though there were unfortunate issues with the mobile kitchen, the quantity of meals that were produced was unprecedented.

Ms. Paoli added that they had communicated with the federal grant provider, the State Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD), regarding the situation, and ADSD said they understood the circumstances and would not remove funding. She said there were days throughout the year when the nutritional value standard did not have to be met, which allowed for alternative food options until the hot meals could be served again. Commissioner Clark shared a comparison where firefighters were able to provide three meals a day from a dirt field for several weeks, and felt Washoe County struggled to serve one meal, which concerned him. He said that in the future, it was important to troubleshoot issues beforehand. He felt the problem they had with gas could have been resolved by using propane instead.

Commissioner Clark commended Mr. Sero for his incredible work ethic and commitment. He said that prior to C19, Mr. Sero drove a van purchased by Lifestyle Homes to service seniors in the North Valleys. He asked if the County could explore more of those opportunities. He thought the van could potentially transport 9 to 11 seniors to various events and locations when seniors could not drive themselves. He felt it was a small amount to pay when there were over 100,000 seniors in the County who could benefit from the service. He mentioned the students from the beauty college helped men and women in need of haircuts. He said Senior ResQ could provide seniors with financial assistance for approximately one year if they had an unexpected rent increase or were on a fixed income and could not afford to pay their rent. He thought that the service could keep seniors from becoming homeless. He mentioned a publication that he thought could be considered for advertising, which included Northern Nevada and not just Washoe County. He felt the Westbrook Community Center was an area that needed some vibrancy. He thought there were many seniors in the North Valleys without a place to go and little to no interaction with others, which he felt could be very isolating. He applauded Cold Springs and Sun Valley as those locations seemed to be much more interactive, were more invested in one another, and did more than just serve lunch.

Commissioner Garcia thanked the team for their hard work and appreciated their dedication while under pressure. She explained the area she was most proud of since the last workshop was the emphasis on mental health and the PEARLS program. She said senior isolation was a national epidemic and was thrilled that a small but mighty program had been launched. She expressed the importance of looking at co-locating resources for seniors in homes, as transportation and fuel issues continued to rise in the senior population. She asked how long Mr. Sero would be contracted for. Ms. Paoli said he was contracted through December 2025, but they were actively seeking funding to maintain his position because he had done such a great job. Commissioner Garcia asked about the opportunities to have volunteer drivers and wondered how people could get involved. Ms. Paoli stated they could call the main office or send an email to the address found on their webpage, which would be routed through Program Coordinator Todd Acker, who would complete the vetting process for the volunteers. She clarified that there were two levels of volunteers: basic volunteers who assisted individuals who needed community service, and senior ambassador volunteers who would go through the same vetting process as an employee.

Commissioner Garcia asked about OnMed Care Stations and asked if they would be available at the 9th Street location and if they were in the process of assessing whether they were a viable option. Ms. Paoli confirmed that the program would be offered at the 9th Street location, and a meeting would be scheduled to review the contracts with the Risk Management Department and the District Attorney's (DA) Office to ensure that the entire program had been addressed. She added that they hoped to be able to launch the program in April or May of 2025 and would operate it for at least two years. She said Anthem would fund the program with no cost to the County, which was an exciting opportunity. She mentioned that any senior could access OnMed and would not need to have Anthem coverage. She stated that the pods would be located at the front entrance of

the Senior Center to allow public access. Commissioner Garcia said that was great news, and felt many seniors did not have access to appropriate health care.

Commissioner Clark asked how many meals were served annually. Ms. Badolato stated that in 2024, the Senior Center served 435,000 meals. Commissioner Clark asked for clarification if senior boxing was happening; he was not aware seniors enjoyed boxing. Ms. Paoli confirmed that they offered recreational senior boxing, focused mainly on exercise and balance, and had a good turnout. Chair Hill commented that boxing was a good activity for individuals with Parkinson's disease. Commissioner Clark stated that the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) jail prepared 1.3 million meals annually and added that quality meals could be mass-produced while maintaining nutritional value.

Chair Hill shared her excitement for the OnMed program and was glad that it would be explored, and that insurance would cover the cost. She asked who handled the request for the Bill Draft Request (BDR), which would lower the age for Medicaid. Ms. Paoli stated that it had been an idea that was put forward in 2023 and noted that there was no BDR, but staff were working with the State to discuss concerns. She said it could be advantageous to seniors if the age range were lowered and they could qualify for more; however, it was a work in progress. Chair Hill said she was impressed and looked forward to seeing the final improvements at the Senior Center when it reopened. She stated that the team had the support of the Board.

25-0052 **AGENDA ITEM 6D** Update on the Sequential Intercept Model initiative (an effort to divert individuals with substance abuse and mental health challenges from the justice system into behavioral health care) and a presentation on and discussion of options for the Washoe Behavioral Health Center (formerly West Hills) for possible future action by the Board at a later meeting.

Ms. Julia Ratti, Behavioral Health Administrator, stated that the presentation would provide an update on behavioral health for vulnerable populations. She said since there had been a prior presentation where all the initiatives were covered, the focus would solely be on the Sequential Intercept Model (SIM) and the Washoe Behavioral Health Center. She acknowledged there was tremendous work done across many divisions and pointed out the Program to Encourage Active, Rewarding Lives (PEARLS) program. She listed multiple divisions on the SIM side and the provider side. She said they spoke that day on behalf of many partners across the County who invested time and resources into the programs. She mentioned the County had invested in over 35 clinicians who were behavioral health professionals and provided direct services within many of the programs. She hoped the program leaders and the multiple people working on initiatives across the County would be recognized. She said the team was working at a policy and systems level with the County and with regional partners.

Judge Egan Walker noted he had three specific topics for discussion. He said he was cognizant that he had directly asked the Board for a full-time employee (FTE) at a recent strategic planning session. He said he hoped that the Board agreed with him that

the return on the FTE would be substantial. He stated he wanted to discuss successes and challenges and would provide a message of hope. He said he had been in the criminal justice field for approximately 35 years in Northern Nevada and had never felt more invigorated in his professional career by what was happening within the County. He stated it had been agreed upon nearly three years ago that the County would own the problem and create a solution. He stated he felt that was being done. Broadly, the SIM was a model of how the appropriate service could be found for the right people at the right time. He mentioned Intercept 3, which was the intercept that he had the most interaction with as a judge, and he wanted to discuss the results. He described an example of heroics that he believed was happening in the County, which occurred at the Washoe County jail related to vulnerable human beings. He said when he first visited the jail in the 1980s, it was a very different place from what it is currently. He mentioned Sheriff Darin Balaam and his staff had actively engaged in behavioral health. He noted he could not overstate the change he witnessed in how human beings were managed at the jail while in custody. He mentioned the District Attorney's (DA) Office, which he felt was one of the busier offices in the State and possibly the West Coast. He said the fact that the DA and his staff had embraced the behavioral health issue vigorously was remarkable. He brought up the large number of hours spent by Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards on a narrow cross-section of individuals who were among the most vulnerable, high-risk, and high needs in the County. He added that in the same category were Public Defender Evelyn Grosenick, Public Defender and Alternate Public Defender Kate Hickman, both of whom appeared regularly at competency court and took personal caseloads. He mentioned the Cares Campus, Lake's Crossing Center, Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS), and felt there was one person who deserved specific recognition for those programs, which was Deputy Public Defender Jennifer Rains. He said she had worked in that area for approximately two decades and had done miraculous work. He felt she should be congratulated and noted that the success of the mentioned programs was due to those professionals. He welcomed questions and comments from the Board.

Ms. Ratti and Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Zach Young conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. They reviewed slides with the following titles: Sequential Intercept Model (SIM); Washoe SIM Implementation Updates; SIM Mapping Brief: Intercept Ratings; SIM Strategic Framework; SJDC Competency Court Goals; SJDC Competency Court; Return on Investment; Next Steps.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *Sequential Intercept Model* and mentioned that the concept was that there were multiple places within the justice system where there was an opportunity to interact with individuals who were experiencing behavioral health challenges. She added that behavioral health encompassed both mental health and substance abuse disorders. She discussed the different intercepts listed on the slide. She detailed that Intercept 0, the crisis response system, was an effort to ensure that individuals who were having a behavioral health crisis would not interact with the justice system unless there were a public safety challenge.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *Washoe SIM Implementation Updates* and focused on the last two bullets that showed the significant progress made on the SIM initiative. She mentioned the justice side deflection and diversion initiatives had been mapped and showed what was currently being done not only in Washoe County, but also in Reno and Sparks. She said the mapping provided an assessment of how each initiative was doing and identified assets, strengths, and gaps that needed to be filled. She noted those gaps were used to create a draft strategic framework that identified which initiatives should be pursued to be more aligned with recognized best practices across the Nation. She explained the last bullet indicated where the County was currently, which was taking the strategic framework and comparing it across jurisdictional meetings. She mentioned the most recent meeting with city attorneys, but they also met with court systems and law enforcement partners from each jurisdiction to test the strategic framework and narrow down the list of initiatives.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide, *SIM Mapping Brief Intercept Ratings*, and said that each of the triangles represented the intercepts. She added that the scale was 0 to 10 and reflected how the County was doing compared to the best practice national model. She said the County was doing relatively well with Intercept 0, the crisis stabilization process that had been worked on for several years. She mentioned good things had happened with Intercept 1 with the initial law enforcement response, particularly training being done through Children in Transition (CIT) programs, the Mobile Outreach Safety Team (MOST), and the Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team, which did specialized responses. She explained that Intercept 2 was the initial diversion, or the first few days in jail or the first court appearance, and potentially the possibility to divert and deflect before getting deeper into the system. She thought that was an area with the least assets in the community, with some opportunity for exploration. She said someone in Intercept 3, the highest-ranked area, would be deeper in the courts. She gave credit to the court systems and credited the specialty court workers who had made meaningful impacts in many lives. She discussed Intercept 4 and noted it was primarily the work done in the jails. She indicated there had been incredible progress, with more work to be done.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *SIM Strategic Framework* and said initially, they had come up with 26 initiatives but narrowed it down to 24. She said partners included more than what was presented in the third bullet. She clarified that not all 24 initiatives would be completed within the first year and mentioned there was a core team that included Judge Walker, who would narrow down the initiatives to the most strategic and impactful. She said all the initiatives would not be discussed because they were still being prioritized. She mentioned they would share insight into one meaningful initiative, Competency Court.

Mr. Young mentioned he believed strongly in the Competency Court and said he spoke on behalf of the different agencies and people involved in the Competency Court. He explained that Competency Court was part of the criminal justice system, and its goal was to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of cases where competency concerns of charged offenders were raised. He noted that they looked at ways to find just results, oftentimes creatively and with an out-of-the-box approach versus the historical

approach. He mentioned Competency Court fell within Intercept 3, the court system. He explained that typically, an offender who commits a crime would be arrested and at some point within the criminal justice process, either at the initial arraignment, bail hearing, or later in the process, competency concerns would be noted. Typically, those concerns would be raised by the defense attorney because they had the most interaction with the offender, but the presiding judge or DA could raise concerns as well. He mentioned that competency should not be perceived as a derogatory term and added that there was a legal definition of what an incompetent person meant under Nevada law. He added it was not unique to Nevada, and each state in the United States (US) had similar laws in which due process would prohibit the prosecution of an incompetent person. He said the Competency Court began in February 2023, and incredible successes had been seen; however, there was room for improvement.

Mr. Young reviewed the slide titled *SJDC Competency Court Goals*, which listed five goals. He said fiscal responsibility was always a paramount concern for government agencies. In the past, when competency was raised, the case could go to any of the district court judges if it were a felony or gross misdemeanor, or any lower courts for the district court level. He noted that Competency Court routed all cases to Judge Walker, with rare exceptions. He said the process resulted in consistency in approach and communication, and a better grasp of available resources. He mentioned the second goal and explained that each case was individually assessed because no case was the same. He explained the assessment included contact with the victim and looking at whether treatment was going to be a feasible option. He mentioned that timeliness in the criminal justice system was extremely important for defendants, victims, and to meet the public's expectations. He explained that the third goal, advance community safety and reduce recidivism, was a paramount concern in the DA's Office. He said that there were obvious benefits to charging offenders who went into Competency Court and received treatment, but that had to be balanced with public safety, recidivism, and victim concerns and rights. He said they looked at what would be the best outcome on an individual, case-by-case basis. The fourth goal, developing partnerships to assist with identifying and providing treatment, was the main focus forward for Competency Court. He explained they were always developing, growing, and expanding who could participate to make Competency Court a success for the offender and the public. Regarding the fifth goal, promoting transparency, efficiency, and improved communication, he noted that everything that was a success or failure began with communication. He explained that communication had been improved with the various stakeholders. He said the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) had committed to being a partner, as veterans found themselves in Competency Court. He mentioned that due process prohibited an incompetent person from being prosecuted. Where competency concerns were raised, the court would order two evaluations from qualified psychologists or psychiatrists to evaluate competency.

