

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

JULY 8, 2025

PRESENT:

Alexis Hill, Chair

Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair

Michael Clark, Commissioner

Mariluz Garcia, Commissioner

Clara Andriola, Commissioner

Janis Galassini, County Clerk

Kate Thomas, Interim County Manager

Michael Large, Chief Deputy District Attorney

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

25-0492 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

Mr. Terry Brooks read an original poem regarding discrimination, housing, and race.

Mr. Oscar Williams displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He opined that there were inconsistencies regarding the Registrar of Voters (ROV) and pointed out the ROV on his submitted *Washoe County Organization Chart*. He believed that the Clerk assisted the ROV with elections but had no line of communication to the ROV. He said that the ROV was not beneath the County Manager and believed there was no Washoe County Code (WCC) or Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) that required it to be. He noted that WCC 5.451, Clause 2 explained that the person appointed as the ROV would serve in such office at the pleasure of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He indicated that the ROV was tethered to the Clerk by NRS and the WCC by assuming all powers and duties vested and imposed upon the Clerk, except those relating to the preparation and delivery of certificates of elections. He asserted that the County Manager was not responsible for running elections; however, the BCC was the chief officer who should oversee the elections. He pointed out that he moved the ROV, Clerk, legal counsel, and a liaison on his *Washoe County Organization Chart* to where he believed they should be.

Ms. Maureen McElroy recalled negative comments made to the BCC regarding the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS). She believed that PERS provided a secure and reasonable base income to qualified staff employed by a public

agency. She reported that PERS was disbursed monthly once the employee retired, and that working public employees contributed half of the payments via payroll deductions, while their employer contributed the rest. She noted that the contributions were invested by an appointed board to provide retirement income to vested employees and that PERS had the best investment and records of return among public retirement systems in the Nation. She strongly countered the continued negative narrative that public employees profited from citizens. She explained that PERS was a benefit that was contributed to and earned over time by hardworking Nevadans. She wondered why individuals had issues with PERS providing a livable income for retired employees when those retirees spent their income in Nevada to support businesses. She wished people would work towards creating a program like PERS for all workers instead of questioning why public employees received a living wage during retirement.

Ms. Penny Brock displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She informed the BCC that she did not see a flagpole in the Washoe County Administrative Complex courtyard and wished to know why. She pointed out that she was wearing a Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) shirt and recalled that the ROV would be investigated by the Department of Justice (DOJ). She reported that the DOJ launched a Nationwide election integrity probe because it felt Americans were silenced for a year due to concerns related to the 2020 primary election. She indicated that the DOJ sent formal inquiries to election officials across the Country to investigate voting machines, cybersecurity protocols, and access to voter rolls. She said that criminal charges for negligent election officials would be pursued. She believed that national security and constitutional duty were important, and she wanted to know which County staff received the DOJ's letter. She speculated the letter was hidden from the BCC and the voters. She opined that there were problems with the ROV, voting machines, and voter rolls. She said she was pleased to tell the BCC that the ROV was being investigated by DOGE. She read from her submitted *New York Times* article that explained the DOJ's election integrity probe.

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

25-0493 AGENDA ITEM 4 Announcements/Reports.

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas announced that the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (WCOSRPC) had an opening for all districts that would close on July 9, 2025, and that the Senior Advisory Board's (SABs) alternate position applications would close on July 30, 2025. She encouraged the public to visit the new Washoe County Administrative Complex directory near the flagpole. She reminded the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) that ten department heads and two unclassified management positions were appointed and served at the pleasure of the BCC. She mentioned that in February 2023, the BCC adopted a recruitment participation process that included the Board's involvement in recruitments, appointments, and performance evaluations. She indicated that she had a list of the positions the Board had oversight of, if anyone desired to see them.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Terry Brooks for his sign regarding equality. She reported that a newborn baby was abandoned in a dumpster on Saturday. She expressed gratitude towards the individuals involved in assisting the baby and the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) for transporting the baby to Renown Regional Medical Center. She expressed gratitude towards the Renown Regional Medical Center staff who cared for the child and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) for a swift investigation. She reminded the public that fire stations, police stations, and hospitals were safe havens and that there was always a place to go in times of crisis. She recalled that there was a critical need for mentors, foster parents, and adoptive parents in the region, and that 21 out of 580 children under the age of 10 and in custody were placed in emergency shelters. She asserted that the abandoned baby's experience and the experience of all children who went through trauma were saddening. She recommended that anyone interested in assisting children in need should reach out to the Human Services Agency (HSA).

25-0494 AGENDA ITEM 5A1 EDAWN Update, Taylor Adams, to discuss Western Nevada's Economic Outlook for Fiscal Year 2024/2025. (All Commission Districts.)

Taylor Adams, President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN), introduced himself and greeted the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He thanked the Board for inviting him to lead the Pledge of Allegiance and noted that it was a lovely surprise. He acknowledged that the meeting's agenda was extensive, so he assured that he would do everything he could to move quickly through the exciting information in his presentation.

Mr. Adams conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN); What is EDAWN?; The EDAWN Team; EDAWN Assisted Companies FY 2025; FY 2025 Assisted Companies Chart; EDAWN Assisted Companies-Industry Breakdown; EDAWN Assisted Companies FY 2024; FY 2024 Assisted Companies Chart; EDAWN Assisted Companies - Industry Breakdown Sales; FY 25 Performance; Business Attraction; Business Retention & Expansion; Entrepreneurial Development; Strategic Partnerships & Workforce; Recapping Our 2024 Initiatives; Ramping Up "Out of Market" Business Attraction & Engaging with National Site Selection Community; Increasing our efforts to support existing businesses; Accelerating out of our inaugural Reno Startup Week; Thank you!.

Mr. Adams displayed the slide titled *What is EDAWN?*. He reminded the public of what the acronym *EDAWN* stood for. He explained that EDAWN was a public-private partnership (P3), and unlike many of the organization's colleagues that were entirely publicly funded, EDAWN was effectively a contract reviewer with over 78 percent of its revenue in 2025 having come from the private sector and about 22 percent from the public sector. He expressed gratitude for the revenue sourced from the public sector. He explained that EDAWN's largest public investor was the Governor's Office of Economic

Development, with Washoe County as the second most significant investor. He thanked the Board for what they did to support the growth of Western Nevada's economy.

Mr. Adams referred to the slide titled *The EDAWN Team*. He explained that EDAWN was divided into four primary teams, which consisted of Business Attraction, Business Retention and Expansion, Entrepreneurial Development, and Strategic Partnerships and Workforce. He noted that the Strategic Partnerships and Workforce team was the newest division in EDAWN. He stated that the division had previously only worked with matters of workforce and education but had recently expanded to its current role in an effort to broaden EDAWN's reach in the community and increase the organization's presence in other areas. He reported that in addition to the four primary teams, EDAWN had an investor relations team, a marketing team, and an operations group. He noted that EDAWN comprised a total of 18 employees.