Mr. Young reviewed the slide titled *SJDC Competency Court* and said that before the Competency Court's establishment, 246 cases could have gone to different judges, leading to an inconsistent approach. Of the 246 cases that went before the Competency Court, 68 offenders were found competent and were immediately returned to the appropriate court for continuation in the prosecution. He noted the greatest

accomplishment was that, prior to Competency Court, the 176 defendants who were found to be incompetent would have been blindly sent to Lake's Crossing without consideration of the charges, mental health history, incompetency history, victim input, or contemplation of what a just outcome was. He noted that was the previous practice and the County had significantly grown in that respect. In speaking about the discretionary mental health treatment, he explained that there were cases where an alternative was simply not appropriate. He used an example of murder defendants in Competency Court that were found to be incompetent. Those defendants would go to Lake's Crossing in the normal course for competency restoration treatment. He said that in many cases, consideration was given to input from victims, and staff performed a review of the criminal, mental health, and incompetency history to determine if the person was driven by crime, mental health, or incompetency. He mentioned the 176 defendants who were opined to be incompetent would be put into a treatment plan, with the case remaining active. He clarified that the DA's Office would not dismiss the case at that point. At that point, there was a collaboration between treatment individuals to decide what the best treatment plan would be. He gave examples of possible treatment plans that could include housing, medication, treatment, court oversight, inpatient treatment, outpatient plan, or a substance abuse facility. He added that the goal of putting individuals in a position for success would help public safety. He said that the plan was not always successful, and if it resulted in failure, the person could go to Lake's Crossing, and the normal course would be followed. He added it was an individualized approach on an individual basis for the benefit of the offender and the community.

Mr. Young said the other defendants who went to Lake's Crossing were not deemed suitable to go through the alternative track. Of those individuals, 40 were later found competent either through restoration efforts at Lake's Crossing or the Jail-Based Treatment Program (JBTP). He mentioned the JBTP was a relatively new approach at the jail through NaphCare, with enhanced treatment. He clarified the JBTP was not a restoration effort, but the treatment allowed them to regain competency. He mentioned that what started as a handful of people with an estimated 4 to 6 cases per week had grown to over 20 agencies with 25 to 30 cases per week.

Mr. Young mentioned the first goal, fiscal responsibility, and said several County agencies provided resources and personnel when the Competency Court began. He reviewed the slide titled *Return on Investment* and said he felt comfortable saying that the investment that the County provided to the program was returned. He mentioned he did not want to underestimate what the fiscal importance was, but mentioned it was the value and betterment to the community and the offenders. He noted the real goal was recidivism, but felt everyone should be proud of the \$3 million in savings. He said it was a privilege to have worked with Ms. Rains on the project since its inception. He was proud of the growth, but recognized there was room for improvement.

Ms. Ratti acknowledged that with 24 initiatives in the current budget environment, some of those initiatives could require investments as they moved further along in the strategic framework. She recalled an example given regarding the jail-based mental health program where individuals were diverted to Lake's Crossing and noted there

was a slight fragility in the SIM process, due to the waiting list at Lake's Crossing. Those individuals ended up in jail and were now in the jail-based mental health program. She mentioned that the jail-based mental health program was grant-funded and was not included in the State's budget for the upcoming year. She noted staff were working on resolving that issue. She mentioned another grant-funded program, the Support, Treatment, Accountability, and Recovery (STAR) Program through Alternative Sentencing, and said it was one of the places that more individuals needed to go to for behavioral health. She opined it was not necessarily just for individuals who had been deemed incompetent.. She thought great things were being done with categorical grant funding.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide, *Next Steps*, and mentioned the justice side was mapped, and one challenge was the behavioral health side. She wondered if there were enough behavioral health services in the community to accommodate the individuals who were diverted and deflected. She mentioned that key data and metrics needed to be identified so that progress could be demonstrated.

Commissioner Andriola thanked the team for sharing the outcome of one of the models. She noted that the previous year, the Board had fulfilled Judge Walker's ask of not just a part-time employee, but an FTE. She asked Judge Walker to share the outcome of having an FTE and what the support of that resource did. Judge Walker explained that if there were a person in Northern Nevada who understood politics, it would be Ms. Ratti. He believed the County made a genius move when they hired her. He explained that he had not met a more detailed, thoughtful, and nuanced professional in his career, and he thanked the Board for the FTE position that allowed Ms. Ratti to be hired. He said the credit and success for the program belonged to the professionals, and a large part of the credit, particularly in mapping the County, belonged to Ms. Ratti, as that was an incredible task. He recalled his history with the matter, which went back to the 1980s when he attended nursing school. He remembered the County had a blue book for resources, which was always outdated as soon as it was published. He said the mapping that Ms. Ratti had done was not that kind of mapping and explained that to understand a system as complicated as the County was genius. He stated that Ms. Ratti could understand the system. He said hiring her, in his opinion, was the best money that the County had spent.

Judge Walker mentioned another key item, through the Office of the County Manager (OCM), was getting funding for strategic planning. He noted that Social Entrepreneurs, Inc. (SEI) was a corporate entity that provided a lot of strategic planning to help advance his and others' visions forward. He wondered how many victims had been prevented by making people and the community healthier and safer, and added that those dollars were incalculable. He said he wanted the Board to know he had been accountable for the FTE and would tell them where every dollar had been spent and what the return on investment was. Ms. Ratti credited Gabrielle Enfield, Community Reinvestment Manager, for making the funding available to support SEI in the first year. She also credited Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH), which included the SIM in their community health improvement plan and would fund the second year.

Commissioner Andriola said it would be helpful, when time allowed, to have a better understanding of the 24 initiatives, with a grid of possible timelines. She

questioned how the Washoe County Behavioral Center would be a resource to the SIM and what it would look like at a higher level. Ms. Ratti replied that the hope was to have a strategic framework published for the community, within the following quarter, that would include the 24 initiatives. She added that there would be another summit scheduled for the afternoon of April 25, 2025, and the strategic framework, which included a grid, would be released to share the progress of the work with the community. Commissioner Andriola shared that the previous mental health summit resonated with her, and it was beneficial to see the accomplishments of where it started and what it had become. She added that Mr. Young's presentation provided a calculation and mentioned that when there was a situation, such as mental health illness, it could affect more than just the individual. She believed the calculation that was presented showed just one example of fiscal dollar savings. She wondered what was saved in terms of an individual's life, future, productivity, and not having taxpayer resources supporting that individual. She thanked the team for their hard work.

Chair Hill asked why Intercept 5 was not included in the ratings. Ms. Ratti replied that Intercept 5 supervision was a combination of County and State efforts, so staff chose to focus on items that local and regional partners could control. She said there was an abundance of work to be done in that phase and hoped to start work for that intercept in the subsequent year, but for now, the focus was on Intercepts 0 to 4. She added that the SIM coalition was focused on 1 to 4 because there were two coalitions working on Intercept 0. Chair Hill asked for verification that the 24 initiatives did not cover Intercept 5 or 0. Ms. Ratti affirmed Chair Hill's understanding and explained that those intercepts were covered in other efforts. Ms. Ratti explained the 24 initiatives covered Intercepts 1 through 4.

Commissioner Garcia said it was clear on the mapping that the County excelled in Intercept 3, due to the specialty courts, the jail, and the years of hard work that had been done. She asked if the 24 projects were going to target Intercept 2 in the area that received the lowest score. Ms. Ratti corrected her previous statement and said that Intercept 3 included the court and the jail, with Intercept 4 being the reentry portion. She noted that the 24 initiatives were spread across all four intercepts, and Intercept 2 was lower because there was historically less effort in that area. She explained it would be the area that would start with the most exploration, and additional time was needed to review that intercept and ensure meaningful work was done.

Judge Walker added that the team met with the justice court, municipal court, and the city attorneys from the Cities of Reno and Sparks. He mentioned those entities were the first line in public safety issues and were responsible for municipal code misdemeanors. He gave the example of Intercept 2 and noted it sat within those entities' jurisdiction. He said it was a personal mission to apply best practices to Intercept 2 by coordinating among the courts. Chair Hill said it was exciting that so many stakeholders were brought together to see real fiscal outcomes for the County that would change people's lives. She added that the Board looked forward to supporting the work his team did.

Manager Brown stated that he and his team had toured the jail-based mental health treatment program at Parr Boulevard. He encouraged anyone who had not seen it to take a tour.

Ms. Ratti conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe Behavioral Health Center Update; Washoe Behavioral Health Center; Untitled (map slide); West Hills Conceptual Usage 2.0; Process to Date; Highest Community Needs; Resources Secured to Date; Additional Expected Costs; Untitled (options slide); Option 2A; Option 2B; Option 3; Considerations.

Ms. Ratti explained she would provide an update and a presentation on progress to date. She requested guidance on the next steps. She provided an orientation of the Behavioral Health Hospital on the slide. She noted that the slide showed the north side of the facility in pink, the south side shown in orange and green, and the administrative and clinical space on the left side of the map. For the purposes of that day's conversation, the orange showed children's programming, which was a psychiatric residential treatment facility. The options were what happened with the area shown in pink. She mentioned that there had been a significant amount of community engagement, particularly with the provider community that referred people to behavioral health services, about significant gaps in the community, and what would be the best use of the County's investment to ensure there was a safeguard regarding behavioral health.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *West Hills Conceptual Usage 2.0* and mentioned it had been shared with the community. She said the goal was to ensure the facility could serve challenged youth because some of the other facilities could not provide treatment options, which left the community without a local option. She mentioned that the Board had previously heard from Director of the Human Services Agency (HSA) Ryan Gustafson about the challenges that foster care and adoptive families faced when things had escalated, and a short break was needed. There was a need for a facility that could accommodate that. Regarding the crisis response system efforts, a facility was needed that provided crisis stabilization for children who could not be stabilized in their own homes. She hoped to be able to meet the needs of the small population of children who were victims of child trafficking. She indicated that a short-term receiving center was needed for those children to be assessed, evaluated, stabilized, and moved into placement. She noted that there had been a lot of discussion about an adult live-in treatment program, which would have the highest and best use for serving the individuals who were diverted and deflected from the justice system as part of the SIM efforts. She acknowledged the adult live-in treatment program could also ensure there was a good place for some of the individuals who lived at the Cares Campus or Our Place, who had significant behavioral health needs and needed a different setting. She said a known barrier to servicing the community was the ability to receive an assessment, and, at times, a person could wait months to begin treatment. Due to this, being able to offer timely assessment services in the facility was important. She mentioned a partnership with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) to make the facility a place where behavioral health professionals could gain residency experience, which was much needed in the community.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *Process to Date* and said the timeline was created so that everyone was aware of the expectations. She said that in July 2022, the Washoe County Capital Projects team performed a facility condition analysis to analyze the building and how it was functioning, as well as its condition. She mentioned there were multiple community meetings from July 2022 to October 2024 for extensive stakeholder engagement, which resulted in a spreadsheet of close to 200 individuals and various groups in the community who gave feedback on what the building should include. She noted her high level of comfort in knowing the community had input. She said the \$14.5 million American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) award from the State was based on the facility condition analysis of the building. She mentioned it was important to note that the H&K Architects contract included the ability for the team to work with a consultant who had specifically worked on behavioral health facilities and had experience in opening and managing hospitals. She noted that it was essential to have a consultant because the County team did not have that level of expertise internally. She explained that from July 2024 to January 2025, they had been working with a professional to understand more licensing, accreditation, and programmatic needs to ensure the facility would proudly serve the behavioral health needs of the community. She said inspections and estimates were completed, but the detailed work was just beginning.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *Highest Community Needs* and said they identified the four highest community needs that were brought up in conversations with the community. Pediatric acute psychiatric beds would be for children with serious psychiatric disturbances up to the level of being acute that needed to be in a hospital setting. She said the community lacked those types of beds, and as a result, many times those children had to be sent outside of the region. She added that the reason the community lacked those types of beds was that there were not many children under the age of 12 who reached that acute level, but when they did, they really needed care where they could be close to their families. She said that specific need had come up on multiple occasions.

Regarding subacute psychiatric residential treatment for adults, Ms. Ratti explained that a person who was seriously mentally ill typically started in an acute bed, was stabilized enough that they did not meet the acute criteria, and then needed an option that would be a step-down. She said if that individual were a person experiencing homelessness, they would be released to the Cares Campus or Our Place; however, they may not have gained stabilization and could require significantly more intensive behavioral services. She stated that option was missing in the community and Statewide and did not exist in the current licensing standards or the Medicaid service manual. The last of the four highest community needs was supportive housing. She believed transitional supportive housing could be considered for West Hills if one of the earlier options were chosen.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *Additional Expected Costs* and said the project would be more expensive than initially indicated. She reviewed the bullet points on the slide, which explained why the project had incurred additional costs. She added that the County did not intend to operate the building on an ongoing basis but was looking for someone else to operate it. She said the building needed to be something that would attract an operator through a Request for Proposal (RFP) process.