Mr. Adams introduced the slides titled *EDAWN Assisted Companies FY 2025* and *FY 2025 Assisted Companies Chart*. He explained that he would discuss what EDAWN had done during fiscal year (FY) 2025, which he noted spanned the same July 1 to June 30 FY schedule as Nevada's public agencies. He stated that the figures listed on the *FY 2025 Assisted Companies Chart* slide were taken as of the end of FY 2025, on June 30, 2025. He opined that FY 2025 had been a good year for Western and Northern Nevada. He acknowledged that the region had faced economic difficulties over the previous year, particularly with market uncertainty caused by an uncertain tax environment. He expressed gratitude that the federal government had brought some closure to those matters the previous weekend. He remarked that tariffs had also affected the economy of Northern Nevada in the short term, though EDAWN had seen some of those impacts abating, and the market was finding more certainty in that regard. He emphasized that the largest factor affecting the market in Northern Nevada over the previous 12 months was the lingering restrictive policies from the federal government related to its interest rates. He hoped that the federal government would go through with implementing the two rate reductions that had been promised, as such changes would give the region's economy the boost it needed. He explained that despite the difficulties the market had faced, EDAWN had made some significant announcements during FY 2025, as listed on the *FY 2025 Assisted Companies Chart* slide. He noted that he would show additional charts and figures in subsequent slides. He emphasized his intent to start his presentation by showing the primary data in order to allow people time to process the information and create an opportunity for him to answer their questions.

Mr. Adams displayed the *EDAWN Assisted Companies-Industry Breakdown* slide and indicated that the graph on the slide depicted what EDAWN had seen across different industries in FY 2025. He noted that he would also show the statistics for FY 2024 later in his presentation. He explained that EDAWN saw logistics and distribution continuing to be a strong industry in the region, regularly staying between 28 and 35 percent of the companies EDAWN assisted annually. He noted that the advanced manufacturing industry had become a significant strength of the region since Tesla's announcement in 2017. He opined that it was interesting that EDAWN had seen the influence of the advanced manufacturing industry migrate into the technology-focused

manufacturing industry. He reported that Northern Nevada was being discovered by the San Francisco Bay Area and Silicon Valley as a place where technology-focused manufacturing was expanding. He noted that Northern Nevada offered a degree of cost-effectiveness, employee quality, and training value that was hard for many other communities to duplicate. He expressed pride in the work put into developing the technology-focused manufacturing industry in the region. He referred to the chart again and acknowledged that it likely would not surprise the Board that the *Technology/Information Technology* category had been included. He noted that conversations regarding the technology and information technology industry had been present in the community, and the growth of data centers in the region had primarily driven the industry. He reported that the technology and information technology sector comprised about half of the industries assisted by EDAWN in FY 2025. He noted that he was frequently asked whether he believed that trend would be something the region could expect going forward and admitted that he was uncertain if it would. He remarked that data centers were the most financeable deal in the market at that time due to the current state of interest rates, which he attributed to the increased activity in that sector. He reported that EDAWN expected other deals to come forward that might offer additional broader value as interest rates decreased. He explained that, regardless of the uncertainty, EDAWN was happy to have seen the growth of the technology and information technology industry, as it was a substantial tax base that did not require an abundance of services. He noted that every community in the Nation faced a similar issue in not having the answer to the challenges caused by the abundance of energy required to power data centers. He opined that the first community to solve that problem would likely become the major winner in the information technology sector. He explained that the Board had not recently seen an abundance of announcements regarding those matters because EDAWN was working closely with its colleagues at NV Energy to ensure that EDAWN was being judicious in its capacity to ensure that it could continue to meet the community's ongoing needs. He elaborated that the lack of announcements during the presentation was attributed to EDAWN still having additional details to work through.

Mr. Adams referred to the slides titled *EDAWN Assisted Companies FY 2024*, *FY 2024 Assisted Companies Chart*, and *EDAWN Assisted Companies - Industry Breakdown Sales*. He indicated he would quickly compare FY 2025 to FY 2024 by displaying the table on the *FY 2024 Assisted Companies Chart* slide. He explained that the table listed the companies assisted by EDAWN during FY 2024. He introduced the slide titled *EDAWN Assisted Companies - Industry Breakdown Sales*, noting that the graph for the industries of the companies assisted by EDAWN in FY 2024 contained significantly more categories than the graph previously shown for FY 2025. He explained that the incongruity between the FY 2024 and FY 2025 charts was attributed to the interest rates he had mentioned previously and the uncertainty EDAWN had seen in the market during FY 2025. He noted that EDAWN anticipated more diversity to return to the local economy as rate cuts became more focused with the recent passing of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. He explained that companies had since become more aware of what to expect from ongoing tax liabilities, resulting in businesses having the increased certainty they preferred. He noted that his statements were not intended to serve as an endorsement or criticism of

the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, as it had only been mentioned to emphasize that businesses liked to operate with certainty.

Mr. Adams introduced the *FY 25 Performance* slide and noted that he would discuss what the teams at EDAWN had done in FY 2025. He introduced the slide titled *Business Attraction*, reporting that EDAWN had announced previously that approximately 1,497 new jobs and over 8 million square feet of new business space were created during FY 2025. He emphasized that EDAWN always liked to provide those statistics, explaining that the expansion was significant because it reflected on the County's tax base. He recounted that EDAWN hosted 93 company site visits during the previous 12 months. He elaborated that the 8 million square feet of new business space accounted for approximately \$3 billion in new capital investment in the community. He noted that those funds were not purely from real estate costs, as the figure also included content with additional taxable revenue.

Mr. Adams showed the slide titled *Business Retention & Expansion* and noted that EDAWN was focusing substantially on business retention. He stated that while the region had a healthy economy, EDAWN wanted to see 80 percent of the new jobs in a healthy economy come from existing businesses, as those companies were established in the area and were based in Nevada. He opined that EDAWN would be operating improperly if the organization did not uphold the same promises for pre-established local companies that it made to the business moving to the region. He reported that EDAWN was working with significant intentionality in its efforts towards the community's existing industries, as demonstrated by the information on the slide. He noted that a slide included later in his presentation would introduce some of the new programs that EDAWN was launching to contribute towards those goals. He displayed the slide titled *Entrepreneurial Development*, reiterating his assertion that the companies that began in the region would continue to grow in the area, and would always be the most loyal customers. He emphasized that those businesses were in the region because they believed in the cultural pillars that defined the community. He explained that the content on the slide demonstrated that substantial resources were invested in entrepreneurial development. He opined that the region had always been a leader in that development, but EDAWN was significantly increasing those efforts with the help of the County, which he noted would be demonstrated further in later discussions regarding the Reno Startup Week event.

Mr. Adams introduced the slide titled *Strategic Partnerships & Workforce*. He explained that EDAWN was reaching out to companies exclusively associated with the parts of the economy the organization worked with, such as the commercial and industrial sectors. He acknowledged that the region's economy was much broader than that, and it was necessary to know what was happening in the local healthcare and professional services industries. He explained that strategic partnerships were about EDAWN becoming more ingrained in the community on a deeper level.

Mr. Adams displayed the slide titled *Recapping Our 2024 Initiatives*. He introduced the slide titled *Ramping Up "Out of Market" Business Attraction & Engaging with National Site Selection Community* and opined that the slide included information that

was very exciting for the region. He acknowledged that it was well-known that California's presence had continuously benefited the local region's economy, which the area had worked toward improving over the previous 40 years. He recounted that 2 years prior, the employees of EDAWN asked themselves what might happen if they broadened their approach. He explained that EDAWN considered states located to the north, east, and south of Nevada. He noted that EDAWN had seen projects from ten different states open in Northern Nevada during FY 2024. Once EDAWN recognized that, the organization began to consider attracting business from the rest of the world. He noted that EDAWN was actively working on projects from three continents worldwide with companies that wanted to be located in the local region and invest in the community. He acknowledged that conversations regarding tariffs were contributing to international investment in Nevada. He expressed excitement about an unprecedented increase in defense spending, with companies making a product needed by the United States (US) Department of Defense (DOD) to manufacture its own products later. He reported that EDAWN saw those defense companies relocate to Nevada, as the State offered a unique benefit for that industry. He noted that EDAWN added four companies from different states to those listed on the slide during FY 2025.

Mr. Adams showed the slide titled *Increasing our efforts to support existing businesses* and noted that he had previously mentioned business retention and expansion. He reported that EDAWN historically visited between 125 and 150 companies per year, with visits to each one every 3 to 4 years. He explained that had he been with EDAWN at that time, he would have utilized the same strategy. He emphasized that the region had since matured, and current demands led to his belief that it was critical for EDAWN to see closer to 600 businesses per year, with a figure closer to 650 being ideal. He reported that EDAWN had recently launched three programs that would achieve that goal. He explained that the organization wanted to test markets over the previous FY and had challenged itself to ambitiously increase the number of business visits from the 140 conducted during Mr. Adams's first year with the agency to 250 visits. He stated that EDAWN had achieved its goal for FY 2025 and planned to increase that figure to 450 starting July 1, 2025, for FY 2026, with the organization eventually planning to see 600 businesses throughout the following year. He opined that EDAWN had to succeed in those plans in order to be connected with the community to the degree the County needed the organization to achieve. He reported that EDAWN doubled its output over the previous year, had plans to do the same for FY 2026, and would get to what the organization described as a mature position during the following FY. He expressed pride in the work his team had done and gratitude for the business community's willingness to be responsive to the meeting requests from EDAWN. He was excited to see the outcome of those efforts and anticipated providing the County with more robust tools to assist the existing businesses in the area that were paying taxes and employing residents daily.

Mr. Adams displayed the slide titled *Accelerating out of our inaugural Reno Startup Week*. He wanted to mention the Reno Startup Week event, as he was grateful for the County's support because he believed the event would not have happened without the Board's support. He noted that near the end of the COVID-19 (C19) pandemic, the BCC worked with EDAWN to secure a grant that allowed the organization to create the Reno

Startup Week program. He acknowledged that the Board was likely aware of their involvement, but he wanted to mention it for the sake of the community. He explained that during the event's first year, EDAWN anticipated there would be 300 businesses attending the event, though 600 existing small businesses and aspiring companies ultimately registered that year. He acknowledged that while 600 was a significant number of attendees, he emphasized that over 1,000 people had registered for the event in 2024. He reported that the third Reno Startup Week event was scheduled to occur in September 2025 and was expected to exceed the number of attendees seen in 2024. He noted that EDAWN was uncertain whether the number of attendees would double again for the 2025 event, but the organization was sure there would be continued growth. He thanked the Board for their support of the initiative, because the event would not have happened without the County's partnership and willingness to support the event through the grant. He reported that many exciting things were happening with Reno Startup Week, including receiving a sanction from the Startup World Cup event. He explained that Reno Startup Week hosted a pitch competition every year, which the event had started during the previous year and would repeat in 2025. He noted that the winner of the pitch competition would receive a spot in the Startup World Cup semifinals to have a chance to win a \$1 million funding opportunity. He explained that the Startup World Cup was held each year in San Francisco, California. He noted that even if the company chosen from Reno Startup Week's competition did not win the Startup World Cup, the companies that pitched their business during the semifinals would be seen by investors worldwide, bringing money into the local community. He stated that the one condition for a company nominated for the semifinals during Reno Startup Week was that, should they win the Startup World Cup, the winnings had to be invested in the region. He thanked the Board again for their partnership with the event, explaining that it was a critical part of EDAWN's programming.

Mr. Adams acknowledged that his presentation had exceeded the scheduled time, apologized, and offered to take any questions from the Board. Chair Hill thanked him for respecting the time allotted to him.

Chair Hill invited Commissioner Garcia to speak, noting that she served on the EDAWN Board of Trustees on behalf of the BCC. Commissioner Garcia thanked Mr. Adams for attending the meeting and inquired whether he had recently celebrated an anniversary. He affirmed that he had just reached his two-year anniversary. She explained that Mr. Adams had completed his second year with EDAWN on July 1, 2025. She speculated that relocating to Nevada must have been interesting for Mr. Adams, as he had come from the Southeastern US. She opined that Mr. Adams had made tremendous strides during his short tenure in the role, congratulated him, and thanked him for his leadership in the EDAWN Board of Trustees meetings. She explained that during the EDAWN Board of Trustees meetings, trustees discussed common themes such as water, energy, roads, and workforce gaps as areas of focus. She acknowledged that many of the prospective companies Mr. Adams was talking to that expressed interest in coming to Nevada were also curious about the area's education, childcare, healthcare, outdoor recreation, and, most importantly, the housing inventory. She noted that those matters represented the infrastructure needs the BCC was tasked with and closely monitored. She stated that Mr. Adams had mentioned where he had been during his previous years with EDAWN. She

expressed her curiosity regarding what Mr. Adams expected would happen within the County during the following five years and his strategy for the region.

Mr. Adams thanked Commissioner Garcia. He opined that one of the reasons he had been chosen for his position by the EDAWN Board of Trustees was that he had always been an advocate for sustainable development. He noted that the term *sustainable development* could not be found in any textbooks on economic development, as it was something personal to him. He noted that those in roles similar to his had an obligation to work within their capacity for what could be sustainably delivered, such as water, critical resource availability, and transportation resources. He emphasized the necessity of considering the infrastructure of a region to ensure that the projects brought forward would not result in overtaxing. He noted that within his industry, Deloitte was likely the leader in that space due to its work on establishing a social impact model for economic development, which EDAWN followed relatively closely. He wanted to present the model to the Board once Deloitte had developed it more comprehensively. He noted that EDAWN had witnessed impacts on its colleagues in the Southern US, especially in Arizona, which was involved in large projects that included buying entire cities in Mexico. He clarified that those projects had brought forth the need for EDAWN's colleagues to divert water into those communities to meet their projects' demands. He noted that EDAWN wanted to ensure it was never put in that position, so the organization worked closely with regional infrastructure providers to prevent overtaxing or getting ahead of the providers with the projects EDAWN was recruiting.