Ms. Ratti reviewed an untitled slide with options listed and said the team had outlined three potential options for the Board's consideration. She discussed Option 1 and noted it included the initial work done by Community Services Development (CSD). She described that Option 2A would include Community Based Living Arrangements (CBLA) and was more of a transitional support of housing model, which already existed within the community. She noted that option would include a supportive housing option that could be helpful for some of the SIM population. She said Option 2B would focus primarily on children and would allow specialized programs for children. Staff believed Option 3 was the best match for the needs of the community and would meet acute hospital standards that would allow for five acute pediatric beds and acute beds for adults. Working with the State, a subacute model could be developed over time. She noted the building standards were not articulated at that point. She reviewed the Ground Up New Construction and said it was for a comparison of cost with the other options and included costs for teardown and rebuild.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *Option 2A* and said a pro was that there were fewer design criteria the County needed to meet, which made it less expensive. She noted that there was relatively high confidence that operating costs could be covered for the children's side of the facility. She detailed on the cons side that there would be no sustainable ongoing business model for supportive housing and would put the County in a position to try to find out how to provide the operating funding.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *Option 2B* and said the main change in the pros section from the 2A option was the sustainability reimbursement model for the entire facility. She informed that there was a payment model for the PRTF, so the County would get the ongoing payment model and would not have to be as worried about paying for operations. It would also provide an opportunity to offer certain specialty services. She mentioned the con would be that it would not offer any services for adults, which would not adhere to the needs in the SIM or help with the Cares Campus or Our Place.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide *Option 3*, and mentioned a con was that it was the most expensive model. She reviewed the slide titled *Considerations*.

Chair Hill asked for clarification on whether they hoped the Board would provide direction on which option to pursue. Ms. Ratti replied that they were looking for energy and momentum around the desired option to pursue.

Commissioner Garcia stated the importance of the facility and recalled that at the previous workshop, the Board gave direction for the County to take the lead role in the issue, and she thought that staff had done that successfully. She remembered that when she was a foster and adoptive mother during COVID-19 (C19), resources were stripped away overnight. She felt services were needed in the community that were not provided elsewhere, and served those who needed help the most. She said that she was most excited about Option 3 because it was critical to provide behavioral health services for those who had nowhere else to go. She explained that the other options could be built, but the community would continue to struggle in a State that was the lowest for youth and adult

behavioral health, and there would be connectivity with the SIM. She said her reasoning for becoming a Commissioner was because of the excitement she had that the County was taking the lead in this matter. She commended the staff for purchasing the asset. She thought a facility needed to be built that did not compete with the other providers in the region. She said she was not afraid of the shortfall, and she believed the community was very generous and resourceful, and mentioned the possibility of private donors, foundations, hospitals, managed organizations, and other individuals. She mentioned it would be the best return on investment that Washoe County could have.

Commissioner Andriola recalled asking Judge Walker what the biggest need was. Judge Walker replied that there was a need for beds. Judge Walker stated that when he was responsible for juvenile services, between 50 and 100 individuals were sent out of State every month for acute psychiatric treatment. He added that the cost to send each person was approximately \$10,000 to \$20,000. He noted that it was an extremely expensive task. He said the answer was easy; beds were needed. She thanked Judge Walker for sharing their conversation. She mentioned the investment in the new facility would make it one of a kind in the State, and she felt there were opportunities that the State would recognize and provide funding. She felt that initial fundraising was a viable option and had been successful for other projects in the community, such as the Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team and the Cares Campus. She believed there were philanthropic efforts that could be explored to help with funding. She said Option 3 had the sustainability model, which she thought was important. She opined it was irresponsible not to look at what already had sustainability built into it. She stated that Option 3 was the option that the Board should move towards. She thought it was important not to put the burden on taxpayers and suggested reaching out to the community for philanthropic funding. She said she was not previously aware of the numbers that Judge Walker had disclosed regarding the cost of sending juveniles out of the State for treatment, and noted it was costly on an annual basis. She mentioned the Kid's Kottage and stated it was not a place for children with mental health situations, but there were no other options for those children. She said she appreciated the efforts of all involved and felt Option 3 would have a long-term impact on the community and would save money and change lives.

Commissioner Clark stated there was no question that the County needed the facility but wondered how the County would pay for it. He recalled a briefing the Board received regarding how tight funds were in the County. He said the information from the previous year stated the initial operating costs would be \$4.8 million to purchase the property and approximately \$13 million to bring the facility to operational condition. He asked for clarification on the operating costs that were presented the previous year and how they had changed in the current presentation. He agreed the County needed the facility and noted staff had met with other counties about the project. He thought individuals from outside the County had occupied the Cares Campus, and he wondered if the new facility would be restricted to Washoe County residents or if people from other counties or states would be allowed. He recalled that the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) was going to receive money for holding people from out of the area. He wondered how the cost could be shared by other entities if people from outlying areas used the facility. He explained that the City of Reno remodeled its police station in an old building and tried to retrofit, which

cost them approximately \$50 to \$70 million. He felt the County could have had a brand-new facility for the cost of what this old facility would cost. He alleged that the new police facility had multiple issues, and he wondered, with all the money that went into the behavioral health facility, if there was a potential for future problems. He mentioned he read the appraisal from when the property was purchased and said the scope of work was limited to only the appraisal. He felt it should have included the costs of licensing and reopening a facility that had been closed. He recalled discussions about a Tuberculosis (TB) clinic that would be built at that location, and he said the Commissioners had prior discussions about selling the old Medical Examiners' building to help pay for the TB clinic. He wondered if that had ever happened and asked staff to inform him about whether the County still owned the old Medical Examiners' building. He suggested that, since the County owned a large number of surplus properties, some of those properties should be sold to help pay for the project. He stated that the County would receive the income from the sales of the properties and would get those properties on the tax roll. He felt there were elected officials' departments that were shorthanded, and thought the existing departments should be taken into consideration. He noted that those elected officials were voted into office, and the County was leaving those departments shorthanded.

Ms. Ratti reviewed the slide titled *Option 3* and clarified that the total cost for Option 3 was approximately \$38 to \$43 million. She said staff explored the possibility of ground-up construction; however, those costs were estimated to be \$66 to \$73 million. Due to that, the team felt that the fiscally responsible solution was Option 3 due to the ongoing operating costs. She said they recognized that the project competed with other departments and other priorities. She hoped the Board would take into consideration the overall economic needs of the County and not just the needs of the project. She said in terms of how funds would be raised, there was high confidence for the philanthropic effort; however, she appreciated other suggestions the Commissioners provided and noted they would be taken into consideration.

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro mentioned that the discussions on the project had occurred over a year, with staff taking strategic direction from the Board. He appreciated the vision that allowed staff to go down unfamiliar paths. He recalled that the Board's direction was to begin work regarding the behavioral health issue, and he felt that it was accomplished strategically by researching properties, how to leverage them, and exploring opportunities. He hoped to have something for the Board on February 25, 2025, to discuss the disposition of the TB clinic and the resulting funds from its sale. Regarding the cost of the facility, he noted the County was now working in a dynamic construction world, and that when staff first researched the facility in 2022, they knew exactly what it would take to buy and rehabilitate the facility. He said understanding the needs of the community and not wanting to compete with other providers in the community changed the outcome of what needed to be done, which was part of the strategic nature of the project. He said he did not want to portray that the staff was perfect every time they evaluated a piece of property. He said the alternative would be to do what had been done in the past, which was building more beds at the jail and more courtroom space; however, he believed that was very unsustainable. He added that the staff's intent, from the Board's strategic direction, was to solve a problem before it became an issue in the

community. He noted that the preventative actions taken for the community were expensive. He said the comments from the Board would be taken into consideration and stated the Board would have a chance to provide further direction to staff as items related to the project were brought forward.

Commissioner Clark said he was not opposed to what was needed but questioned how to get there. He added it was essential to understand what the costs would be. He believed cost overruns and government were closely related. He opined it was rare, in a government project, that the estimated cost was less than the actual cost. He explained that, by definition, homeless people did not have an address. He said other counties admitted to transporting people to Washoe County facilities, and he thought it could happen with the behavioral health center when other counties did not. He felt it was important to research how to get reimbursement from other entities. He mentioned the RGJ reported that the Cares Campus had devalued property in the neighboring area. He wondered if the new facility would do the same. He thought the County needed to figure out how to make the facility work because it was stuck with it.

Ms. Ratti responded that it should be acknowledged that Washoe County was the urban center for Northern Nevada. She noted that the way healthcare worked in Nevada was that there was limited healthcare, particularly in the rural counties. She noted the County served as the regional hub for healthcare in Northern Nevada. She anticipated that most of the individuals being served in the new facility would qualify for Medicaid. She explained that Medicaid did not come out of the County's budget, and for the most part, the funding source for Medicaid was a combination of a state contribution that was generally around one-third and a federal contribution that was generally around two-thirds. The ongoing payer source for the individuals using the facility would primarily be a combination of State and federal resources through the Medicaid system, since it was a healthcare facility. She could not say that the facility would not potentially serve individuals from rural areas, but because the County would own the facility, the County would be conscientious to ensure that Washoe County families would have access to care in the facility. She added that there was more leverage with the County facility than in any other behavioral healthcare facility in the community. She said Washoe County was a regional center with rural areas that relied on Washoe County's health care systems, but she felt the County had more leverage and influence because it owned the building and the RFP. Commissioner Clark informed that he asked the questions he asked because they were questions that would come up with the constituents. He mentioned other department heads had similar questions because their departments were neglected for a new facility. Ms. Ratti said she was aware of the sensitivity of the issue and that the Board, as the governing body, understood the difference between a one-shot capital improvement cost and an ongoing operating cost. She noted her intent to fund the project in a way that would not impact the ongoing operating costs or be competitive with other County departments or other private health care facilities partners in the region. She noted that was the reasoning for the emphasis in the presentation to complete the project as a one-shot as opposed to an ongoing expense.

Commissioner Garcia said she understood that what was needed was direction on how to move forward with the new facility. She felt the County needed to

decide what type of landlord it wanted to be. She said extensive community outreach had been done, and she felt all details had been addressed. She thought that what was found was that there were populations that were not being served and had nowhere else to go. She felt confident that when looking for philanthropic support, staff would find that the facility filled an essential service that was currently missing in Northern Nevada. She mentioned it was made clear by Ms. Ratti that Option 3 was a billable and sustainable pathway for the County as landlords, not operators, which meant County staff would not be dedicating time and energy at the facility. She noted the facility would be a hospital that was run similarly to any other partner in the region. She thought Option 3 allowed flexibility to offer subacute, which was a key component. She said she was comfortable with the direction to staff and was excited to see resources come together. She added that the community had been last for many decades, and she thought it was a great starting point for the County. She acknowledged it was a scary time to start the program, as fiscal conversations were at the forefront; however, she reiterated that the staff would seek philanthropic donations.

Ms. Julia Ratti recognized the HSA and CSD teams who did a lot of work on the project. Chair Hill stated that when they went to the Legislature to ask for funding, the Interim Finance Committee specifically asked if Washoe County would accept its rural neighbors, and the County responded it would because it was not something that existed in Nevada. She noted the Interim Finance Committee gave the County \$14.5 million. She believed the County needed to be a good partner. She said it had been proven that the County could fundraise and noted it raised \$6 million for the Cares Campus, and she believed double that could be easily raised with a facility that served children. She stated she supported Option 3.

12:52 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

1:32 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

25-0053 **AGENDA ITEM 6E** Discussion of regional housing availability, affordability, inventory challenges and best practices used to stimulate additional housing, which may include engagement of the private and non-profit sectors.

Taylor Adams, President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN), and Eric Rowen, Board Member of EDAWN, conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Approaches to Public/Private Partnerships; Discussion Flow; Public/Private Partnership Overview; Economic Development Background - Eric Rowen; Economic Development Background – Taylor Adams; What is a Public/Private Partnership; Benefits of a Public/Private Partnership; Benefits of a Public/Private Partnership (cont.); Public/Private Partnership Process; Thank You! Questions?

Mr. Adams thanked the Board for inviting them to present at the meeting. He stated that they would primarily discuss the opportunities available to Washoe County

to utilize Public Private Partnerships (P3) in advancing critical infrastructure needs for housing, public use, and infrastructure expansion. He expressed the belief that there were issues the private sector could solve faster, more efficiently, and at a lower cost than the County could accomplish alone. He stated that he intended to present the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) with strategies that he hoped could create new opportunities for the Board and citizens.

Mr. Rowen introduced himself and expressed his privilege and pride in presenting before the Board and assisting the community. He noted his enthusiasm for supporting the community by generating several opportunities and fulfilling the communities' needs without the County paying for them entirely. He attested that there was significant potential that had gone unrealized or unused that the County had the ability to utilize, which could facilitate several sought-after changes. He reiterated their pride and joy in being present at the meeting.

Mr. Rowen referred to the slide titled *Economic Development Background – Eric Rowen* to provide more insight into his professional background and experience. He stated that he had substantial experience with economic development. He reported that he had served as a Board Member of the Los Angeles Economic Development Council (LAEDC) since 1993 and as Chair of the LAEDC from 1998 to 1999. He reiterated his substantial experience with economic development and working towards facilitation. He reported that one of his primary responsibilities during his employment with the LAEDC was specifically related to P3 projects. He reflected that while in his initial role with LAEDC, he did not document or finalize details for their P3 projects but had known enough to be effective in providing significant assistance. Mr. Rowen reported that the LAEDC had conducted several substantial P3 projects and proposals but noted that they had not all been completed. He listed Martin Luther King Jr. Community Hospital, the University of California Los Angeles Harbor Medical Office Complex, and the West Adams Affordable Housing Project as the P3 projects he had worked on while employed with Los Angeles County.

Mr. Rowen stated that he was a lawyer and had worked in that field for major law firms throughout his career. He noted that he was a litigator with specific experience in coordinated real estate litigation. He listed relevant former work experience, including Coordinator of Jones Day West Coast Real Estate Litigation, President of ParkMedia, and Vice Chair of Paul Hastings. He described his current position as Chair of Greenberg Traurig Global Real Estate Litigation, where he had worked for 18 years. He noted that he had left that position to run a company for Apollo Global Real Estate Aggregation for about five years. He stressed that he had a substantial background working on P3 projects and utilizing real estate in various ways.

Mr. Adams referred to the slide titled *Economic Development Background – Taylor Adams*. He acknowledged that while many people knew him as the CEO of EDAWN, there were elements of his past work that they might not be aware of. He stated that before working at EDAWN, he served as the Chief Procurement Officer for the City of Virginia Beach, where he structured all of the region's P3 projects during his three-year

tenure in that role. He noted that he later moved to the position of Deputy City Manager for Economic Vitality for the City of Virginia Beach, where he oversaw their P3 projects. He stated that as the Economic Developer he was responsible for executing P3 projects. He asserted that over \$1 billion was secured by projects operated through those P3 programs, which he noted had been successfully executed throughout the eight to nine years he had spent in that role.

Mr. Adams noted that before he served in those positions, he served as the Chief Administrator, Chief Development Officer, and Chief Procurement Officer of Starkville, Mississippi. He described Starkville and reported that it had a total population of approximately 25,000 residents at the time of his employment. He attested that they had initiated and executed a comprehensive revision of the zoning and development code and generated \$350 million worth of P3 development, which included a new convention center, a hotel, and several other projects. He stated that those efforts allowed the community's private sector to thrive. He reflected that during that time, he was convinced to serve as the President and Chair of the Governing Board for the National Institute of Governmental Procurement, which he described as the professional association that oversaw all public procurement practitioners in the United States (US) who wrote and administered solicitations. He reiterated his experience and delight to have been invited to present at the BCC meeting.

Mr. Rowen referred to the slide titled *What is a Public/Private Partnership?* to elaborate on the purpose and role provided by P3 projects. He acknowledged that many knew what a P3 was but described the partnership in regard to Washoe County as a collaboration between government and private enterprise that would enable the governmental agency to provide desired public services to be planned, financed, and executed by EDAWN in conjunction with the private partner. He elaborated that the private partner would take on the onus of the operations and development to earn potential profits and opportunities generated by the project. He stated that those efforts would not be possible without involvement and participation from the County and that their participation would considerably benefit the County and its constituents. He provided an example of a hypothetical circumstance that could be created by a P3, where a County asset such as land or a building in disrepair that had little value or significant liability was developed into something that not only prevented the loss of funds but generated income while providing the County with a needed service or facility. He listed workforce housing, government installations such as courthouses, infrastructure in the form of waste treatment facilities, and other projects that could generate income as potential services or facilities that could be developed.

Mr. Adams elaborated that they had included those specific examples due to EDAWN's vested interest and understanding of the BCC's priorities. He acknowledged that EDAWN understood the importance of addressing the County's need for workforce housing, senior resources, and amenities and facilities which could be developed and delivered by the private sector to ensure the health and longevity of citizens throughout their careers and into their retirement. He reiterated their belief in P3s being an effective tool for that space. He elaborated on the example they had provided regarding the

courthouse and identified it as the oldest building in downtown Reno. He attested that there were solutions available in the market to address the portions of the courthouse that were approaching a state of disrepair while delivering a more modern result and improving service delivery.

Mr. Adams referred to the content on the slide titled *Benefits of a Public/Private Partnership*. He noted that the listed examples identified advantages for the County becoming involved in P3 projects. He attested that a critical factor for the success of a P3 project was the proper assignment of risk. He opined that risk was equivalent to cost in development efforts. He noted that effectively and appropriately conducting risk assignments led to better results and potential outcomes. He noted that economic growth and job creation referred to the County's tax base. He reiterated that EDAWN understood the issues faced by the Board and referred to conversations held regarding future public budgets across Washoe County and the entire region. He asserted that the vast majority of projects that EDAWN would bring forward under any potential partnership would serve as a source for a new net tax base. He expressed the belief that the region needed those sources to continue delivering services at the level expected by the citizens.

Mr. Rowen noted that the tax base did not exclusively refer to property taxes but also to creating jobs and stimulating the local economy. He opined that one of the most significant results of P3 projects was the potential of creating the halo or umbrella effect. He attested that the umbrella effect often occurred when a P3 project led to the improvement of an area and was particularly common in areas that were dilapidated or underperforming. He elaborated that the P3 project would transform those areas, attract a new customer base, and subsequently inspire the ownership of neighboring locations to conduct independent property improvements. Those improvements would spread exponentially and eventually enhance the entire surrounding community around the P3 project developed with support from the County. He reiterated that while a P3 project might not generate significant income from property taxes for the first several years due to terms being set to incentivize the private partner's role in development, there were numerous additional opportunities to generate revenue by and for the County. He attested that the P3 project would turn an asset from a cost burden into an opportunity that generated revenue. He noted that the period without generated revenue was comparatively short in relation to the total lifespan of the development. He asserted that the private partnered enterprise would naturally be incentivized to quickly make a profit on the development.

Mr. Adams noted that enhanced accountability did not exclusively refer to the accountability of the private partner. He indicated that there was an opportunity for initial solicitations to be developed into public processes, which would be necessary to ensure the County and the citizens remained protected with any proposed P3 projects. He stated that an essential aspect of accountability was the removal of the barriers to entry as they related to the market. He provided the example of housing and noted that creating better housing options could potentially stabilize a household and allow the County's focus to shift to enabling the local economy in a meaningful way that empowered citizens to grow and enjoy the aspects that made the region great. He noted that another critical factor

of accountability they contributed was removing the barrier to entry related to the economy and the opportunity to thrive within it.

Mr. Adams referred to the list of benefits outlined in the slide titled *Benefits of a Public/Private Partnership* and noted that the list was provided for the Board to review. He attested that the benefits listed on the slide were relatively broad and offered exciting opportunities for the future.

Mr. Adams noted that the list on the slide titled *Public/Private Partnership Process* contained a summary of actions EDAWN was willing to take. He acknowledged that the concepts presented to the BCC were relatively new to Northern Nevada and not broadly utilized locally, despite being more common around the US. He attested that EDAWN would be present to support the BCC as a partner by providing their expertise at both the executive and staff level for assistance in administering the potential P3 opportunities as necessary. He offered to take questions from the Board.

Chair Hill inquired if most of the P3 projects would require bonding and informed Mr. Adams that the Board was recently advised by their financial team not to bond. Mr. Adams asked whether Chair Hill had referred to bonding related to construction sureties or the County's capacity to issue debt. Chair Hill asked for information on both categories to understand the topic better, as the Board had been told numerous times to avoid non-standard procedures. She attested that elaboration would be helpful to familiarize the Board with possibilities to leverage the funding already available for P3 projects in consideration of the County's fiscal situation.

Mr. Rowen explained that construction bonding could be described by the example of bonding the completion of a particular project, where a bond would be placed to support the cost to complete the project and ensure the necessary funding was available to substitute the original private party if they defaulted and could not deliver a completed project. He reiterated that those bonds were typically called performance or completion bonds, depending upon the project being undertaken. He noted that the responsibility in that case would fall upon the developer, not the County. He acknowledged that Chair Hill was likely referring to a different type of bond and opined that being warned about bonds was reasonable if they did not know enough about them, but attested that bonds could be very beneficial. He noted that P3 projects generally would not anticipate any bonding with the County.

Mr. Rowen introduced the concept of Community Facility Districts (CFD), which he noted had been adopted in many different states and communities to transfer the responsibility of costs associated with developing new infrastructure from the government entity to the district. He noted that the implementation of CFDs also provided an opportunity for developers to choose and identify a new development area in need of infrastructure. He offered a hypothetical example of an area needing the construction of infrastructure, such as sewers, curbs, gutters, lights, and utilities, before a developer could develop lots for the homes they intended to build. He elaborated that in such a case, the county or presiding government entity of that area would be requested to provide and

establish those facilities, which would come at a significant expense. He stated that the government entity could instead classify that area as a CFD to transfer the responsibility of the infrastructure development cost onto the district rather than taking it upon themselves. He noted that typically, in such a case, each lot would be separately assessed in addition to its property tax for the cost of carrying the bonds, and the governmental entity would be expressly excluded from the responsibility for those costs. He asserted that general funds would not be at risk unless the governmental entity decided voluntarily to step in and willingly contribute funding, such as in the case of development issues. He reiterated that the CFD would be an independent entity responsible for repaying those bonds. He noted that the cost could be significant for the owners of each lot.

Chair Hill likened the concept of a CFD to a Special Improvement District (SID) and asked if a CFD was specifically for commercial development. Mr. Adams confirmed that CFDs and SIDs followed the same concept and clarified that a CFD could be used for commercial or residential purposes. He noted that generally, a P3 would not contemplate using any of the jurisdiction's bondable capacity, but he reported knowing examples of P3s utilizing that in the past. He reflected on his experience working on an urban revitalization project in a city he previously served. Mr. Adams complimented the project and noted that it was under construction and, at completion, would contribute approximately \$450 million worth of net new construction in that region, which would contribute to taxes. He stated that real estate taxes had not been collected for the project but identified other revenue sources, such as but-for taxes, which could cover the cost of developing parking infrastructure. He noted that collecting those taxes enabled them to overbuild the parking infrastructure and create the halo effect, which could improve the tax base of the entire district. He noted that they had utilized industrial revenue bonds for that project as they would not count against the general obligation capacity of the city and were specific to the revenues projected by the bonding authority. He attested that if the Board implemented that process in Washoe County, the County's general obligation capacity would be untouched in the transaction. He noted that the benefit of using industrial revenue bonds was that they would reduce the private developer's financing cost and allow for a better-completed project. He stressed that the structure of P3 partnerships would be exclusively at the County's discretion and noted that there were many tools available for funding other than bonding. He indicated his strong agreement with Mr. Rowen's previous statements about surety bonding. He attested that he would never encourage the County not to have certainty with their general contractor or development completion. He expressed understanding of the Board's apprehension toward utilizing the County's general obligation capacity and why they had been advised to avoid doing so.

Chair Hill noted the individual basis of determination for each project. Mr. Adams agreed and attested that most P3 projects would not require bonding. He attested that if bonding was needed, the terms would be incredibly specialized, and tools would be available to avoid utilizing the County's general obligation capacity. Mr. Rowen clarified that the County would not be contributing the money as the bonds were sold to private entities. He elaborated that all of the funds generated for the CFD or the SID would be from private purchasers of government-issued bonds backed solely by the district and the property or infrastructure they created, as well as the revenue generated by using that

infrastructure. He elaborated that each person who used the infrastructure would be charged and that money would be received separately after the property tax bill, which would then be paid to the bondholders. He stressed that the government entity had nothing to do with that process aside from serving as an intermediary of the funds, as they would be solely tied to the CFD projects.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Adams and Mr. Rowen for educating the Board on the topic. She referred to the slides titled *Benefits of a Public/Private Partnership* and *Benefits of a Public/Private Partnership (cont.)*, which outlined the different benefits of P3 projects. She asked for examples of challenges they had experienced at the county and city levels in the jurisdictions they formerly served that would be relevant to the Board.

Mr. Adams opined that the biggest challenge they could face was the procedural difficulties associated with soliciting the proper request when notifying the market of their intentions. He stressed the need for the inquiry to be accurate and attested that the chance for success depended on the quality of that document. He reflected that where he had witnessed projects fail most commonly was when projects began with improper requests containing unclear intent or an uncertain desired outcome from the public agency seeking a private partnership. He stressed that it was critical to initiate that process very intentionally in order for the private entity to understand how the Board defined success. He reiterated the importance of understanding what they intended to achieve. He noted that all of the tools available in the market could be utilized to deliver results only if the goal was fully understood. He reiterated that if they were to put forward a vague request, they could expect to receive unclear responses and experience increased difficulty in evaluating the quality of their options. He stressed again that when P3 projects did not succeed, it was a result of providing indistinct intentions and expected accomplishments from the partnership. He emphasized that acting intentionally was the critical first step to moving forward.

Mr. Rowen reflected that in his experience, the point of failure could be found even earlier in the process. He agreed that the Request for Proposal (RFP) would have to be explicit regarding what was desired. He noted that the RFP did not have to include what was being done or how it would be done, as those factors were negotiations meant to take place later in the process. He stressed that the RFP needed to be precise about the agency's goals as the potential partner would serve as the project designer, builder, and contractor who would be responsible for the deal, the build, the engineers or architects involved, and for completion within the maximum budget they had agreed upon. He elaborated that the governing agency in the partnership would set forth negotiations and outline how they were willing to enhance the deal to provide incentives for the private entities. He noted that the government agency would not be losing anything in a P3 project as they would be transforming, for example, a parcel of their property that had been losing money into a project that would produce considerable funds, jobs, and other benefits to the community.

Mr. Rowen reiterated his agreement with Mr. Taylor and emphasized the importance of transferring the process out of politics. He stressed that politics was

challenging due to the commonality of conflicting priorities among Commissioners, council members, and the community. He opined that the misalignment of those priorities often led to further disagreements and delays, which shifted the focus to minute details rather than the comprehensive vision. He opined that a primary contribution provided by EDAWN was its neutrality in accomplishing goals as quickly as possible. He expressed that much of the early success of P3 projects depended on identifying easily achievable projects that demonstrated to the community the governmental agency's ability and the benefits of the opportunities the project created. He stressed the necessity for the Board to attempt to separate politics from projects by withstanding opposition from constituents and groups who pushed for their individual interests.