Mr. Adams opined that housing was the most important thing he was working on aside from his responsibilities that directly involved recruiting companies or growing businesses in the region. He introduced Mr. Dan Morgan, Executive Officer at Builders Association of Northern Nevada, as his close colleague, noting that rarely a day went by without the two of them talking to one another. He explained that he and Mr. Morgan understood that neither could be successful in their roles without the other. He assured the Board that they were working daily to ensure they had a plan to account for the anticipated housing needs of the entire community, not just those related to owner-occupied luxury housing. He emphasized that housing was a topic that needed to be addressed for all the citizens in the region, regardless of whether they were actively engaged in the workforce, noting the challenges in the community related to housing for senior citizens. He explained that EDAWN recognized those housing difficulties, how the region's population was aging, and the resources needed to address that. He assured the Board that EDAWN worked every day to improve those matters.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Adams and congratulated him on his anniversary with EDAWN. She opined that the previous two years had passed swiftly, to which Mr. Adams agreed. She appreciated Mr. Adams' presentation and noted that she would like him to present before the Board more often. She thought the strategically aggressive strategy to visit more businesses per year was great, acknowledging that EDAWN had started at approximately 120 to 125 companies per year and was progressively increasing to 600 to achieve the goal he described using the term *mature position*. She referred to Commissioner Garcia's previous questions and wondered if Mr.

Adams could speak about the five-year timeframe he had suggested for that increase in business visitation. She asked what Washoe County could do to assist EDAWN and what the County could consider as it moved forward. She noted that the figures Mr. Adams had provided previously were only related to the number of businesses visited rather than the number of employees those figures equated to. She reiterated her curiosity about what challenges EDAWN might face and what the County could do or consider in areas such as housing or other services already shared between Washoe County and EDAWN.

Mr. Adams thanked Commissioner Andriola. He explained that he would endeavor not to get ahead of the matters the Board might already be considering as he provided his answers to Commissioner Andriola's questions. He mentioned the intricacy of Nevada's tax policy and noted that he recruited businesses worldwide based on Nevada's low tax rates. He opined that the reduced taxes and the State's unwavering support of free markets were critical to attract companies. He acknowledged that Nevada was prone to focusing on growth over its ability to pay for public infrastructure, especially for a State with only two metropolitan areas, Washoe County being one of them. He opined that a broad set of tools had been deployed in the other metropolitan area in Nevada, which EDAWN considered to be an enabler of residential construction. He suggested that those tools might have value within the local region, but EDAWN recognized that those matters had to be carefully measured. He acknowledged that a General Assembly session had recently concluded, which had included deliberation about resetting property taxes at the time of sale, though the matter never achieved momentum. He acknowledged that discussion on the subject would not be heard again for the following two years at a minimum. He referred to the current state of the economy and admitted that Mr. Morgan could comment on the market's impact on residential issues in more detail than he could. Mr. Adams explained that he was better equipped to talk about the economy regarding the industrial sector. He reported that there were tools that could be used locally, which would allow infrastructure construction in a way that was true to Nevada's principle that growth should be able to pay for itself. He emphasized that he did not want to get ahead of any plans or discussions already conducted by the BCC, as EDAWN was honored to partner with the Board and would continue to work collaboratively to deliver the desired development with the resources granted and within the environment given to the organization. He stated that he would be remiss if he had not mentioned that EDAWN witnessed those tools working elsewhere in the State and bringing success.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Adams and agreed that there were opportunities that the BCC and EDAWN could continue to discuss that might already be available to address how they could maximize the potential for benefits, economic quality, and balance between infrastructure and community needs. She opined that EDAWN was excellently recruiting businesses to the region, and everyone wanted those companies to stay. She referred to the second question she had asked and noted that Mr. Adams had explained the importance of business retention. She explained that any business would agree that gaining a new customer costs more than retaining one. She asked whether EDAWN's benchmark was a goal of 80 percent retention of new companies, and whether that rate would be considered high or average.

Mr. Adams explained that the professional economic development community would dictate that in a healthy market, 80 percent of business would come from existing industry. He detailed EDAWN's membership with the International Economic Development Corporation and explained that a retention of 80 percent was considered an industry benchmark and best practice. He acknowledged that achieving such a rate was not an easy task, but that the difficulty associated with the goal made it a best practice. He stated that for the first time in his career, he believed the region had a community that could achieve that percentage. He assured the Board that EDAWN was working hard to ensure those efforts were successful. He noted that EDAWN had achieved approximately 50 percent, though growth was still needed.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Adams. She recounted mentioning during the previous BCC meeting that data centers had been a frequent topic of conversation, and that Dr. Jeremy Smith, Director of Regional Planning at the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission (TMRPC), was investigating the creation of a standard. She expressed certainty that Mr. Adams was involved in heavy discussions with Dr. Smith, but she wanted to ensure that there was an opportunity for Mr. Adams to remain engaged in that process, as Dr. Smith was prioritizing that objective. She acknowledged that Mr. Adams was likely very aware of that but reiterated her desire to mention it. Mr. Adams expressed gratitude that conversations about data centers were happening in the region, as the community in Virginia he served prior to his role with EDAWN was one of the largest data center markets in the Country. He described his experience compiling a similar set of data center standards for the community he served prior to Washoe County. He stated that EDAWN welcomed the opportunity to participate in that discussion. Commissioner Andriola opined that Mr. Adams would be a great partner for Dr. Smith in gathering information. She thanked Mr. Adams for his work and for always considering maintaining the quality of life, ensuring balance, what the County could do with infrastructure, and the matters that could be conducted differently with the available resources. Chair Hill noted that as the new chair of the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA), Commissioner Andriola would bring a discussion of those matters forward to be heard by the BCC in the fall.

Commissioner Clark thanked Mr. Adams for his report, which he thought seemed to indicate that there would be positive things in the future. He encouraged Mr. Adams to keep up the good work, and Mr. Adams thanked him.

Chair Hill referred to Commissioner Garcia's earlier question and asked whether Mr. Adams had anything the Board needed to hear about quality of life issues the BCC needed to address. She acknowledged that the Board was aware of the issues regarding the cost of housing and childcare in the community. She noted that parks and recreation were a major priority, and all of those matters were associated with a cost. She appreciated Mr. Adams's presence in the discussion on those topics. She acknowledged that Nevada followed a small government model, which the Board would not change, though it presented some structural issues that needed to be considered. She expressed curiosity about whether there were additional matters Mr. Adams wanted to bring to the Board's attention.