Mr. Rowen reflected on his previous experience working in Los Angeles County, which he noted had tremendous reciprocal opposition and varying opinions to consider from the county and the 88 cities it encompassed. He stressed that Washoe County had a comparatively better opportunity due to its homogenous nature, ability to identify development needs collaboratively, and capacity to compromise on solutions to meet those needs reasonably. He suggested removing the politics from projects by providing a list of surplus properties that the County was willing to enter into a P3 partnership program, so that experts such as EDAWN could identify the best strategies to achieve the Board's goals. He noted that EDAWN would not operate alone or without consultation at the end, receiving initial direction in the beginning, or knowing the exact and definite desired outcome. He noted that once goals were communicated, the RFP process could begin. He reiterated that the biggest challenges he faced in achieving a successful P3 project were consistently related to politics. He stressed that while the RFP process was critical, it would not always be difficult with expert consultation. He reported that EDAWN was aware of a preeminent organization that acted as accountants with experience in representing government entities in P3 projects. He suggested that they could provide highly accurate projections of costs and estimated needs, as well as recommendations on how to proceed with the project based on the terms the County set for the project.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Adams and Mr. Rowen for spending their time sharing the information they had presented. She acknowledged that it was essential to investigate optimizing available resources and prioritizing the needs of the County and the community, but there were legislative tools already available to them. She stated that she had expressed to many that she disliked the name of the Special Assessment Districts (SAD) due to the spelling of the acronym. She noted that she would prefer to view their actions as not being described by that word. She acknowledged that there were SADs and SIDs already in place legislatively. She stressed the importance of utilizing what the County already had available to the jurisdictions and community-wide, with investigations into the flattening of Nevada's Consolidated Tax (c-tax) and property tax adjustments to the Legislature. She opined that despite being outside of the Board's purview, the way funding came into local jurisdictions needed work, and they would need to think differently about how they approached that issue. She noted that a part of the State was utilizing those resources extremely successfully. She referred to the idea that development paid for infrastructure but indicated a delay in that process, which created a need to approach that concept differently. She reported that 20 or 30 years ago, there were very few contractors

able to do design-build projects, and there was trepidation about placing trust in the expertise of those interested in being involved in every aspect of the development. She noted that she was not suggesting that everything be turned over blindly and referenced comments from Mr. Adams and Mr. Rowen regarding having and communicating very clear expectations for the projects. She opined that the Board could avoid delays and investigate what could be done. She noted that the Nevada Legislature would soon be in session, and the outcomes were unknown. She acknowledged that the issue of housing was a predominant topic for conversation and that there would be a presentation to discuss that topic further during the meeting. She reiterated that potential funding may be received from the State and that legislative tools and resources were already available. She agreed with Mr. Rowen's previous mention of politics.

Commissioner Andriola stressed the importance of educating the community. She acknowledged the County's efforts to inform the community. She noted that constituents were the ones who felt the pain and carried the burden of issues caused by the construction of infrastructure. She stressed that the Board was missing opportunities that were available locally and immediately. She opined that there was more that the Board could do to assist in improving the education process so that those they served could better understand what the process looked like. She elaborated that EDAWN had a place in that process due to their neutrality in creating jobs and developing the future to ensure later generations could live in and afford to stay in the County. She acknowledged that EDAWN would have the statistics for addressing those issues, but stressed the importance of having attainable housing for various categories of individuals who lacked representation and accommodation. She referred to Mr. Rowen's previous work developing the Martin Luther King Jr. Community Hospital and compared it to the Washoe County Behavioral Center. She noted that she would gladly speak to Mr. Rowen about it as a potential fundraising opportunity. She described the behavioral center as an example of a project that addressed a crisis in the community. She asserted that the County had been recognized as the only one in the State with the resources available to fund that project without using money from taxpayers. She voiced that they investigated opportunities to offer resources that would impact everyone's lives and be part of the public safety infrastructure. She reiterated her offer to connect Mr. Rowen with the staff handling the finances for that project. She opined that he had a perfect background and relevant experience in those efforts, as he had previously assisted in building a hospital.

Mr. Rowen asked if there was a hospital in that complex, and Commissioner Andriola noted there could be an excellent opportunity for that. Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards advised that the conversation should be limited and realigned to the matters on the agenda. Commissioner Andriola agreed and noted that there would be an opportunity to have that discussion later. Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Adams and Mr. Rowen. Mr. Adams thanked Commissioner Andriola for sharing her thoughts and noted that they agreed with what she had expressed. Chair Hill and Commissioner Andriola thanked ADA Edwards. Mr. Rowen reported that the hospital complex they had talked about in Los Angeles was proposed to be self-sustaining through medical office properties and other private ventures that generated substantial income through rent, which funded hospital operations and contributed to the nearby Charles R. Drew University of Medicine

and Science, which had faced challenges previously. He elaborated that the opportunity zone was to encompass an area of 145 acres, but noted that they could discuss the topic further at another time.

Commissioner Clark referred to the P3 opportunities he had been involved with during his career and stated that many companies would build post offices and then lease the buildings back to the government. He noted that the contractors, investors, and lenders would come together to present a plan that the government liked, with details such as square footage. He proposed that if a builder-developer could be identified to construct a courthouse for the County, the judges would be involved in the design, and the developer would utilize their architects for that task, with the County serving as the tenant. He reiterated that the developer would construct the building and be the owner in charge of maintaining the property while the County leased the building from them. He noted that a P3 project operated in that way was something the Board should consider, as that would be much simpler than utilizing bonds or other options. He reiterated that if they could identify a company to build a courthouse, the County could enter a long-term lease for the building and be involved in the design process, and the County would not need to provide the developer with tax breaks if they owned the building. He stressed that the County would be provided with a facility that could be used and serve as a source of pride, while another entity owned, maintained, and paid property taxes on the building. He reiterated his interest in the County becoming involved in a P3 investment of that kind.

ADA Edwards noted that while a P3 of that concept and type was possible, he reminded the Board that the agenda outlined their discussion as covering P3 partnerships that addressed housing. County Manager Eric Brown stated that the topic was not confined to housing. ADA Edwards recited the exact language from the agenda.

Mr. Adams reported that the model Commissioner Clark had described was well-known nationally, very likely to be successful, and had been used for housing and other public facilities such as schools. Commissioner Clark clarified that he had broached that topic as the discussion previously included mention of the Martin Luther King Jr. Community Hospital. He attested that he was very familiar with that project and the logistics due to his time spent in Southern California. Commissioner Clark described P3 projects in simple terms and noted that if the County owned the property or the land, it would have a lease with the private entity, which would be solely responsible for maintenance. He referred to the content of an earlier presentation that discussed the costs and logistics associated with maintaining infrastructure, which demonstrated the benefits of serving as a tenant with a lease rather than bearing ownership responsibilities. He reiterated his intent to identify a simple way for the County to access a new facility while allowing another entity to collect rent and maintain the property. Mr. Adams agreed that leasing and operating a facility that was purpose-built by a private partner for the exclusive use of the County would be a desirable use of the P3 model within Washoe County.

Chair Hill asked Mr. Adams and Mr. Rowen how workforce housing would generate revenue, as she did not entirely understand the financial logistics. Mr. Adams answered that it could be as simple as designating a piece of property owned by the County

as surplus, which could be marketed to a private developer for the specific intent of building housing. He elaborated that the County had tools, such as the value of that real estate, that would allow the County to bring the per-unit cost down and let the market deliver better housing in an area chosen by the County, most likely near where most tenants would be working. He attested that within that space, there would be an opportunity to deliver housing to the market from a competitive developer within the private sector at a number that dramatically increased opportunity and the tax base. He noted that they would anticipate that the project, upon completion, would be subject to tax rules.

Chair Hill noted that she had heard from developers that the new economic reality was that the County giving them the property was not enough incentive or compensation for their role in development. She stated that she was especially concerned about that as it related to workforce housing. Mr. Adams responded by stressing that complications around the 10-Year US Treasury Note were impacting the financing ability of deals that were of a very short-term nature. He attested that they anticipated markets to stabilize and conditions to change quickly with the end of the election. Chair Hill noted that the information was interesting and suggested they would need to have further discussions. She expressed her appreciation for EDAWN's service as a non-profit partner that worked with all jurisdictions. She noted Commissioner Garcia served as a Designated Trustee on the EDAWN Board of Trustees. She expressed her excitement that the other jurisdictions would want to support and contribute to a new thing for EDAWN. She noted that the County would see whether they could have further discussions to identify what that would look like.

Mr. Rowen and Mr. Taylor thanked the Board. Manager Brown thanked them and informed Chair Hill that the following steps would be continuing discussions with EDAWN to potentially bring additional information back to the Board that they could respond to regarding P3 projects. Chair Hill agreed with the suggestion and thanked Manager Brown.

Manager Brown invited Maurice Page, Executive Director of the Nevada Housing Coalition (NHC), to come forward and thanked him for participating. Mr. Page introduced himself to the board and thanked the Board for allowing the NHC to participate in housing conversations in Washoe County. Mr. Page expressed his gratitude for his involvement and hoped to provide insight and outlook into vital housing solutions for Washoe County.

Mr. Page conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Approaches to Attainable Housing; Discussion Flow; Nevada Housing Coalition Washoe County Strategy Meeting; About Us; 2024 Nevada Housing Profile; Challenges Facing Washoe County; Washoe County Housing Statistics; Housing Affordability – Washoe County; Cost Burdened Renter Households - Washoe County; Nevada's Affordable Housing Supply; Tools to Address the Affordable Housing Issue in Washoe County; Washoe County Affordable Housing Trust Fund; AB310 – Supportive Housing Development Fund; Supplemental Government Services Tax; Possibilities in the Future; Possibilities in the Future (continued); Thank you.

Mr. Page described the mission and role of the NHC in providing direction, guidance, and advocacy for affordable housing across Nevada. He informed the Board that the information in the presentation was pulled from a Statewide network of over 350 NHC members. Mr. Page acknowledged the Board's familiarity with the issue of housing affordability in Nevada. He attested that discussing the topic would need to begin with comparing housing affordability and affordable housing. Mr. Page clarified that affordable housing could be described as specifically designed and priced for low-to-moderate-income households, which were often government-subsidized or regulated to ensure they remained affordable for those demographics over time. Mr. Page stated that housing affordability was a broader concept, with the term referring to the overall affordability and availability of all housing that encompassed all income levels, which additionally considered the impact of economic and market forces on housing costs relevant to household income. Mr. Page stressed that affordable housing was desperately needed in Washoe County and attested that the issue could not be ignored. He noted that the need to manage and provide housing to all populations of Nevadans could be better addressed through discussion on the comprehensive concept of housing affordability.

Mr. Page referred to the slide titled *Washoe County Statistics* to provide data on population growth and housing costs within Washoe County and identify the challenges indicated by the data. Mr. Page reported the current population of Washoe County to be over 500,000 in 2024, with an expected increase to over 600,000 by 2044 and a projected 0.81 percent annual population growth rate. Mr. Page stated that there was an evident housing shortage, as demonstrated by only 40 affordable rental homes available per 100 low-income households, a figure he noted was worse than the national average. Mr. Page stated that the local median home sale price had increased by 4.7 percent as of December 2024, with over 50 percent of renters in Reno spending more than 30 percent of household income on rent and utilities.

Mr. Page referred to the slide titled *Housing Affordability – Washoe County* to compare the annual household income needed to afford different housing options in Washoe County to the average yearly salary of employees across various fields. Mr. Page interpreted data from a graph titled *Rental Market Affordability*. He attested that, on average, an individual or family would need to earn over \$108,000 annually to afford the rent for a four-bedroom home and over \$42,000 annually to afford the rent for a studio apartment. Mr. Page reiterated that rent affordability was at an all-time low Nationwide, particularly impacting middle-income renters with an average annual salary of \$30,000 to \$50,000. Mr. Page stated that Nevada's median gross rent increased by over 70 percent since 2010 and had outpaced the rise in the median household income of 58 percent. Mr. Page acknowledged that members of the Board would be familiar with the statistics but expressed that it had not yet been addressed effectively.

Mr. Page addressed the challenges faced by homeowners. He stated that Nevada ranked sixth highest in the population of cost-burdened homeowners and regionally was ranked the second highest within the western US, just behind California. He acknowledged that the gap between income and median home prices had widened since 2013, further limiting access to home ownership. Mr. Page expressed that home ownership

was integral to achieving the American dream for many. He described that many individuals in his generation had been raised to believe and strive to achieve the American dream, which consisted of growing up, getting an education, and building a career to obtain a home and family. He explained that this dream had become unattainable for younger generations as they instead focused on survival. He acknowledged the massive growth in Nevada over the last 15 or more years and stated the importance of addressing middle-income families' needs.

Mr. Page referred to the slide titled *Cost Burdened Renter Households – Washoe County* to further address the housing issues renters faced in Washoe County. Mr. Page described the number of cost-burdened renter households in Washoe County as a significant issue and attested that 186,115 households in Washoe County were considered cost-burdened. He reiterated that cost-burdened housing was defined as housing that costs more than 30 percent of a household income. He stated that among those within this category, approximately 15,000 units, or 10 percent of the sample, underscored the importance of bridging the housing gap and providing affordable housing options where there was the greatest need to address deficits.