Mr. Adams said he spoke both professionally and as a parent of four children. He expressed gratitude toward Commissioner Garcia's earlier comments regarding the baby that had recently been found abandoned in a dumpster. He was relieved that the baby would be cared for and described the event as heartbreaking. He explained that his wife had left the workforce after their second child was born because childcare was the primary cost that their family could not afford at that time. He acknowledged that they had decided to have four children over a timespan of five and a half years, as they had begun those efforts late and wanted a large family. He noted that such circumstances were common, and the cost of childcare was only getting worse. He expressed gratitude towards Governor Joe Lombardo for his economic development bill, which included certain provisions that would incentivize the companies EDAWN was recruiting to offer childcare to their employees in the region. He opined that it was unfortunate that the portion of that bill covering those matters had not passed. He noted that discussions about workforce participation in the Country involved many families not being engaged in the workforce exclusively because they could not afford childcare at the quality needed. He stated that EDAWN would welcome any assistance the Board could offer, as the organization was working towards solutions on the matter daily. He noted that EDAWN believed those solutions were critical. He referred to his previous role as a city planner when mentioning public spaces and emphasized his belief that placemaking was the way great communities grew and built culture. He noted that anything that could be done to continue creating public spaces, allowing citizens to congregate productively, would be helpful to the community.

Chair Hill acknowledged the substantial work to be done by both the Board and EDAWN. She opined that it had been apparent through the economic downturns witnessed during the exit of the 2008 Great Recession in Northern Nevada and the C19 pandemic that the community had been more resilient due to the region's strategic economic development. She acknowledged that there had been criticism about how things could have been handled better, which she agreed the Board could and would always strive to achieve. She reiterated that making it out of difficult economic times had been something the region could do because of the work of EDAWN and the State. She thanked Mr. Adams for those efforts and anticipated seeing how the Board and EDAWN could continue to make the area the best community and county in the Country. She noted that such goals represented the BCC's job and were efforts on which the Board would partner with EDAWN. Mr. Adams thanked Chair Hill and the BCC for their time.

DONATIONS

25-0495

6A1 Recommendation to accept a donation of [\$1,500.00] from the Boys and Girls Club of the Truckee Meadows to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office for the Reserve Deputy Program, including funds to be used for food purchases and operating supplies, retroactive for March 6, 2025; and, if approved, authorize Finance to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0496** **6A2** Recommendation to accept a donation of [\$2,241.69] from the Hot August Nights Inc. to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office for the Citizen Corps Program (CCP), including funds to be used for food purchases and operating supplies retroactive for March 6, 2025; and, if approved, authorize Finance to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0497** **6A3** Recommendation to accept a donation of [\$5,000.00] from Lucky Beaver Reno, LLC to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office to be used for Washoe County Sheriff's Office most pressing needs retroactive for March 6, 2025, and, if approved, authorize Finance to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0498** **6A4** Recommendation to accept a donation of [\$1,500.00] from the Reno Air Racing Association, Inc., dba: National Championship Air Races to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office for the Citizen Corps Program (CCP), including funds to be used for food purchases & operating supplies retroactive for March 6, 2025; and, if approved, authorize Finance to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 6A1 through 6A4 be accepted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 7A1 THROUGH 7J1

- 25-0499** **7A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meeting of May 27, 2025. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0500** **7B1** Recommendation to accept the Bureau of Behavioral Health Wellness and Prevention Sub-Award from the Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Public and Behavioral Health in the amount of [\$298,618.00; no County match required] to be used to cover personnel costs and operating expenses related to Year 4 of the Department of Alternative Sentencing Support in Treatment, Accountability and Recovery (STAR) program, for the retroactive grant period of July 1, 2025 – December 31, 2025, and if approved authorize Connie Lucido, County Grants Administrator to execute grant award documents on behalf of DAS; and direct Fiscal to make the necessary budget amendments. Alternative Sentencing. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0501** **7C1** Recommendation to approve an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services between Washoe County and Tahoe Resource Conservation District (TRCD), retroactive to July 1, 2025 through June 30,

2028, [not to exceed \$172,817.00 - three-year cost] to allow TRCD to collect, analyze, and report the necessary data to satisfy the objectives and requirements for Stormwater Compliance Monitoring. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

- 25-0502** **7D1** Recommendation to approve Washoe County's Indebtedness Report and accompanying schedules for fiscal year 2024/25 as of June 30, 2025, including general obligation and special assessment debt. If approved, staff will submit the report and schedules to the Washoe County Debt Management Commission and to the Nevada Department of Taxation by August 1, 2025, pursuant to NRS 350.013. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0503** **7E1** Recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to retroactively acknowledge a grant of [\$20,000, no County match required], awarded to the Second Judicial District Court from the Lee F. Del Grande Foundation, for Family Peace Center operating expenses; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0504** **7E2** Acknowledge retroactively various one-time Fiscal Year 2025, in-kind 20 Wal-Mart gift cards and 30 Target gift cards at an individual value of \$50.00 each for a total value of [\$2,500.00] from the Washoe Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) Foundation accepted by the Second Judicial District Court, CASA Program. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0505** **7F1** Recommendation to approve Washoe County's Debt Management Policy as of June 30, 2025 which includes (1) a discussion of the County's ability to afford existing general obligation debt, authorized future general obligation debt and proposed future general obligation debt; (2) a discussion of the County's capacity to incur authorized and proposed future general obligation debt without exceeding the applicable debt limit; (3) a discussion of the County's general obligation debt that is payable from property taxes per capita as compared with such debt of other municipalities in this State; (4) a discussion of the County's general obligation debt that is payable from property taxes as a percentage of assessed valuation of all taxable property within the boundaries of the municipality; (5) policy regarding the manner in which the County expects to sell its debt; (6) a discussion of the County's sources of money projected to be available to pay existing general obligation debt, authorized future general obligation debt and proposed future general obligation debt; and (7) a discussion of the County's operational costs and revenue sources, for the ensuing 5 fiscal years, associated with each project included in its capital improvement plan if those costs and revenues are expected to affect the property tax rate; and direction to staff to submit to the Department of Taxation and the county

debt management commission the policy or a written statement of the County's debt management policy on or before August 1 as required by NRS 350.013(1)(c). Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0506 **7G1** Recommendation to accept an FFY25 Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP) subaward amendment #1 from the State of Nevada, Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) in the amount of [\$108,908.00; no county match] retroactive from October 1, 2024 to September 30, 2025 to supplement food costs for the Older Americans Act Title III congregate and home-delivered meal programs which address the food and nutrition needs of seniors, retroactively authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to execute the subgrant amendment and related documents, and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0507 **7H1** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$75,000.00] for Fiscal Year 2025-2026; District 1 Commissioner Alexis Hill recommends a [\$38,235.00] grant to Tahoe Transportation District -- a government entity - - to support and develop multi-modal transportation projects and transit services in the Washoe County portion of Lake Tahoe; and a [\$15,000.00] grant to Incline Village Crystal Bay Community and Business Association (IVCBA) - a nonprofit organization created for religious, charitable or educational purposes - for the purpose of supporting the Nevada Main Street program, an initiative focusing on downtown revitalization, and other community engagements; and a [\$10,000.00] grant to St. John's Children's Center - a nonprofit organization created for religious, charitable or educational purposes - for the purpose of installing a mandated back flow valve; and a [\$5,000.00] grant to Latino Arte – a nonprofit organization created for religious, charitable or educational purposes - to support the Fiesta on Wells, a special event celebrating Hispanic Heritage Month; and a [\$2,850.00] grant to MidTown Reno Foundation - a nonprofit organization created for religious, charitable or educational purposes - to support MidTown Snowflakes, an annual winter tradition lighting up MidTown; and a [\$2,020.00] grant to Washoe County Community Services Department (CSD) Regional Parks and Open Space – a government entity - to cover park fees at the Hawkins Amphitheater for Gospel Fest; and a [\$1,895.00] grant to Word of Life Ministries – a nonprofit organization created for religious, charitable or educational purposes - to support the audio equipment provided by Starsound Audio, Inc. at Gospel Fest 2025; approve Resolutions necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary disbursements of funds and the necessary intrafund or cross functional transfer. Manager. (Commission District 1.)