Mr. Page referred to the slide titled *Nevada's Affordable Housing Supply* to provide insight and figures on the supply of subsidized units in Nevada. Mr. Page stated that as of February 2022, the Nevada Housing Division (NHD) identified 36,187 documented subsidized housing units within the State. He asserted that the NHC worked closely with the NHD to identify more current affordable housing supply statistics. Mr. Page mentioned that with funding of \$500 million secured from the Home Means Nevada (HMN) initiative, 2,800 total additional units were planned to be developed over the next few years, with 1,800 units designated for households with 50 percent Area Median Income (AMI) and below. Mr. Page reiterated that while progress had been made, there was still a long way to go to address current affordable housing demands successfully. Mr. Page referred to a figure on the slide titled *2024 Nevada Housing Profile* that demonstrated a shortage of nearly 100,000 affordable and available rental homes in Nevada. He asserted that the 2,800 units planned for development under the HMN initiative represented only a fraction of the future affordable housing development plans. Mr. Page commented on the graph on the slide titled *Nevada's Affordable Housing Supply*. He asserted that of the 36,187 subsidized units in Nevada as of 2022, only 1,118 units were utilized by households with 30 to 35 percent AMI. Mr. Page confirmed that subsidized units had decreased to below 1,000 units Statewide. He indicated that this resulted from a lapse in the ability to preserve the units and ensure continued upkeep that would prevent condemnation, an effort that had been limited due to the lack of necessary funding from tax credits. He identified that as an area of concern that would need further attention.

Mr. Page identified critical funds and programs Washoe County could utilize to address the local affordable housing issue and future possibilities for expanding relevant programs. Mr. Page reported that one such tool was the Washoe County Affordable Housing Trust Fund, Nevada's first local housing trust fund, established in 2019 to support funding exclusively dedicated to affordable housing development by enabling private sector contributions. Mr. Page stated that the fund's creation had been a

considerable success, but there was room for generating more development opportunities from the fund.

Mr. Page referenced the Nevada Assembly Bill (AB) 310 and explained that the NHC created the bill for the 2023 Legislative Session, which Nevada Governor Joe Lombardo subsequently approved. He stated that AB 310 included a one-time grant of \$32,200,000 to be administered by the NHD to support initiatives regarding future housing developments. Mr. Page attested that the grant program would enable the coalition to demonstrate that, given support and a network to aid in the maintenance of a home, individuals would have the assistance necessary to find success. He stated that one of the grant program's goals was to track and obtain data that could be utilized to support further efforts to secure a permanent funding source for future affordable housing development in the 2027 Legislative Session. He described several successful projects and initiatives made possible by the Washoe County Affordable Housing Trust Fund and the grant from AB 310. He reiterated that there was still more that could be done to address the issue of affordable housing.

Mr. Page suggested there could be an opportunity to acquire additional funding for developing and preserving affordable housing units in Washoe County from the Supplemental Government Services Tax. He stated that the Supplemental Government Services Tax funding would fund infrastructure improvements for higher-density, missing-middle, and attainable housing units within unincorporated Washoe County. He explained that the funding would offset the costs associated with on and offsite housing improvement projects. He noted that several specific target areas for future infrastructure improvement efforts had been chosen. He provided examples such as developing locations near high-density communities in Sparks and Reno and locations the NHC identified as difficult-to-develop areas where the coalition could allocate funds to leverage Low-Income Housing Tax Credit investments.

Mr. Page offered to take questions from the Board on his presented information. With no proposed questions from the Board, Chair Hill informed Mr. Page that the Board would hold all questions until the end of the presentation.

Mr. Page stated that the NHC had conducted research to identify opportunities for increasing the housing supply and availability in Washoe County. He referred to the 2040 Housing Policy Plan of Minneapolis, Minnesota. He stated that the goal of that housing plan was to accelerate housing production by enacting several supply-side policies that would encourage construction regardless of affordability considerations. He noted that the policies within this plan involved the elimination of all single-family zoning and removing parking requirements for multi-family buildings citywide. Mr. Page reported that the pace of construction in Minneapolis had accelerated relative to other cities within the Midwest region because of the implementation of the policies outlined in this plan. He stated that a consensus formed that it would be possible to efficiently address the shortage of affordable housing units by providing additional resources across the state, especially by mitigating perceived financing gaps in the construction of explicitly affordable housing units. He asserted that the policy plan had been very successful and that

Minneapolis had experienced growth in both the affordability and availability of housing. He recommended utilizing similar ideas to target the housing problems within Washoe County.

Mr. Page referred to the slide titled *Possibilities in the Future* and introduced the Truckee Meadows Public Lands Management Act (TMPLMA). He stated that Senator Jacky Rosen aimed to reintroduce legislation enabling evaluations of certain federal lands within Washoe County to determine their suitability for developing and constructing affordable housing. Mr. Page attested that the TMPLMA would allow for critical collaboration between the NHC and federal agencies to expedite land evaluation efforts and subsequent development. He acknowledged that Governor Lombardo had advocated for federal agencies to release federal land to the State for the future development of additional housing accommodations. Mr. Page asserted that another opportunity to address the need for land necessary to develop additional housing units would be to conduct a Statewide comprehensive land inventory plan that investigated land ownership, zoning, buildability, infrastructure needs, and development suitability. He referred to the recent process undergone by Clark County to conduct similar land investigations. He affirmed his belief that implementing a similar process locally would enable Washoe County and Northern Nevada to identify opportunities and constraints in development and reduce associated costs. Mr. Page elaborated further on Governor Lombardo's housing priorities and advocacy for attainable housing development. He referred to the Nevada Housing Attainability Act, a proposed bill that would allocate \$1 billion in funding for construction and development incentives of attainable housing units. Mr. Page stated that the proposed legislation would support P3 efforts by leveraging development incentives that could increase housing production and provide innovative housing solutions. Mr. Page opined that the funding from the proposed bill would enable investigation into the most efficient long-term strategies to maximize the investment into sustainable and inclusive housing solutions.

Mr. Page acknowledged the importance of previous and current efforts and conversations conducted to address the issues of local housing affordability and attainability. Still, he stressed that the implementation process would be critical to addressing Washoe County's growth over the next 15 years and beyond.

Mr. Page referred to the slide titled *Possibilities in the Future (continued)* to provide information on Public Facility Corporations (PFCs) and explain how they could assist in meeting local housing needs. He stated that PFCs were nonprofit corporations created and operated by local government entities such as counties and cities to support public purposes, including affordable housing development. He explained that PFCs functioned as conduits for coordination between private developers and public entities. He elaborated that under that model, the PFC held ownership and title to the property and operated as a nonprofit, which generally allowed for property tax exemptions that would significantly reduce development and operation costs. Mr. Page attested that the reduced cost of developing and operating PFC-owned properties would enable developers to provide tenants with housing at affordable lower rent costs. He stated that in return for the utilization of the PFC property tax exemptions as a partner of the PFC, developers would

be expected to agree to maintain a percentage of the units as affordable housing, typically targeting households that earn under 80 percent AMI. Mr. Page referenced the success of similar development initiatives in Dallas, Texas, that addressed the need for mixed-income housing for individuals in the workforce and their communities. He provided an example of a specific 289-unit mixed-income development property recently opened to the workforce in Dallas and highlighted its success. Mr. Page stated that this property was just one of the many affordable housing projects developed in Dallas over recent years.

Mr. Page suggested further investigation into zoning reform, accessory dwelling units, and impact fee reductions as options to expand upon local housing affordability. He reiterated that the information and content he presented had also been discussed within the Governor's Office to develop and preserve housing in Northern Nevada. Mr. Page concluded his presentation and requested that the Board ask their questions.

Vice Chair Herman requested clarification on what determined whether housing was affordable or not. She opined that affordable workforce housing would need to be affordable to the average person. Mr. Page clarified that there was no true definition of what made housing affordable to the workforce, and the constraints of the term varied for every person depending on their circumstances and income. He stated that affordable housing typically addressed the needs of individuals earning below 80 percent AMI on average and, in some instances, individuals earning up to 150 percent AMI. He attested that defining what could be considered affordable for the workforce was more complicated, as many varied factors individually determined affordability for each household, and the term could include a wide range of people at different stages of their lives. Vice Chair Herman replied that the issue had not been addressed well in the past.

Chair Hill responded and opined that attainable housing was much less of a concern in the past. She reflected on the affordability of homes in Washoe County in previous years. She mentioned that in the past, it had been feasible for two service industry members to buy a home together in Sparks and noted that the situation had changed drastically since then. Mr. Page agreed and reflected on the cost of starter homes when he initially relocated to Nevada approximately 20 years ago. He stated that starter homes during that time would cost, on average, \$120,000 to \$150,000, but average costs had risen to \$460,000 for a new home. He stated that even the cost for condos and townhomes had reached an average cost of approximately \$380,000, and those interested in homeownership would likely need to make a salary of \$100,000 to \$120,000 to be able to afford or secure the necessary down payment. He stressed that those issues were critical and expressed the need to provide more assistance to residents to enable them to achieve the ideal of home ownership.

Commissioner Garcia stated that the terms *affordable* and *living wage* were used interchangeably and had several definitions. She noted that she often thought of the students graduating from the Washoe County School District (WCSD) who would continue to college and later into careers in teaching or social work, only to face an inaccessible housing market. She acknowledged her understanding that there were programs to assist

those in that position, but she was only aware of one that assisted teachers in becoming first-time homeowners. Commission Garcia asked if any other career sectors were similarly receiving additional support.

Mr. Page answered that some unions operated similar programs, such as for those in the culinary field. He stated that the NHD offered homeownership and down payment assistance programs for non-profit employees, case managers, social workers, and those within other similar careers. He elaborated that those programs were insufficient, as fire workers and police had minimal opportunities due to inadequate funding.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Page for sharing the information and stressed the importance of reiterating the facts he had mentioned. She recognized and commended the staff of Washoe County for clearing a path with court code ordinance changes to address affordable housing. She urged caution when considering the balance of market forces and falsely supplementing certain things. She clarified that there were incentives that they could use to help close the gap between those pooling resources with others to afford housing. She noted that the issue came down to the relationship between supply and demand, as there was significant demand to purchase homes, but there was inadequate supply availability to meet that demand. She attested that Washoe County continued to do everything it could to simplify permitting and development opportunities so the housing supply could meet the demand and ultimately bring prices down. She opined that Governor Lombardo had been very clear in his conversations with the administration during the 2025 Nevada State of the State Address regarding the release of federal land. She echoed his comments, noting that Nevada was behind only one other state in being comprised of a large percentage of land owned by the federal government. She opined that the release of federal land in Nevada would enable many opportunities.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Page for his continued Statewide efforts. She acknowledged the quality of the NHC's Board of Directors members and their support staff. She reiterated her belief in optimizing the available resources, attempting to do everything they could, remaining ahead of the issue, and thinking differently than they had in the past. She indicated that they would not always be continuing with business as usual. She referred to the research Mr. Page had mentioned conducting on housing programs in cities such as Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Dallas, Texas, as opportunities to keep local jurisdictions such as Washoe County ahead. She reiterated the importance of taking any opportunities to improve housing if federal land were made available.

Commissioner Andriola acknowledged Mr. Page's prior mention of PFCs during his presentation and suggested that he was likely aware of a non-profit developing housing in Sparks and Reno. She stated that the housing development in Reno would serve as workforce housing, and the development in Sparks would serve as senior housing. She noted that she had met with that non-profit. She described it as a private family foundation that considered their family's success and the privileges they had been given as an opportunity to create their family foundation. She reported that she had asked them how many other similar organizations existed. She attested that they had reported housing as a significant national trend, which led to them developing senior housing in Sparks,

workforce housing in Reno, and two additional projects. She elaborated that those projects were based in Southern Nevada; one was already completed, and the other was being developed for the workforce, mainly to accommodate teachers. She expressed interest in getting Mr. Page in contact with that non-profit.

Commissioner Andriola voiced her curiosity regarding the number of other family foundations in the US that were deciding on their missions and goals. She postulated whether they could attempt to identify whether there were opportunities with those foundations that they could capitalize on. She elaborated that, in that case, the foundations would own the land and pay for the development and building costs. Mr. Page agreed and noted that he wanted to contact that family foundation. Commissioner Andriola reiterated that she would be interested in getting him in connection with them and thanked Mr. Page again for all of the work that he has done.

Chair Hill thanked Mr. Page and noted that his presentation had provided them with considerable information to contemplate. She stated that she would likely follow up with him in an email for additional information on specific programs that he had introduced to the Board. She thanked Mr. Page for his commitment to housing, Northern Nevada, and the State of Nevada. She thanked him for fighting for them at the Legislature by identifying opportunities to continue the HMN initiative that the NHD created and to support the working families of Washoe County. Mr. Page thanked Chair Hill and the BCC.

25-0054 **AGENDA ITEM 6F** Presentation on permanent supportive housing and discussion on Washoe County's role in the supply of permanent supportive housing units and accompanying services. This will include an update on the current number of permanent supportive housing units in the County and how many are needed. This item will also include a discussion of the diversion efforts designed to assist individuals experiencing homelessness to obtain and remain in permanent housing.