25-0508 **7H2** Recommendation that the Board of County Commissioners re-adopt the 2025 Washoe County Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan due to requested revisions from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The Regional Hazard Mitigation Plan is created under the authority of the Stafford Act, as updated by the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 and federal regulations (44 CFR § 201), which require communities to identify local hazards, assess risks, and develop strategies to reduce the impact of disasters. If adopted authorize the County Commission Chairman to execute a Resolution to promulgate the plan. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

****Due to the size of the supporting material for this agenda item, hard copies are not being provided to County Commissioners. Electronic copies are available on Washoe County's website at:**
<https://www.washoecounty.gov/em/Hazards/Washoe-County-Regional-Hazard-Mitigation-Plan-2025---State-Approved.pdf>

25-0509 **7I1** Recommendation to retroactively approve the Forensic Support Services Agreements between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and various Local Law Enforcement Agencies: Eureka County Sheriff's Office \$10,997 for Forensic Laboratory Analysis Service fees for the retroactive term of July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025 with a total income of [\$10,997.00]. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0510 **7I2** Recommendation to retroactively approve the Forensic Support Services Agreements between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and various Local Law Enforcement Agencies: Reno Tahoe Airport Authority \$1,500; Carlin Police Department \$6,611; Carson City Sheriff's Office \$179,730; Churchill County Sheriff's Office \$107,092; Elko Police Department \$118,991; Lyon County Sheriff's Office \$157,107; Mineral County Sheriff's Office \$18,853; Mono County District Attorney's Office (CA) \$12,569; Pershing County Sheriff's Office \$29,850; Reno Sparks Indian Colony Police Department \$32,992; State of Nevada Department of Wildlife \$1,500; Washoe County School District Police Department \$3,771; West Wendover Police Department \$25,137; White Pine County Sheriff's Office \$28,279; Winnemucca Police Department \$108,090; Yerington Police Department \$7,855 for Forensic Laboratory Analysis Service fees for the retroactive term of July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026; Nevada Gaming Control Board effective upon approval through June 30, 2027 for amount not to exceed \$5,000; with a total income of [\$844,927.00] for all agreements. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0511 **7J1** Request to establish a Backstop Bank Account for the Washoe County Sheriff's Office's Northern Nevada Drug Task Force (NNDTF) to investigate suspected illicit drug trafficking and make purchases through electronic payment platforms such as Venmo and Zelle. No fiscal impact. Treasurers. (All Commission Districts.)

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock recalled that Agenda Item 7F1 pertained to the County's debt management policy and expressed shock that it was in the Consent Agenda because she wanted a robust discussion on the matter. She mentioned that the County's recent Fiscal Year (FY) ended with \$27 million in debt and wondered where the money was spent. She asked if the Washoe Valley fire station was included in the debt plan. She indicated that the Washoe Valley fire station would have cost \$4 million to be built when originally approved, but would now cost \$16 million. She reported that Mr. Tom Daly's proposal to reopen the existing volunteer fire station for \$500,000 was possible with the existing budget. She asserted that fire departments were important in the Mt. Rose Corridor because she believed it was beautiful and protected the Tahoe Basin. She expressed disappointment because she speculated that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) was burying Agenda Item 7F1 in the Consent Agenda.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7J1 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7J1 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

BLOCK VOTE – 8 THROUGH 13

25-0512 **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to: 1) accept the State of Nevada, Division of State Parks, Recreational Trails Program RTP 2025-11 "Sierra Front Trail Construction" grant [in the amount of \$275,048.62 with a Washoe County cash/in-kind match in the amount of \$68,762.16, equaling 20% of the \$343,810.78 project total]; and 2) approve the Project Agreement with a grant period from execution through September 30, 2027; and 3) authorize the Assistant County Manager [Dave Solaro] to sign the Project Agreement and any subsequent documents related to the grant on behalf of the County; and 4) direct the Department of Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. This section of the Sierra Front Trail will connect from the Michael D. Thompson Trailhead to Hunter Lake Road and includes approximately 7.7 miles of new non-motorized singletrack trail. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8 be accepted, approved, authorized, and directed.

25-0513 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to approve Amendment No. 3 to the Agreement for Professional Consulting Services between Washoe County and Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc. for additional engineering services required to update the Remediation Management Plan (RMP) for the Central Truckee Meadows Remediation District Program (Remediation

Program) [in the additional amount of \$336,439.00 for a total contract amount of \$555,877.00]. The additional engineering services include a detailed evaluation and associated recommendations of certain portions of the current RMP and the Remediation Program to reflect the targeted approach to achieve Remediation Program efficiencies and objectives through alternative field work, sampling, modeling and mitigation activities with the goal of achieving “No Further Action” status from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection for all identified sites by 2040. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be approved.

25-0514 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to accept five (5) Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development in an amount not to exceed [\$1,417,200; no county match] with an initial term of twenty years, subject to funding availability, and upon approval of inspection, to support veterans seeking housing support with rental assistance with Veteran’s Affairs case management and supportive services at the Nevada Cares Campus, Permanent Supportive Housing building; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be accepted, authorized, and directed.

25-0515 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to accept FY26 Community Corrections Partnership Block Grant from the Department of Health and Human Services – Juvenile Justice Programs Office in the amount of [\$318,598.74] to provide treatment and programming to youth referred to the Washoe County Department of Juvenile Services; for the period of 7/1/25-6/30/26 and authorize Elizabeth Florez, Director of Juvenile Services to sign grant award. No match required. Juvenile Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

25-0516 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the annual report of the Recorder Technology Fund (IN20014), a fund created pursuant to NRS 247.305(2) for the acquisition and improvement of technology in the Recorder's Office, which has projected proceeds in the amount of [\$419,760.00] and projected expenditures in the amount of [\$389,959.00] for FY26. Recorder's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

25-0517 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to award, on behalf of the Washoe County Regional Basemap Committee member agencies (Washoe County, City of Reno, City of Sparks and NV Energy) and the Washoe County Assessor's Office, Washoe County Bid No. 3263-24 for oblique imagery products over a three-flight acquisition schedule in the years 2025, 2027, and 2029 to Pictometry International Corp. dba EagleView, 25 Methodist Hill Drive, Rochester, NY 14623; and to approve and execute an agreement for such services in the amount not to exceed [\$325,200.00]. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 13 be awarded, approved, and executed.

25-0518 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 approving Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC25-0008, to amend the development agreement between Washoe County and Mesa View Reno, LLC (previous landowner), which was originally approved on July 16, 2024 (WAC24-0005). This amended development agreement is between Washoe County and Mesa View by Desert Wind LP, and its purpose is to extend the deadline for presenting the fourth final map to the Director of Planning and Building for final signature from April 28, 2025, to April 28, 2026, with all subsequent final maps being subject to the deadlines set forth in NRS 278.360.

The project was originally approved in 2004 as Tentative Subdivision Map Case No. WTM04-001 (Sun Mesa), and is a residential subdivision located

along the eastern terminus of Sun Mesa Drive and Rising Ridge Drive in Sun Valley. The project encompasses a total of approximately 70.28 acres, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 207 with 149 lots recorded and 58 lots remaining to be recorded. The parcels are located within the Sun Valley Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 3. (APN: 504-460-03).

And, if approved, schedule a public hearing, second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for August 19, 2025, and authorize the Chair to execute the Development Agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1933.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1933 was introduced by Commissioner Andriola, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

25-0519 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Discussion and possible action under the Board of County Commissioners Rules of Procedures Section 6.7, as requested by Commissioner Michael Clark at the June 24, 2025 Board meeting to reconsider the Board vote on June 17, 2025 for the appointment to the Public Seat of the Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife (WCABMW). Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Clark stated that two initial members were reappointed to the WCABMW, based on an application process. He believed that for the second appointment on June 17, 2025, the application process was not reopened. He mentioned that after the reappointment, additional individuals were interested in applying but were unable to. He said the issue was brought to his attention shortly after the second appointment was made. He felt that the process was flawed and thought the seat should be reopened to allow consideration of additional candidates. He requested that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) rescind the vote and appointment that was made on June 17, 2025. He stated the position could be reopened and follow the appropriate application process for individuals who considered applying.

Chair Hill asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large for clarification on when the appointment was effective. She wondered if the BCC would be removing Ms. Caron Tayloe from the position if the appointment was effective after the approval. She said that State law for removal stated that members of the board shall be removed by the board of county commissioners of the county served, for cause, including but not limited to absences from three consecutive duty called board meetings, unless excused by their respective board chairs. She noted that she wanted to ensure that the County was in good legal standing to continue the discussion.

CDDA Large said that the BCC had the power to reconsider the WCABMW appointment. He explained that the effective date was the date the member was appointed; however, the WCABMW had not met yet, and no action had been taken by the applicant. He said the BCC was empowered to reconsider the vote. Regarding Commissioner Clark's comments, he noted that the item asked for a reconsideration of what was previously heard, which included 15 applicants. He stated that if the reconsideration was approved that day, the next agenda item would be identical to what was discussed at the June 24, 2025, meeting. He said that the only way to allow additional applicants would be to determine that none of the previous applicants were qualified. He believed that the two reappointments on May 27, 2025, were for the Wildlife Sportsmen's positions. He thought applications were being processed for the Public Seat and the Wildlife Sportsmen's seats simultaneously. He mentioned that the Public Seat position was open from April 18, 2025, through May 9, 2025, and noted that applications were only solicited once. He explained that the reappointments were for existing members.

Chair Hill explained it was difficult for her to reconsider the appointment because the WCABMW consisted of five members, four of whom were represented by hunters, trappers, anglers, and ranchers, and only one from the general public. She felt comfortable with her vote. She indicated that in the future, the BCC could revise the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) to consider being more specific about the general public member. She believed that the BCC had heard from the public, who were concerned about the reconsideration, and wanted someone who was not a hunter or a representative of that group. She thought that currently those groups were overrepresented, and she would not vote in favor of a reconsideration.

Vice Chair Herman said she had discussed the process with the public and thought there might be a misunderstanding. She mentioned that she was not involved in the application process. She felt that if the public had doubts, it would be good to review it.

Commissioner Garcia did not believe that the process was flawed. She said that the application deadline was May 9, 2025, and noted that the BCC received communication that provided her with the clarification she needed. She stated that she was not interested in discussing the item for reconsideration.

Chair Hill asked CDDA Michael Large to explain if an affirmative vote brought the item back to the BCC and reopened it, and whether the 15 applicants would be removed as potential applicants.

CDDA Michael Large said there would be a similar situation with the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission appointments the following month. He explained that when there were multiple positions, applications were opened every time, unless there was a reappointment. The candidates on the list, if the list was under a year old, would be contacted to ensure that their circumstances had not changed and that they still wanted to be considered. He stated that if the applications were over a year old, that process would not apply because it would be considered a new position. He indicated that all 15

WCABMW Public Seat applicants would be considered, along with anybody else who applied.

Chair Hill asked for confirmation that the previous individuals would not be removed from the list and that it would be reopened.

CDDA Michael Large affirmed and said the position would be reopened, and applications would be solicited for a longer period.

Commissioner Andriola believed that there were a few things to address. She said the agenda item was based on reconsideration but felt that there was an opportunity to review the recommendations of representation. She explained that it was not unusual for various boards to have a diverse group of individuals. She thought statutorily that was outside of the BCC's purview but felt that there was an opportunity to look at the WCABMW and to have discussions and make recommendations. She explained that she prides herself on placing calls to each applicant, reviewing their qualifications, and taking time to understand the specific board and its composition. She stated that neither of her recommendations was the unanimous choice among her colleagues. She mentioned that she strongly supported reconsideration. She said she was not suggesting that the Commissioners did not come fully prepared but noted that one of the recommendations in the Raftelis report was for Commissioners to do their due diligence. She thought that there was an opportunity to have a discussion, outside the agenda item, for the BCC to review the application process. She recalled that recently, the Board looked at not retaining applications for extended periods of time, but she felt that there was confusion about keeping them for a year. She thought that staff time needed to be considered to find efficiencies regarding application postings and retention. She indicated that it was not uncommon for organizations to have applications where, if someone had applied before, they would be considered again. She said she supported reconsideration.

Commissioner Clark understood that the item on the agenda was to reconsider the candidate. He thought that if there was a new vote and the candidate was not reaffirmed, it would give the Board an opportunity to refine the process. He said he supported reconsideration.

Chair Hill stated that hunters and anglers were well represented on the WCABMW and thought they constituted a majority of the County advisory boards and the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners. She believed other voices were important when considering wildlife management. She explained that the important regulations and recommendations of the WCABMW extended well beyond matters related to hunting and angling regulations. She disagreed with Commissioner Andriola's points but said a discussion could be held on a future item. She thought a board would choose similar candidates to themselves. She felt the job of the BCC was to look at diverse voices and how the community experienced wildlife and Nevada open spaces, not necessarily through hunting and angling.