Human Services Agency (HSA) Housing & Homeless Services (HHS) Division Director Dana Searcy conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Diversion Tactic: Diversion budgets in /shelters/Outreach; Diversion Tactic: Rental Assistance / Deposit Assistance; Diversion Tactic; Shallow Subsidy Program; Summary of funding for Diversion and Preventative Housing. She referred to true diversion, which she said focused on keeping individuals from entering the shelter. She read from the *Diversion Tactic: Diversion budgets in /shelters/Outreach* slide regarding diversion options in place and the comparable costs regarding reunifying families versus nights in a shelter. She believed that the diversion options were better for the individual and the County. She read from the *Diversion Tactic: Rental Assistance / Deposit Assistance* slide and indicated much of the rental assistance the County received was from the Emergency Rental Assistance (ERA) grant, which she said would be completed in fiscal year (FY) 2025.

Ms. Searcy introduced and explained the cost breakdown of the new program on the *Diversion Tactic; Shallow Subsidy Program* slide, which she said researched how to assist individuals outside of the shelter. She noted that the County paid

the subsidy while the person was on the Reno Housing Authority (RHA) waitlist, which she said was less expensive and better for the individual because they were housed. She indicated that the *Summary of Funding for Diversion and Preventative Housing* slide explained the costs associated with the previously discussed diversions and that starting FY25/26 the County would not have rental assistance. She voiced that while the Cities of Reno and Sparks were great partners and were willing to take in individuals from unincorporated communities, there was still not enough funding. She pointed out the lack of funds due to the COVID-19 (C19) era funding depletion and said that she did not want to build more shelter beds but would rather use the funding needed for diversion tactic programs.

Commissioner Andriola referred to the year-over-year matrix provided in the presentation and asked Ms. Searcy what the number of people being served was. Ms. Searcy indicated the ERA grant served a total of 2,128 households. Commissioner Andriola asked what the household demographics were. She said she recalled Ms. Searcy explaining in previous presentations that a high percentage of the individuals at the Cares Campus were seniors or 55 years or older. Ms. Searcy said she did not have the information but would provide it to Commissioner Andriola. She believed that 43 percent of the individuals at the Cares Campus were 55 and above in age and that 55 percent had a disability. Commissioner Andriola felt that knowing the demographic breakdown was important and wanted the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) to be informed.

Chair Hill said that she recalled that Ms. Searcy had indicated the HSA witnessed an increase in seniors at the Cares Campus due to the ERA grant depletion. Ms. Searcy confirmed Chair Hill's statement. Chair Hill was thankful for the Cares Campus because she said it gave people a place to go. She commended the HSA team on the shallow subsidy. She believed there would be great outcomes from the shallow subsidy for vulnerable individuals who did not have additional money; however, she said she understood it was not enough to fill the community's needs.

Ms. Searcy noted that the shelters were very full and had a long waitlist. She wanted to request the BCC's support in focusing on diversion tactics rather than building more shelter beds.

Vice Chair Herman referenced a shortage. Ms. Searcy indicated there was a funding shortage, which she said was a fear with the subsidy program because the number of people in need versus finding housing at a rate the County could afford was a concern.

Director of Southwest (SW) Geography Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) Brooke Page indicated she was a Nevada native who had worked in homeless and housing solutions for six years and in Clark County previously.

Chair Hill noted that Ms. Page had been contracted with the County before to perform a needs assessment.

Ms. Searcy indicated that the CSH was renowned for its work, and when the County began researching how to address homelessness and housing at the 30 percent

annual median income (AMI) or below, the CSH continued to be recommended in discussions with other government agencies.

Ms. Searcy continued conducting a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Housing: Permanent Supportive Housing (slide 3); Shelter Utilization; Recent Housing Units Built with Current Local Subsidies. She noted that affordable housing had a different meaning for everyone; however, she said it generally meant spending less or at 30 percent of gross income on housing costs, including utilities. She referred to the *Housing: Permanent Supportive Housing (slide 3)* slide regarding the explanation of AMI percentages and job examples matching the salaries described. She noted that someone with a bachelor's degree could be in the 50 percent AMI range, whereas someone making roughly \$100,000 was more comfortable but difficult to find in the region. She referred to the *Shelter Utilization* slide regarding the Our Place and the Cares Campus bed count. She mentioned the two facilities tripled their beds and indicated the waitlist for beds was at 94. She referred to the *Recent Housing Units Built with Current Local Subsidies* slide, which was a collaboration of information from the County and the Cities of Reno and Sparks. She mentioned that the projects were receiving some funding through the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Home Dollars and Sewer Waiver Programs. She pointed out that most of the developments went to 60 percent AMI or above because it was costly to build below 60 percent AMI. She indicated that she encouraged lower development through prioritizing and making the needs known. She noted that the chart showed information from about 4,000 units and that many were funded with large amounts of funding through the Home Means Nevada initiative, the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, and the Assembly Bill (AB) 310 grant.

3:00 p.m. **Commissioner Clark left the meeting.**

Ms. Page conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: It Costs the Same to Provide in Washoe County; What is Quality Supportive Housing; Supportive Housing if For People Who Are; Washoe County's Impact on Addressing Homelessness; Total Unmet Need for Permanent Housing; System Efficiencies; Cost Benefits for Supportive Housing; The Business Case for Supportive Housing; Outcomes and Benefits of Supportive Housing. She noted that the cost of healthcare and incarceration was staggering. She indicated that according to the PSH assessment, eight days in the hospital were equivalent to four months in jail or one year of supportive housing. She mentioned that the analysis highlighted the potential for significant cost avoidance and improved outcomes regarding PSH. She referred to the *What is Quality Supportive Housing* slide and said PSH was an evidence-based intervention, and that the intervention proved to be effective for over 30 years. She indicated that when discussing affordable housing, it was important to ensure that tenants were not paying more than 30 percent of their household income on housing expenses; otherwise, they were compromising food, medication, and the day-to-day ability to manage their lives. She pointed out that one of the keys to PSH was ensuring that tenants had a choice and the ability to determine the services they needed to have in their lives. She said the affordable housing criteria were vast and explained those who needed PSH on the *Supportive Housing*

if For People Who Are slide. She noted that older individuals could have income and health concerns, which could place them inappropriately in an institution, while families could be placed in the child welfare system. She mentioned that people who have chronically experienced homelessness may have healthcare or mental health concerns that could be exacerbated when housing was unavailable. She commented that recently discharged individuals needed help reestablishing themselves in housing and the community.

She referred to the *Washoe County's Impact on Addressing Homelessness* slide and reported that the County was addressing the homelessness issue with the HHS. She felt that data was important to understand the needs and that increasing from 40 percent compliance to 90 percent compliance was beneficial. She noted that the Northern Nevada Continuum of Care (COC) was reporting on the assessment. She mentioned that if there was a lack of service providers, trauma-informed property managers, and infrastructure in the community, then individuals were not being addressed. She reported that while Nevada had an increase in homelessness, Washoe County only had an increase of 4 percent, and noted that resources were needed to ensure progress. She said that there was recently a funding allocation for service providers and that 12 applications were considered in Nevada, and only 5 applications met the high-quality threshold, with 4 of them being from Washoe County. She referred to the community's need for PSH on the *Total Unmet Need for Permanent Housing* slide and utilization on the *System Efficiencies* slide. She said the emergency shelters and PSH were at high utilization for both individuals and families, which she said meant people were in a heightened emergency crisis response setting. She pointed out that transitional housing had a lower utilization rate, which she said meant that transitional housing did not need to be prioritized for funding. She reiterated the importance of PSH as an economic decision to support the community when compared to hospital and jail costs. She indicated on *The Business Case for Supportive Housing* slide the cost for interventions and noted that while the cost seemed substantial, it was important to understand the County was already paying for it and the issue was exacerbated when nothing was done. She felt that the investment was manageable when looking at the national rise in homelessness. She reported that the research showed that when quality PSH was implemented to fidelity standards, tenants displayed the experiences on the *Outcomes and Benefits of Supportive Housing* slide. She indicated that the tenants were not entering the emergency crisis response, and the PSH was allowing them to reenter the workforce, which increased economic benefits.

Ms. Searcy indicated that Ms. Page was asked to start with the COC at a regional level to understand the cost and what was needed.

Ms. Page continued conducting a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Planning Process. Northern Nevada CoC's Action Plan Supportive Housing Development Plan; Northern Nevada CoC's Action Plan Funding Plan; Northern Nevada CoC's Action Plan Develop a Diversion Program. She indicated that due to the COC assessment, she was able to develop an action plan. She referred to the *Northern Nevada CoC's Action Plan Supportive Housing Development Plan* slide and indicated that creating a PSH development plan was important and essential. She noted that a committee would be created to envision and monitor housing needs. She said the plan would strengthen community-based organizations for capacity-building efforts and

leverage existing infrastructure with landlord engagement strategies for existing housing. She read from the *Northern Nevada CoC's Action Plan Funding Plan* slide regarding the funding plan recommendations, vision, and action steps. She mentioned that a champion was needed to oversee the efforts; otherwise, there was no one to implement the changes and alignments needed. She referred to the *Northern Nevada CoC's Action Plan Develop a Diversion Program* slide and said the committee would start by strengthening the capabilities of community organizations to understand diversion, problem-solving, and prevention programming. She noted that the three slides referenced were the three steps involved with the COC and their recommendations.

Ms. Searcy continued conducting a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Efforts by Washoe County to Increase Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH); Board Direction. She read from the *Efforts by Washoe County to Increase Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)* slide regarding the steps taken by the County to increase PSH. She indicated that the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds allocated were specifically for PSH. She was excited to support people in need, show individuals how to reduce cost and create a better community, and improve individual lives. She mentioned that the Sutro Street Sanctuary, the Line Drive Apartments, and the Nevada Cares Campus PSH were funded by the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. She read from the *Board Direction* slide regarding four different options. She indicated that legislation and addressing Medicaid were critical and noted that much of the funding was through State opportunities from legislation. She said that collaboration was mostly managed by the COC to research funding opportunities and timeline alignment. She voiced that there were partnership opportunities with land and developers.

Commissioner Garcia asked if Medicaid funded supportive housing.

Ms. Searcy indicated she was not a Medicaid expert; however, she would provide a detailed summary regarding what was funded. She noted that Medicaid did not cover much regarding homeless services and PSH, which was why she said that researching areas of the County that lacked coverage was important to address.

Ms. Page said the Nevada Supportive Housing Development Fund (SHDF) resources were beneficial to pilot and demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to Medicaid.

Commissioner Andriola asked if there were housing providers that had a model to demonstrate that would display reimbursement.

Ms. Page indicated that CSH was tracking fund sources across the Nation. She said she would share a map that displayed the communities with health-related social needs and tenant support waivers that tracked housing. She noted that Washington had a Foundational Community Support (FCS) benefit that showed the importance of leveraging Medicaid dollars and housing. She mentioned that the CSH was in the infancy of tracking evaluations.

Commissioner Andriola noted that using the term *affordable* was difficult because she said affordable depended on the person and location. She felt the program was dignity housing and that looking at the Governor's initiatives and attainable housing as an umbrella was beneficial. She thought researching opportunities and best practices were important as the program progressed. She said that she did not want the government to have a long-term commitment to continue subsidizing, and that there may be other vendors to benefit and support the program. She voiced that the money involved was significant and while the County was already paying for it, there may be opportunities to investigate savings. She referred to the Sequential Intercept Model (SIM) and the \$2.9 million saved, which she felt was important in the discussion of housing funding. She noted presentations were helpful in tracking progress. She asked why the County's homelessness had only increased by 4 percent while the rest of the Nation had increased by 18 percent.

Ms. Page indicated that the communities where homelessness had not increased significantly had invested in an intentional effort to address housing needs. She said that a lack of affordable housing and shortages contributed to a rise in homelessness. She referred to Los Angeles and its minimal increase in homelessness due to important infrastructure and resources.

Commissioner Andriola noted that sharing the homelessness trends was helpful and that the subject was complex. She referred to the Great Depression and the direct correlation between a lack of jobs and economic conditions. She believed the County needed to be cautious and that homelessness was never going to be zero. She mentioned that decreasing homelessness and helping families were important and that the Washoe County Behavioral Center and public-private partnerships were critical and helpful. She thanked Ms. Page and Ms. Searcy for the presentation and asked for regular updates. She said she looked forward to updated progress and information regarding funding and investments.

Chair Hill indicated that she was excited about the initiatives and that the initiatives showed the County's commitment. She noted that the accusations regarding the County warehousing homeless individuals were not true, and that the County wanted to get individuals out of the shelter to be productive members of the community. She mentioned that the County was a model for the Nation and thought the County needed to continue progress. She thanked Ms. Page for the partnership and Ms. Searcy for overseeing the HHS program.

Ms. Searcy asked if the BCC was comfortable with the recommended options on the *Board Direction* slide.

Chair Hill confirmed the BCC's agreement with the recommended options with the addition of regular updates. She felt that highlighting the need, cost savings, and dramatic improvements to individual lives was important to share with the community.

3:38 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

3:52 p.m. **The Board reconvened with Commissioner Clark absent.**

AGENDA ITEM 6C Discussion and update on Citizen Advisory Boards. Summarize input received from commissioners at the September 10, 2024 Board meeting and from the community at the December 19, 2024 community forum and identify opportunities for improvement and enhanced communication and outreach. This item will also include a summary of the plan to bring an item forward for action by the Board at a future meeting in either February 2024 or thereafter. This discussion will include but is not limited to town hall meeting formats, meeting frequency, commissioner participation in CAB meetings, and topic-based meetings.

County Manager Eric Brown stated that a decision had been made to continue the Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs) based on the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) feedback during the September 10, 2024, meeting. He attested that the decision was based on the Board's consideration of CABs as a key element in obtaining feedback from the community and providing the community with information on Washoe County activities. Manager Brown acknowledged that the Board called for topic-driven CAB meetings, when possible, to address specific concerns of the community. He noted increased attendance at CAB meetings that addressed relevant and compelling subject matter compared to CAB meetings that did not.

Manager Brown stated that no requested changes to the boundaries or locations of CAB meetings had been made as of the September 10, 2024, BCC meeting. Manager Brown noted that the CAB communities had asked to conduct a CAB community forum to solicit direct input on additional changes or concerns.

Manager Brown addressed the feedback from the December 19, 2024, community forum hosted at Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH). He noted that the sentiment expressed by the community during that forum indicated overwhelming support for the continuation of CAB meetings and the implementation of a topic-driven approach to subsequent meetings, which was consistent with the feedback that the Board had given. He stated that the community voiced an overwhelming preference at that forum to institute meetings in an open town hall format that addressed topics of interest. He reported that the community had also recommended alterations to the format of future CAB meetings to avoid specific Open Meeting Law (OML) requirements. Manager Brown stated that during the forum, participants voiced many requests to incorporate additional opportunities for addressing development concerns and to ensure more consistent BCC participation in future CAB meetings.

Manager Brown offered staff recommendations for further action based on the discussions during the September 10, 2024, BCC meeting and the December 19, 2024, community forum. He acknowledged the community's concern regarding the speculation on the possible suspension of CABs. Manager Brown confirmed and reiterated that CABs would continue without plans for suspension or removal. He announced that further opportunities were being researched to implement additional topic-driven CAB meetings, as requested by the Board and the forum. He recalled his previous experience attending CAB meetings and reflected that certain CABs were noticeably less topic-driven,

specifically those in more rural communities. Manager Brown voiced that he believed it would be beneficial to have the opportunity for all CABs to make decisions on compelling and relevant topics.

Manager Brown stated that decisions regarding adjusting CAB meetings to a town hall format should be made when appropriate, and decisions regarding the frequency of CAB meetings should be decided based on conversations between members of the BCC in consultation with CAB Chairs. He clarified that he did not recommend that those decisions be made by staff and that he would support decisions made by the CABs in conjunction with their Chairs. He suggested that CAB meetings be held bi-monthly and opined that the frequency could improve attendance based on observations he had made over previous years. He clarified that his comments were merely a recommendation, and he fully intended to preserve the ability for CAB Chairs to collaborate with Commissioners to make decisions on meeting frequency.

Manager Brown announced that efforts had begun to update the CAB bylaws. He explained that the bylaws had become dated and should reflect the recent input from the September 10, 2024, BCC meeting and the December 19, 2024, community forum. He stated that he and a legal team led by Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Jennifer Gustafson would work on updating CAB ordinances and boundary maps, which would then be brought forward for consideration at a future BCC meeting, which he expected to be held in February. He welcomed any additional recommendations regarding further changes to CAB ordinances, bylaws, and boundary maps.

Manager Brown referred to a slide titled *Staff CAB Recommendations for 2025*. He requested that the Board approach him or the Commission Support staff to inform them of any desired alterations to the CABs within their districts before February 7, 2025. He expressed hope that collaboration and input from the Board would enable staff to prepare informed adjustments to the bylaws and ordinances that would assist them in presenting all findings in a future meeting. He stated the goal would be to show any planned changes or implementations at a February meeting for the Board's consideration.

Chair Hill thanked Manager Brown and looked to the Board for comments. Vice Chair Herman accepted the writings and acknowledged the need for future discussions in February to implement any changes after she had discussed the subject with the CABs within her district. Commissioner Garcia voiced her support for the suggested recommendations as presented by Manager Brown. Commissioner Andriola thanked Manager Brown for the update and expressed gratitude that the community heard on the record that the CABs would not be going away. She hoped the discussion clarified to all constituents that there was no plan to eliminate CABs. She expressed her belief that revisiting and reviewing relevant ordinances would be a great opportunity, and she would do her best to provide the necessary feedback. She expressed that she was eager to discuss CAB ordinances and boundary maps. She thanked Manager Brown for organizing the meetings and ensuring everyone involved would be better informed whilst they moved forward and reviewed the current ordinances and bylaws. She reiterated in closing that the CABs would not be going away.

Chair Hill voiced her agreement with the Board and stated she would look forward to reconvening on the matter in February. Chair Hill acknowledged that many community members were present to comment on the discussion of CABs and notified those in the audience that they would have the opportunity to do so when the Board moved on to the final public comment.

Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards commented on Manager Brown's earlier mention of community interest in reformatting CAB meetings into an open town hall format to avoid specific OML requirements. He stated that despite whatever merit such requests had, there was no opt-out clause for the OML, and as such, the law would be upheld. Chair Hill reported that with members of the Board in attendance at CAB meetings, adherence to the requirements stipulated by OML would be necessary to prevent any legal issues. She referred to the decision made in 2021 to format CAB meetings following the OML requirements during initial discussions that considered altering the format of CAB meetings. Chair Hill reiterated that the decision to adhere to OML requirements in 2021 was made to ensure legal compliance. Chair Hill acknowledged that the request to change the CAB meeting format and the desire to avoid specific OML requirements were well-meaning. She attested that adherence to OML requirements was necessary for the Board to ensure that community members remained well-informed and understood what the wants and needs of Washoe County were.

Chair Hill thanked everyone for their endurance and engagement during the meeting.

Erica Olsen, Chief Operating Officer (COO) and Co-Founder of OnStrategy, displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and summarized the BCC direction from the meeting. Ms. Olsen noted that she would only mention the primary points of each topic by referring to the bold text in the document. She asked that the Board voice any commentary or clarification and that Manager Brown clarify anything that may be misrepresented. She reiterated that she would be covering the direction, sentiment, and energy of the discussions and not the precise purpose of the discussions in their entirety.

Ms. Olsen stated that the first strategic capital project was on track, but there were several follow-up items. She noted that the Board enjoyed the infrastructure scorecard and referred to raising the grade. She acknowledged that the topic was detailed and that the BCC was interested in continuing to be informed and educated on how the infrastructure scorecard worked.

Ms. Olsen noted that the Washoe County Senior Services team was on the right track and should be kept on the same path with the same energy around those services and the programming. She noted that she had heard only support for those topics.

Ms. Olsen acknowledged the great work surrounding the sequential intercept model, mainly focusing on increasing the work on areas one through four.

Ms. Olsen noted that she had heard general support for option three of the Behavioral Health Center, doing what was necessary to remain sustainable and address all the needs that the Behavioral Health Center would encompass. She acknowledged that philanthropic efforts supported the funding, and there was still a need to identify additional strategies to close the funding gap.

Ms. Olsen stated that there had been interest in exploring public-private partnerships further and acknowledged the high level of detail in that topic. She noted that a workshop dedicated to understanding the model's operation could be necessary.

Ms. Olsen referred to the three strategies presented by Dana Searcy, Division Director of Housing and Homeless Services, for preventing and diverting homelessness, which received Board support.

Ms. Olsen summarized the presentations from Ms. Searcy, Maurice Page, Executive Director of the Nevada Housing Coalition, and Brooke Page, Director of Southwest Geography of the Corporation for Supportive Housing, regarding approaches to attainable housing and permanent supportive housing. She noted that the Board was supportive of the four permanent supportive housing initiatives and had requested regular updates, including information on the Return on Investment (ROI) and the results of those initiatives. Ms. Olsen noted that there would be a follow-up from the team regarding the additional things the Board had mentioned needing to revisit.

Ms. Olsen summarized that the Board had supported the recommendations for the CAB meetings as presented by Manager Brown. Commissioner Andriola reiterated her support for the CAB recommendations as presented, with continued review and feedback for future action. She thanked Ms. Olsen, who assured her they would do as requested. Ms. Olsen asked Manager Brown if there was anything she had missed or that he would like to underscore.

Manager Brown thanked the Board for their engagement during the meeting. He noted that they had gotten what they were looking for, which was feedback from the BCC on those significant topics that were important to the County's future. He noted his belief that there was a clear connection between the discussions coming together to form a safety net through examples such as the Nevada Cares Campus projects, the sequential intercept model, and the Behavioral Health Center (BHC). He indicated that the teams that presented during the meeting consisted of reliable individuals and noted that they would continue based on the Board's guidance and be good stewards of the resources allocated to them.

Ms. Olsen thanked the team for their time structuring the strategic conversations and moving the County forward. She noted that their methodology worked due to their attention and time spent on those topics.

Commissioner Garcia thanked the staff for setting up the meeting and expressed her appreciation for the heavy lifting and effort that went into preparing it. Chair

Hill agreed that workshop meetings took tremendous work and thanked Manager Brown and the staff who contributed to it. She voiced that she anticipated further dialogue on the topics discussed during the meeting, as they had only just begun the efforts, and there was action for the Board to take in the future.

Commissioner Andriola thanked everyone. She commended Ms. Olsen for her work and involvement in the planning of the strategic planning meeting, which she noted was a particularly intense effort. She thanked ADA Edwards for sharing his expertise in providing legal counsel to the Board. She stressed the importance of holding strategic planning meetings on an annual basis so the Board would understand how the County would be moving forward. She referred to Ms. Olsen's professional experience. She acknowledged that Ms. Olsen would realize how critical it was to have those benchmarks, outcomes, and measurements to refer to without waiting for the next year to re-evaluate the current situation, identify the direction the County would go in, or implement the needed adjustments. She expressed that she was anticipating following up on the topics they had discussed and suggested that they be addressed potentially every quarter, given the approval of Chair Hill. She noted that many of the issues they had discussed the previous year had been discussed during the meeting. She reiterated the importance of keeping those topics in mind, seeing how those adjustments happened, and how the measurements of outcomes were going. She thanked everyone again for their excellent work.

Chair Hill noted that more frequent strategic planning meetings had been held in the past, but they had not been prioritized recently. She stated that more meetings would be needed and agreed that more updates were necessary during the year.

Vice Chair Herman noted that they should keep the changed seating arrangements for future meetings, as they would need the seating availability for the upcoming concurrent meeting. Chair Hill agreed with Vice Chair Herman's suggestion.

ADA Edwards asked to review the summary provided by Ms. Olsen. He referred to the item included to summarize the discussion of the Behavior Health Center, which stated that the Board was generally supportive of option three. He recommended that the language of the section should be changed to indicate that the Board was generally supportive of future action on option three. Ms. Olsen noted the recommendation, and Chair Hill stated that there would be fundraising work to be done in the future.

25-0056 AGENDA ITEM 7 Public Comment.

Mr. Terry Brooks recited a personal poem regarding the importance of government intervention in preventing poverty, unemployment, and homelessness.

Mr. Drew Ribar notified the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) that he would run for Assembly District 40 in 2026. Mr. Ribar expressed concern over the contents of public records he requested, which consisted of email correspondence between staff of the Washoe County Library System (WCLS). He confirmed that the BCC held no jurisdiction over the libraries but reminded the Board of their authority over the Washoe

County Library Board of Trustees (LBT). He remarked that the District Attorney's (DA) Office worked closely with the WCLS and questioned the delay in addressing the contents of that public records request (PRR). He attested that the role of the DA's Office was to protect agencies and the public from violations of the law. Mr. Ribar recited from a document containing the public records, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. Mr. Ribar reiterated his concern with the contents of the document. He opined that the records indicated that staff within the WCLS attempted to prevent the public from exercising their right to freedom of speech in the context of leaving accurately recorded public comments. He noted the color of clothing that members of the Board wore during the meeting. Mr. Ribar remarked on recent actions taken by President Donald Trump related to federal funding and asked if the Board had been made aware of those actions. Mr. Ribar suggested staffing changes within the WCLS in response to the records he read aloud. He clarified his position against banning books and the Drag Queen Story Hour (DQSH) event and alleged that employees of the WCLS had inaccurately placed his opinion on the record. He thanked the Board and concluded by stating that he would run for Assembly District 40 in 2026.

Mr. Lawrence Dodson introduced himself as a member of the Liberty Experience Advisory Board and expressed his appreciation for supportive housing. He stated that he hoped to reinforce the importance of the topics brought forth by the presenters of Agenda Item 6F, Housing and Homeless Services Division Director Dana Searcy and Director of Southwest (SW) Geography Corporation for Supportive Housing (CSH) Brooke Page, in their presentation on permanent supportive housing. Mr. Dodson attested that supportive housing enabled healing and growth that could facilitate those in need to become functioning members of society. He explained that supportive housing was essential to assist people in need efficiently. He expressed his hope that the Board would consider the presentations at that meeting and thanked the Board for their time.

* * * * *

4:20 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

ALEXIS HILL, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

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

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

Pending Board Approval