Commissioner Clark stated his concern was to allow anyone who wanted to be on the WCABMW to have an opportunity. He explained that he was not a hunter or an angler and did not have associates who were. He added that everyone was entitled to their own opinion. He stated that his decision had nothing to do with who was an angler, hunter, or a conservationist. He indicated that he wanted to fix the issues that happened when individuals wanted to apply but were unable to. He said God bless the hunters, fishermen, anglers, hikers, and birdwatchers, although he did not participate in those activities.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Jim Rhea said that he formerly held the seat being discussed. He mentioned that he advocated for candidate Kristie Marchese and thought that the outcome differed from what was expected. He cautioned Chair Hill when she used the term *conservationist*. He believed that hunters, anglers, and hikers were all conservationists. He said those groups' actions of putting in a great deal of time and effort supported their words. He mentioned that Ms. Marchese spent many hours finding water sources for big game through the Nevada Bighorns Unlimited (NBU) guzzler projects, which he felt was conservation. He explained that all animals in Northern Nevada utilized guzzlers. He stated that he had encountered Ms. Marchese and her family many times while fishing in northern Washoe. He advised against appointing someone to the WCABMW who stayed within the McCarran loop and thought that hiking around Mount Rose was the entirety of Washoe County. He said that Washoe County spanned all the way to the Oregon border. He mentioned that there were many things discussed on the WCABMW that were very important and affected all wildlife. He stressed the importance of finding someone who cared about Northern Nevada and had a ranching background like Ms. Marchese. He believed it was important to consider all aspects and not just someone with a focus on a specific agenda item.

Mr. Mel Belding, a lifetime resident of Washoe County, said he attended the WCABMW and the Nevada Board of Wildlife Commissioners' meetings for wildlife for over 50 years. He thought that giving an opinion was one thing, but he believed that being involved in conservation efforts throughout Nevada was the biggest help to wildlife. He mentioned that he was on the Board of Directors for NBU for many years. He explained that his job was constructing guzzlers, finding places to build them, and habitat reconstruction and rehabilitation, which could cost over \$150,000 per year. He said the organization built and rehabilitated more guzzlers than the State did. He noted that he took his job seriously and thought that with the declining number of mule deer and the increased number of predators, there was a bigger focus. He believed the problem was controversial but needed to be addressed. He indicated that there was a Mule Deer Enhancement Program (MDEP) across the State. He proudly stated that the WCABMW was the most active, having probably five times more meetings than the rest of the State combined. He said he had attended 95 percent of those meetings and had only seen one applicant at one meeting. He explained that he was a member of the public, a hunter, and a conservationist. He noted that the WCABMW did not need controversy on their board, and he felt the candidate that the BCC previously appointed would bring controversy. He mentioned that conservationists and sportsmen followed the strict North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. He stated that the Boone and Crockett Club rules provided the governance that he believed was needed to continue.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 3-2 vote with Chair Hill and Commissioner Garcia voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 15 be considered.

PUBLIC HEARING

25-0520 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 904 Nonconformance, to revise the timeframe to obtain building permits for nonconforming uses of a structure and nonconforming structures that have been partially or totally destroyed; and to clarify the requirement for bringing a nonconforming use of land or nonconforming use of a structure into compliance with current development code provisions; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1740, Bill No. 1932.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1740, Bill No. 1932, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

25-0521 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Public hearing, second reading, and adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code (“WCC”) Chapter 45 by: 1) repealing WCC 45.430 (Adult Day Health Services/Daybreak Program) in its entirety; 2) modifying WCC 45.410 (Division Directors) to reflect gender-neutral language, correct job title, and selection process; 3) modifying WCC 45.435 (Homemaker Program) to include permissive language and address any limitation based on funding availability; 4) modifying WCC 45.445 (Nutrition Program) to include permissive language and address any limitation based on funding availability; 5) modifying WCC 45.450 (Representative Payee Program) to include permissive language, provide for management of funding, and address any limitation based on funding availability; and 6) modifying WCC 45.455 (Human Services Program) to reflect caseworkers’ correct job title. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1741, Bill No. 1931.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large reported a technical error with the clean copy of the ordinance. He noted that the document was resubmitted, uploaded, and would be signed and uploaded in conformance with Nevada Revised Statutes

(NRS) 241.020 Subsection 9, with no open meeting law (OML) violation having taken place.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1741, Bill No. 1931, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

25-0522 AGENDA ITEM 18 Public Comment.

Ms. Trista Gomez thanked Commissioner Andriola for the Washoe County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife (WCABMW) reconsideration because she believed the reconsideration would create a more transparent process. She recalled that the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) presentation was informative and asked what infrastructure Clark County maintained that EDAWN wished to emulate in Washoe County. She indicated that there were new roads and exits every time she visited Clark County, and thought that the infrastructure was built before development occurred. She believed that fatalities, insurance increases or cancellations, flood zone changes, increased accidents, drive time, and traffic decreased the quality of life in Washoe County. She speculated that the time and monetary impacts the community experienced would be more apparent if constituents were able to attend Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meetings in person. She hoped that open spaces would be discussed in development planning and opined that there was an increase in revenue needs that the BCC did not plan for. She desired a full disclosure of personal relationships between interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas and the BCC members. She requested a staff survey to occur during the hiring of a new County Manager.

25-0523 AGENDA ITEM 19 Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Andriola reported that she would be unable to attend the July 15, 2025, Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting due to a National Association of Counties (NACO) conference. She thought that the NACO conference would create future discussions for the BCC.

Commissioner Andriola explained that the City of Sparks created an opportunity for Andelin Family Farm to participate in agrotourism. She recalled sharing agrotourism information with Chair Hill and interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas. She reported that the Office of the Lieutenant Governor had detailed agrotourism information that she thought would be beneficial for future BCC discussions. She pointed out that Ferrari Farms was in Commissioner Garcia's district and thought there were other potential places in the County that could benefit from agrotourism due to its unique framework and unincorporated areas.

Commissioner Andriola recalled that Raftelis recommended a BCC work session to provide the Commissioners with detailed agenda item explanations in

preparation for upcoming regular meetings. She requested that the BCC have a work session regarding the Fiscal Year (FY) 2026/2027 budget because she thought there was an opportunity to have ongoing budgetary discussions to research efficiencies and processes with Finance and staff. She knew that the staff was working diligently to prepare for the next FY and thought that learning from the past provided a platform to utilize new opportunities. She said other organizations saved money by maintaining a six-month budget process. She noted that she did not intend to participate in layoffs or hiring freezes because she did not think that approach was beneficial. She looked forward to the consideration of a work session.

Commissioner Clark believed that ICM Thomas was doing a great job, and he was optimistic about the changes she had made.

* * * * *

11:26 a.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:
Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk
Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk
Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk