

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

AUGUST 26, 2025

PRESENT:

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

**Janis Galassini, County Clerk**  
**David Solaro, Assistant County Manager**  
**Michael Large, Chief Deputy District Attorney**

ABSENT:

**Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair**

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

**25-0590      AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.**

Mr. James Stewart expressed the desire to be selected as the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (WCOSRPC) appointee. He said that he was a Reno native and recalled great memories spending time at regional parks. He noted that he was passionate about parks, trails, and open spaces and believed that he could provide a unique perspective. He mentioned that he lived two minutes from Rancho San Rafael Regional Park, which he used daily for a variety of activities, including the dog park, mountain biking, walking, and park events. He explained that his grandchildren played soccer at various parks, which provided him with a broad perspective. He paraphrased that a community's quality could be judged by its parks. He believed he had been gifted with common sense and objectivity to analyze and solve problems and said he would be honored to serve on the WCOSRPC to assist with challenges and maintain the parks, trails, and open space.

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

Mr. Steve Dolan read a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He indicated that he had lived in Incline Village for 33 years and raised both of his children in the area. He said that he was the Director of the Friends of Third Creek nonprofit organization, which included 250 members. He opposed Agenda Item 16

regarding the Washoe County Code (WCC) Chapter 110 amendment to update the Tahoe Area Plan (TAP). He recalled that he fought the Oakland Firestorm of 1991 and said the insurance evaluation showed the fire was caused by high-density housing on narrow hillside streets. He explained that Agenda Item 16 would cause a reduction in parking minimums, which would create no off-street parking for condominiums or similar housing. He said that the changes to the TAP would cause crowding in the streets and would allow accessory dwelling units (ADUs) on less than one acre. He noted that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) indicated in 2021 that they would not amend ADU standards in Incline Village. He said that the TAP amendment stated the owner had to hold the BCC harmless, which he speculated was an addition made by the District Attorney's (DA) Office due to the danger the changes could cause.

Ms. Maureen McElroy read a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She expressed the concerns outlined in her document regarding the relationship that would occur between the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WSCO) and the United States (US) Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) if the BCC approved the Homeland Security Grant (HSG).

Mr. Patrick Gubbins noted that he was a WCOSRPC applicant and expressed the desire to give back to the community. He said that he was an outdoor recreation enthusiast and enjoyed camping, backpacking, snowshoeing, skiing, and mountain biking. He explained that he had enjoyed an incredible career as a parks and resource manager and worked at various levels of the government, including the County, State, federal, and a special parks and recreation district in Colorado. He said that during his career, he was responsible for human resources, financial resources, cultural and natural resources, fire management, and public safety programs. He indicated that he had worked on many teams and partnerships, which he felt was the best way to solve problems. He mentioned that he started his career as a Boulder, Colorado, park ranger and retired from the National Parks Service (NPS) in 2018 as a deputy superintendent of Lake Mead National Recreation Area. He recalled that he had also worked for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and multiple other agencies throughout his career. He thanked the BCC for considering him as the WCOSRPC appointee.

Ms. Pam Darr explained that she understood there was a lot of work done to help the homeless community; however, the County was not preventing possible attacks from homeless individuals. She recalled that on the previous Thursday, two women were stocking their business in the early morning when they were verbally attacked. She said that situations like that were dangerous and mentioned she heard stories of daughters being chased in Midtown by homeless individuals. She noted that Governor Joe Lombardo wanted to rid the State of its sanctuary label, and she wondered how that would occur. She recalled that her husband had purchased his home when he was 22 years old; however, now the average age at which individuals could buy a home had increased to 33. She wondered how people could start a family without being able to purchase a home and said that there were more rentals than homeowners. She was worried about the future of the community's children. She believed that visa reviews needed to be reconsidered because she was almost hit by a vehicle in the Trader Joe's parking lot by someone she felt was unaware of traffic

safety laws. She wanted the community to be safe and felt that the region's growth was too fast.

Biggest Little Action Group Organizer Mark Pritchard said that there were videos online that displayed revolting ICE agent behavior. He believed that ICE brought the Country shame and that the BCC should question the WSCO's relationship with ICE. He understood that every relationship with the federal government had an obligatory and discretionary process; however, he was requesting an audit that included how much of the WSCO's relationship with ICE was discretionary.

Mr. Beau Walker noted that he was a WCOSRPC candidate, raised in Washoe County, a graduate of the Washoe County School District (WCSD), and spent a great deal of time at parks in his youth. He said that he grew up in a nontraditional household and was a free-range child. He explained that he received a bachelor's degree in secondary education from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and two master's degrees, one in athletic administration and coaching, and a second in educational leadership. He indicated that he was a government, civics, and US history teacher for 12 years and a dean of students for three years. He reported that he currently serves as the athletic director at a local high school. He said that he had a strong background in youth engagement, recreation, and athletics while leading and collaborating with diverse groups, schools, families, and community organizations. He mentioned that he was skilled in long-term planning, policy implementation, and stewardship of community resources. He said that the City of Reno Parks and Recreation Department was his first job and that he was lucky to work at the former Moana Stadium, Idlewild Field, and the Plumas Gym. He asserted that he had a deep lifelong connection with the region's parks and an appreciation for the impact those parks had on the community. He said that he had three daughters who were active in sports, which provided him with a first-hand perspective on the importance of accessible communal parks. He pointed out that he was an avid outdoorsman who enjoyed hunting, fishing, and hiking. He opined that Washoe County had the most beautiful open spaces in the western US. He believed in sustainability and protecting open spaces for future generations. He stated that he was dedicated to promoting respect and honor in community service. He noted that he lived near Whites Creek Park, which he felt lacked dog running areas. He relayed that he ran his dogs in undesignated areas and understood the need for a space that allowed his active dogs to be off-leash. He looked forward to the opportunity to serve on the WCOSRPC.

Mr. Frank Wright recalled speaking to the DA about the new Incline Village Recreation Facility Fee because he felt that the fee was illegal and had no statutory limit. He said that the fee put individuals in financial harm. He felt that there was no fee assessment and that the money did not go towards assisting the community. He opined that the BCC needed to be involved and address the community's concerns. He noted that the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) did not provide an answer when asked what the fee provided for the community. He said that the fee was not distributed evenly amongst the residents, which caused the less financially inclined population to struggle and not receive benefits. He mentioned that IVGID was under fiscal investigation by the Nevada Department of Taxation (NDT). He urged the BCC to help the community

and said that collecting the fee was unfair to the residents. He guaranteed that the concern would be addressed within the next couple of years by another government entity if the BCC did not become involved.

Ms. Lynette Cardinale said that she had lived in Incline Village since 1992 and witnessed the area change in a direction that was unacceptable to the parcel owners. She echoed Mr. Wright's concerns regarding the Incline Village Recreation Facility Fee and said that it was uncontrollable. She mentioned that since COVID-19 (C19), people had moved to the area and promoted propaganda from IVGID. She noted that Incline Village used to be cohesive, which allowed parcel owners to maintain equity for all who lived in the area. She believed that the fee was outlandish and created an inability for those on fixed incomes or with families to experience the amenities they were forced to pay for. She said that the fee was destructive to the area's vitality and that IVGID had not taken into consideration their NDT fiscal investigation. She explained that IVGID built a new building for around \$12 million without public input and that each parcel owner had to pay the increased fee or they would receive a lien on their property. She asked the BCC what kind of fee would warrant a lien on another person. She asserted that the fee was abhorrent to the people of Incline Village and believed that IVGID did not care or pay attention to residents' concerns. She thought that it was not cohesive or pleasing to live under the tyranny of IVGID because it forced residents to pay high fees.

Mr. Ed Powell expressed concerns regarding ICE tactics and was unsure if they were common in the County. He said that ICE performed masked kidnapping with excessive force and often without a judicial warrant. He asked the BCC to discuss the residents' concerns further. He suggested that, before the BCC accepts the HSG, Sheriff Darin Balaam provide a statement indicating whether the WCSO supported or opposed ICE's tactics within the County.

Coalition of Nevada's Wildlife (CNW) Director Joel Blakeslee said that he supported the Virginia Range fencing project to keep the wild horses off the roadway and out of the neighborhoods for public safety. He indicated that he understood fencing was a temporary approach and would not solve the wild horse overpopulation. He believed that fertility control did not reduce the current population of wild horses and said that there were many animal and plant species that shared the ecosystem, with 39 of them endangered. He speculated that if he had 40 dogs in his backyard, animal control would be involved, or if his real estate were infested with rats, his home would be condemned. He recalled that he and Ms. Lesieutre conducted a presentation at the recent Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) meeting regarding seven counties within the State that adopted resolutions regarding ecological disasters from wild horses. He urged the BCC to support horse fencing for the community's safety and to consider joining the other seven counties with a resolution.

Ms. Jenny Lesieutre explained that she had 18 years of range land management experience with a focus on wild, feral, and stray horses. She noted that she represented the CNW, Coalition for Healthy Nevada Lands (CHNL), Nevada Wildlife Federation (NVWF), Rangeland Wildlife Wild Horses LLC, and Rangeland Scientists at

UNR. She explained that all those agencies supported the continued fencing project for public and animal safety. She asserted that she was willing to work closely with the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) to ensure continued hard fencing progress. She asked the BCC to ensure that the horses on the east side of Washoe Lake, near Andrews Lane, and other residential neighborhoods were relocated once fencing was complete. She urged the BCC to prioritize the vast amount of wildlife and plants that suffered from the wild horse overpopulation. She hoped that the BCC would be transparent when working with the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe (PLPT), BLM, and the US Forest Service (USFS). She said that there were horse population concerns in areas such as Cold Springs and Spanish Springs that people were not talking about. She requested that the County discuss the ecological disaster resolutions declared by seven other Nevada counties. She indicated that there were many areas where horses needed to be managed, and it was beyond the point of concern.

Ms. Ronda Tyner provided and read documents regarding the Incline Village fire evacuation concerns that she believed would arise if the BCC approved the TAP amendments. Copies of these documents were placed on file with the Clerk.

Mr. Doug Flaherty provided and read documents regarding his concerns about the TAP amendments and how they would affect Incline Village residents and increase fire evacuation risk. Copies of these documents were placed on file with the Clerk. He clarified that as of that morning, 262 individuals had signed a petition in opposition to the TAP amendments.

Ms. Lisa O'Sullivan believed that horse fencing would have a negative impact on Steamboat Valley because fencing would increase fire dangers. She recalled that the horses had been in the area for a long time and had cleared brush on the rocky terrain. She noticed that the fencing was built three-quarters of the way up the hill, which left 250 acres of private and BLM land ungrazed. She noted that there were target shooting ranges where the Skinner Fire originated and that the residents were lucky the backdrop was rocky with no wind. She urged the BCC to revise the fence project because she wanted the horses to do their job and clear the terrain. She thought that it was cruel and inhumane to block the horses from every water source in the area. She did not know how the fence would block the horses from Little Washoe Lake because the fence crossed utility terrain vehicle (UTV) roads, causing individuals to take down the fencing and not re-erect it. She thought that there were many individuals living in the valley who worried about fire danger, and she felt that the fencing added to the fear. She said that the horses cleared a large portion of her land that she would otherwise be unable to access. She reported that there could have been a significant fire if the horses had not eaten brush around a fallen power line last October.

Ms. Liz Lord expressed concern regarding the increased danger of wildfires if wild horses were fenced outside of properties. She said that horses ate brush, which helped mitigate fire concerns. She recalled that Governor Lombardo indicated that water would be trucked into the range for the horses, but she noted that she witnessed dry lakes that were supposed to be the horses' new source of water. She wondered if the BCC had

ever witnessed a horse dying from dehydration, which she felt was horrible and a travesty. She asked what happened to the Nevada bills that protected wildlife and wondered if Nevada had become like California, which she believed did not care about the wildlife. She indicated that she heard rumors of hunting horses, and she hoped that it was a fallacy. She urged the BCC to help wild horses because they were in the area long before the community was. She speculated that when an individual looked into the eyes of a horse, they would witness the horse's soul. She added that the fertility program was working.

Ms. Penny Brock provided and read from documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She explained that Nevada was under investigation by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and other federal government agencies regarding the 2020 elections. She believed that an investigation would also occur in the County and referred to the submitted documentation regarding her reasoning and evidence.

Mr. Richard Miner felt that the BCC could choose to table Agenda Item 16 until the fire evacuation study was completed. He said that the study would take about one year to complete and would be the first comprehensive, publicly supported study of wildfire evacuation from the Lake Tahoe Basin. He believed that it was common sense to postpone Agenda Item 16 because the lives of hundreds of North Lake Tahoe residents and thousands of visitors were at risk. He thanked the BCC for their serious consideration of postponing Agenda Item 16.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

Please see Agenda Item 4, Minute Item 25-0591, for the remarks of one additional virtual public commenter who was accommodated by Chair Hill after Agenda Item 4.

\* \* \* \* \*

**25-0591     AGENDA ITEM 4   Announcements/Reports.**

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro stated that Item 16 would be eligible for virtual public comment in Incline Village. He reminded everyone that the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) General Manager was scheduled to provide a report to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on September 16, 2025. He noted there would be a special presentation in Chambers on the State of the County on September 2, 2025. He advised that the event was called Washoe Works: Serving our Community, which he described as a series of videos highlighting key areas of the Strategic Plan. He said the meeting notice indicated it would begin at 11:00 a.m.; immediately following the Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC) meeting that morning. He explained that the timing would allow for public comment, then a recess, and then the public showing of the videos with all Commissioners in attendance. He expressed his appreciation to the

Commissioners for their involvement with that event. He added that American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding recipients would be in the lobby at the State of the County event. He offered that if anybody from the public wanted to better understand how ARPA dollars were used to help the community, some of those organizations would be available to provide that information.

Commissioner Andriola stated that she and Vice Chair Herman served on the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) Board of Directors. She noted that two public commenters that morning remarked on the same issue she was highlighting. She described that during a recent public lands committee meeting, there was a presentation that specifically addressed the evaluation of a proposal from the Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife. She revealed that a number of counties had already signed on to indicate their support for a resolution declaring a state of emergency resulting from non-compliance with the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971 (WFRHBA) as written and amended. She communicated that over 120 organizations supported the resolution, and she requested that the BCC agendaize the item for consideration. She hoped the BCC would consider adopting the resolution.

Commissioner Andriola shared that the State of Nevada was chosen by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service to provide the United States (US) Capitol Christmas tree. She commented that there had already been a lot of activity in support of the event, including people making ornaments and each county submitting a portion of the tree skirt. She revealed that the prior day, the USDA Forest Service, along with Nevada Lieutenant Governor Stavros Anthony and the Nevada Division of Outdoor Recreation, announced an essay contest for Nevada fourth graders. She advised that details were available on the USDA Forest Service website, and submissions were due by September 15, 2025. She conveyed that the student who won the essay contest would be flown to Washington, D.C. and would be able to light the Nevada Christmas tree. She informed that this was the first time that Nevada had been chosen to provide the U.S. Capitol Christmas tree in the history of a state being chosen annually, which had occurred since the 1960s. She wanted to make sure all fourth graders and their parents were aware of the essay contest opportunity.

Chair Hill remarked that it was an incredible opportunity.

Commissioner Andriola agreed and added that if people wanted to see all the related activities planned throughout Nevada, they could look online for US Capitol Christmas tree and learn about numerous ways for people to come together to represent the Silver State.

Commissioner Clark thanked everyone who came to BCC meetings and offered their opinion. He said it was important for the Board to hear how the public felt about issues. He acknowledged that sometimes Commissioners would not like what they heard, but he opined that the Board needed to hear from the public. He spoke about a phone call he received early that morning from a Washoe County Senior Services Advisory Board member who alerted him that certain seniors were afraid to go into the 9th Street Senior

Center. He conveyed that some seniors drove to the center, got out of their car, and walked in, but then saw activity that they did not find appealing and subsequently left. He theorized that seniors were being forced out of the center, and he communicated allegations that homeless people were taking over the Senior Center. He said the Board had heard numerous reports that a large number of the people at the Cares Campus were seniors. He asked the County to explore holding senior activities at the Cares Campus so that seniors who were housed there could participate in activities on their campus rather than having to travel across town to access the 9th Street facility.

Commissioner Clark mentioned an article in the online publication *Picon Press*, which was supported by County documents he shared with the publication regarding the previous week's BCC meeting. He said somebody was so outraged by the donation to the Reno Toy Run (RTR) that they either sent an email or placed a phone call in which they threatened all the Commissioners and threatened to run over motorcyclists. Commissioner Clark asked the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) and the District Attorney's (DA) Office to investigate the threat, find out who sent it, and send law enforcement to speak with the author of the threat. He commented that when somebody threatened to step on the gas and run over anybody they saw on a motorcycle, the public needed to be aware and understand that the threat may or may not be carried out. He remarked that many times when acts of violence occurred in the County, people spoke about it in advance and shared what they planned to do. He wanted the County to take charge of the situation, find out the identity of the person, and determine their agenda.

Chair Hill pointed out that, for anyone who was concerned about the detention facility and the County's relationship with the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Sheriff Darin Balaam would discuss the detention facility during his quarterly report at the September 9, 2025, BCC meeting. She encouraged people to watch that meeting if they were interested in the topic.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chair Hill reopened Agenda Item 3 to accommodate an additional virtual public commenter from the Gerlach library.

Ms. Kristy Evans introduced herself as a resident of Gerlach and said she appreciated the opportunity to provide public comment. She noted that the Burning Man festival was occurring nearby, and she disclosed that she had been in touch with the Commission Support Team about an agenda item for the upcoming Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) meeting in Gerlach. She wanted to inform the Commissioners that a request for additional County support would be made in the future to address circumstances where weather, like rain, closed the playa and paused access to Burning Man. She advised that those situations caused strain on Gerlach's infrastructure, resources, and community. She explained that the main issues were traffic management and sanitation. She revealed that Gerlach did not have enough restrooms to accommodate the influx of hundreds and possibly thousands of people who were stuck. She noted that she was not against Burning Man and viewed it as a very important economic driver in the community. She said Gerlach



sought additional support from the County to address the predictable situations that arose, like severe weather. She wanted to make Commissioners aware and hoped that Vice Chair Herman, and maybe some other Commissioners, could attend the Gerlach CAB meeting on September 11, 2025. She aimed to get more BCC support in the future.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **PROCLAMATIONS**

**25-0592**      **5A1** Proclamation for the month of August to be recognized as Emergency Management Awareness Month. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Garcia read the proclamation.

On the call for public comment, Homeland Security Program Coordinator Jessica Adams-Lopes remarked that emergency management was a profession that was often behind the scenes. She expressed appreciation for the proclamation and the opportunity to raise awareness about the work she and her team did.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Adams-Lopes and encouraged everyone to be prepared, make a plan, and stay informed.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5A1 be adopted.

### **PRESENTATIONS**

**25-0593**      **AGENDA ITEM 6A1** Presentation and Possible Discussion - Chris Sarman, Washoe County Assessor - State of the Assessor's Office and the Dynamics of Property Tax Revenue. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Assessor Chris Sarman conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: State of the Assessor's Office & the Dynamics of Property Tax Revenue; Brief History; Stakeholders; Duty & Mission of Assessor's Office; Valuation Statistics – FY25; Revenue Statistics – FY25; Key Performance Metrics – FY 25; Organizational Chart; WCAO Budget Overview; Return of Investment; Recent Initiatives; Future Initiatives; Conclusion; Attachment A; Attachment B; Thank You.

Chair Hill welcomed Mr. Sarman and stated that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) had looked forward to his presentation. Mr. Sarman introduced himself and thanked the Board for the opportunity to provide his presentation. As an elected official, he remarked that it was important to present the state of the Washoe County Assessor's Office (WCAO) to the Board and the public. He emphasized the importance of discussing the dynamics of property tax due to ongoing conversations about expenses, revenues, and budgets.

Mr. Sarman displayed the slide titled *Brief History* and remarked that the WCAO was foundational for funding essential services. He explained that Washoe County and the WCAO were established in 1861, before Nevada became a state. He noted that the Nevada Constitution was adopted in 1864 and defined the WCAO through the provisions of Article 10. He believed the WCAO was an essential service enacted to support other essential services. He reported that the WCAO generated 52 percent of the County's General Fund revenue.

Mr. Sarman introduced the *Stakeholders* slide by remarking that the WCAO had many interests and was involved with matters across the State. He noted that because the WCAO was defined by the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) and was essential, the office worked in collaboration with the Nevada Department of Taxation (DOT), the Nevada Tax Commission, and the State Legislature.

Mr. Sarman displayed the slide titled *Duty & Mission of Assessor's Office*. He referred to the WCAO's interest in legislation and reviewed what the WCAO was bound to do by statute. He explained that Article 10 of the Nevada Constitution and NRS 361 listed the statutory duties that the office followed closely, describing those documents as the book of the WCAO. He acknowledged that he only had ten minutes for his presentation, which would not be sufficient time to discuss the content of those documents, and instead offered to summarize them. He reported that the WCAO's duty was to discover, list, and value all property subject to taxation unless otherwise exempt, and to provide for a just valuation with a uniform and equal rate of assessment. He hoped to have enough time to discuss the different exemptions to property taxation. He explained that the WCAO's mission was to efficiently produce and manage fair and equitable values built upon accurate property records by an impartial, transparent, and courteous staff, which stemmed from the office's statutory duty. He opined that many important words were included in the WCAO's mission and remarked that *courteous staff* was the best phrase in the messaging. He emphasized his belief that the WCAO had an amazing staff.

Mr. Sarman showed the *Valuation Statistics – FY25* slide and explained that as the WCAO staff met the office's mission and duty, they simultaneously performed the work reflected in the slide's listed statistics. He opined that the figures on the slide were substantial, noting that the County had approximately 192,000 parcels for which the WCAO performed discovery, listing, and valuation processes. He elaborated that the WCAO produced, managed, and maintained an asset base of about \$95 million due to those efforts. He emphasized that the funds generated were of significant taxable value. He noted that during fiscal year (FY) 2025, the WCAO experienced a \$1.7 billion increase through the office's reappraisal process due to market variables. He reported that through the discovery process, including permits and reviews, the WCAO witnessed an increase of \$1.8 billion. Those two factors collectively represented the additional \$3.5 billion total funds added to the roll as new taxable value in FY 2025. He explained that there were approximately 30,000 personal property and business accounts in FY 2025, which was a statistic that did not typically fluctuate each year. He explained that those accounts represented \$5 billion in taxable value from personal property. He referred to the listed \$1.9 billion in taxable value added during FY 2024, noting that such data was deceptive.

Despite being able to demonstrate the amount of work that the WCAO staff did each year, businesses came and went, so the additional value was not consistently experienced annually.

Mr. Sarman introduced the slide titled *Revenue Statistics – FY 2025*, noting that he would explain what value meant in terms of revenue. He stated that the Treasurer billed about \$811 million in taxes during FY 2025, primarily through property taxes. He explained that approximately \$54 million in new taxes were added in FY 2025, which he attributed to the previously mentioned statistics of \$1.7 and \$1.8 billion worth of increases totaling \$3.5 billion. He explained that the value of the new taxes added during FY 2025 was not representative of the abatements and exemptions that were issued. He noted that about \$244 million was abated and \$128 million was exempted in FY 2025. He hoped there would be an opportunity to discuss those matters further.

Mr. Sarman displayed the *Key Performance Metrics – FY 2025* slide. He explained that the WCAO calculated the numbers he had provided on previous slides by going through the annual appraisal process for the 192,000 parcels. He noted that about 1,700 parcels were created in FY 2025, representing new value. He reported that throughout FY 2025, the WCAO evaluated 24,000 permits and reviewed the property records of 23,000 parcels. He explained that the WCAO audited 260 parcels during the review process of those property records, which resulted in significant findings.

Mr. Sarman suggested that he had previously mentioned a lot about the role of the WCAO and opined that the success of the office's operations was demonstrated by the number of appeals received. He noted that of the 192,000 parcels across 30,000 personal property accounts, only 139 appeals were levied. This represented 0.07 percent of the parcels appraised by the WCAO. He believed this statistic was something to be proud of and remarked that the WCAO was doing a fantastic job. He reported that 25,000 transfers, otherwise referred to as sales, were processed in FY 2025 by staff who investigated property ownership and reviewed legal descriptions to ensure that everything was accurate. He clarified that such duties were undertaken by the WCAO staff rather than the Washoe County Recorder's Office staff. He explained that the WCAO's appraisal team determined the market value of properties through the sales records investigated by their office. He noted that the WCAO's website experienced 880,000 visits in FY 2025, which he believed was significant. He opined that people loved the WCAO's website and reported that he had spoken to many individuals who agreed. He explained that the WCAO processed 255,000 mailings throughout FY 2025 and acknowledged that everyone was aware of how expensive such operations currently were. He asked whether anyone knew how to eliminate the costs associated with mailing, and to be informed about it if they did.

Mr. Sarman displayed the slide titled *Organizational Chart* and explained that 63 full-time employees (FTEs) performed all of the WCAO's previously mentioned duties. He noted that the number of WCAO personnel had decreased from the 85 FTEs employed by the office before the 2008 Great Recession but had increased from 59 FTEs in 2012. He emphasized that the WCAO staff were doing substantial work relative to the limited number of FTEs, which they were proud of. He noted that the public was placed at

the top of the WCAO's organizational chart, as the office's staff worked for them. He explained that Nevada law stemmed from the chart's category for the public because WCAO staff were administrators of that law. He noted that the WCAO was divided into two sections, which were defined for the office by the NRS, with one department being for appraisal and the other for the related support services such as mapping, exemptions, and abatements. He explained that the WCAO employed its own technologist team, which did much for the office, including programming.

Mr. Sarman showed the *WCAO Budget Overview* slide. He explained that the WCAO's budget was approximately \$9.5 million. He recounted having heard the Board discuss that 80 percent of office costs were attributed to labor. He reported that 91 percent of the WCAO budget belonged to that category, with 9 percent remaining for office supplies, furniture, and computers. He acknowledged that the WCAO also had a technology fund for similar expenses.

Mr. Sarman introduced the slide titled *Return of Investment*. He referred to the values listed on the slide and explained that he had already reported what the WCAO's investments were, with a budget of approximately \$9.46 million. He explained that the net benefit of the WCAO was the \$54 million added to the tax roll in FY 2025, which had a cumulative effect and would compound over time. He suggested that the value the following year would reach \$108 million. He explained that the return on investment (ROI) of the WCAO was approximately 470 percent, which he believed was a good number.

Mr. Sarman referred to the *Recent Initiatives* slide and remarked that the WCAO was still doing more with fewer resources, which represented an initiative that began in 2012. He explained that the initiative was impacted by the 2008 Great Recession, and opined that the WCAO had progressed significantly since then. He noted that the WCAO had experienced restructuring during FY 2025 due to many retirements, which led to a significant loss of institutional knowledge. He reported that the WCAO had since filled the positions with qualified people with knowledgeable skill sets. He stated that the WCAO was cross-training staff to account for advancements in technology, which might prompt reclassifications in the future.

Mr. Sarman noted that another initiative of the WCAO was related to technological development and programming. He explained that the WCAO's tech services (TS) team won a national award for digital surveys. He opined that a significant contribution to the success of that endeavor was due to the TS team's work with artificial intelligence (AI) to implement efficiencies in processes and automation. He acknowledged that there was still significant work to be done towards the final goal of automation and expressed excitement for that. He emphasized that while AI automation would not remove or eliminate the duties of the WCAO, it would change the skill sets of personnel. He stated that there would be more information on that initiative in the future. Mr. Sarman explained that another of the WCAO's initiatives was to develop internal liaison teams, including a technology liaison team, that would utilize tech-savvy employees to help others in the office with their computers and phones. He explained that doing so allowed the technology programmers to focus more closely on their programming work. He described how the

same was done to create a communication liaison team to help build relationships between different departments.

Mr. Sarman introduced the slide titled *Future Initiatives*. He emphasized that the WCAO would continue its effort to do more with less. He reported that the WCAO was trying to fill roles within an appraisal team and develop an internal audit team, which he believed would have a good ROI. He noted that an internal audit team could consider potential impacts on revenue. He acknowledged that such a team would need to adhere to the allowances stipulated within the NRS, remain fair, and be equitable. He believed that there could be additional opportunities brought about by developing that team. He explained that the WCAO would continue its work on developing and deploying new technologies. He opined that it was impossible to avoid how expensive technology was, and that there was often an equal and opposite inconvenience for every convenience.

Mr. Sarman explained that legislative changes and new laws, such as Assembly Joint Resolution (AJR) 1, represented another future initiative of the WCAO, as they could greatly impact the office. He reported that during legislative sessions, staff monitored approximately 30 bills related to matters such as confidentiality or exemptions. He reflected on the WCAO's efforts to monitor a bill brought forth in 2025 that questioned the reset of depreciation. He acknowledged that many individuals supported that bill from the perspective of the WCAO. He noted that the bill had generated many questions and concerns, particularly concerning efficiencies and increased complexity. He referred to another legislative change, Assembly Bill (AB) 377, reporting that it had passed. He explained that people could apply for an abatement to place a 3 percent primary tax cap on their residence. He emphasized that NRS dictated that an individual had to go through an application process for that rate. He noted that in many cases, an individual would purchase a home, go through the closing procedures on the sale, and ultimately throw away the mailings they received from the WCAO without looking at them. He explained that the same people would often only realize many years later that they were supposed to have the primary tax cap on their property. He reported that AB 377 removed the burden from the taxpayer by including the tax cap application form on the property's declaration of value, which was already necessary to complete during a sale's closing. He noted that with the completion of the form within the declaration of value, the WCAO would have the records required to mitigate the need to send out mailings to over 20,000 individuals, thus saving the office money. He opined that AB 377 was mutually beneficial and that many other opportunities and ideas could be applied similarly.

Mr. Sarman displayed the *Conclusion* slide. He reiterated his presentation's primary points and emphasized the importance of the WCAO. He opined that the WCAO's investments would improve returns, that the office had always been fiscally responsible, and that it was doing more with less. He stated that change was the only constant for the WCAO, and he asked for the Board's support as staff worked through changes.

Mr. Sarman showed the slides titled *Attachment A* and *Attachment B*. He asked whether the Board wanted to discuss abatements or exemptions, noting that he included relevant information on both slides. He explained that there were many different

types of abatements besides the previously mentioned tax cap. He reported that there were also energy, lead, and economic abatements. He noted that there were similarly many exemptions, such as government exemptions, and personal exemptions for veterans, the blind, or a surviving spouse. He remarked that airports were a topic related to exemptions that might require further discussions with the City of Reno or the BCC. He explained that the land the airport was on operated under its own taxing authority by statute, with no taxation on the buildings located on that land. He acknowledged that the airport was leasing the land and speculated that conversations could be held related to escaping taxation. He explained that nonprofit organizations also received exemptions. He thanked the Board and asked if they had any questions.

Chair Hill opined that Mr. Sarman's presentation was fantastic and that the WCAO seemed fascinating. She acknowledged that the WCAO had a lot of history and conducted substantial planning, development, and investigation. She thought it was interesting that the WCAO had people working in the field. She noted that she had several questions but wanted Commissioner Clark to begin the discussion due to his experience in the field and passion for the topic.

Commissioner Clark thanked Chair Hill and Mr. Sarman. Commissioner Clark opined that the presentation was long overdue and suspected that few individuals realized what was happening in the WCAO. He explained that the County had seven elected officials in Countywide positions, including the District Attorney (DA), the Sheriff, the Public Administrator, the Recorder, the Assessor, the Treasurer, and the Clerk. He remarked that while many people could go through life without ever having interacted with many of those elected officials, everybody who lived in the County and many who resided outside of its boundaries would have an interaction with the WCAO. He explained that even an individual who was driving from Chicago and stopped in Washoe County to fix a flat tire, eat a meal, or rest in a hotel for the night would be interacting with personal property. He noted that personal property impacted landlords, tenants, business owners, and those purchasing items from various stores. He emphasized that every item in the County was subject to taxation, ranging from wall fixtures, utensils, electronics, bedding, and more. He referred to Mr. Sarman's earlier mention of the WCAO serving to discover, list, and value all property subject to taxation unless exempt. He noted that the Washoe County Administrative Complex, schools, and police departments were examples of exempt properties. He reiterated his thought that many people did not realize that everything an individual used was subject to taxation, and he provided the example of the utensils in a restaurant. He noted that the cost of those items being taxed was ultimately passed along to the consumer, which was why everyone was connected to the WCAO. He explained that the WCAO valued everything before the resulting data was processed through the system at the Treasurer's Office. He commented that the WCAO was responsible for 52 percent of the revenue that allowed the County to pay for things.

Commissioner Clark thought it was important to note Mr. Sarman's earlier comments about added value. He explained that he had regularly mentioned the topic, and people acted like he had fabricated the concept. He noted that value was generated through the involvement of the WCAO when improvements were made to properties, including

new construction, the issuance of permits, adding features to a property, such as fencing or drilling a well, and through the discovery of taxation evasion. He remarked upon the WCAO's ability to manage an extensive number of properties for approximately \$50 each. He described having previously discussed with Mr. Sarman how the WCAO experienced large corporations coming before the Board of Equalization (BOE) in an attempt to reduce their valuations, which would eventually produce the need for an outside company to conduct an appraisal. Commissioner Clark recounted that Mr. Sarman informed him that the cost of appraising a single building for Walmart was \$30,000. Commissioner Clark asked Mr. Sarman to confirm whether that was correct, which was affirmed.

Mr. Sarman thought everybody would be familiar with Walmart. He reported that Walmart had appealed its values from the WCAO and BOE for the previous ten years. He asserted that the WCAO staff saw significant success in upholding the values determined at the state and county levels. He reported that the State reduced Walmart's valuations the year prior, which required the WCAO to consider the matter from the perspective of the property being established as a big-box retail building. He noted that in the interest of fairness and equity, the WCAO hired an outside appraisal of Walmart to prevent the reduction in value of similar properties, such as Costco and Home Depot, as those reductions would come at a cost to the County. He reported that the outside consultant ultimately cost \$30,000, as mentioned by Commissioner Clark, and clarified that the WCAO was not charging \$30,000 for every appraised property.

Commissioner Clark wanted the public to understand that the WCAO appraised properties at an investment cost of \$49 per parcel, which could be calculated by dividing the WCAO's allocated budget from the General Fund by the vast number of parcels the office was responsible for. A single private residential appraisal could cost nearly \$1,000. He speculated that if all 192,380 properties in the County were appraised by an outside consultant and contained all the same data collected by the WCAO, the cost would be billions of dollars.

Commissioner Clark emphasized that the work associated with the WCAO's services was conducted by fewer personnel than before the COVID-19 (C19) pandemic and the 2008 Great Recession, while the County had grown over the last ten years. He asked Mr. Sarman what the growth percentage was, and Mr. Sarman explained that the asset base in 2012 was approximately \$50 billion and was currently \$95 billion. He emphasized that the County's asset base had essentially doubled over the last ten years. Commissioner Clark remarked that the workload and valuation amount had also doubled with that growth. He appealed to the Board and staff working with the County's budget to listen to WCAO staff when they expressed the need for two or three employees to manage the workload and maintain office operations.

Commissioner Clark opined that people would reach a point of demoralization if they had to work too much, and there was a need to have staff who could fill in to account for that. He emphasized the ROI associated with paying additional staff compared to the hundreds of millions of dollars that could be generated with additional personnel in the WCAO. He opined that Mr. Sarman was doing a great job and encouraged

County residents and those who benefited from the WCAO to learn about the foundational history of the office. He explained that the WCAO was one of the three original offices established when the County was created, along with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) and the Treasurer's Office. He noted that the founding fathers believed those three services were essential for the County's health. He appreciated the good work Mr. Sarman was doing. He opined that the presentation should be made available to everyone so they could understand what was taking place at the WCAO. He thanked Chief Property Appraiser Howard Stockton, Personal Property Coordinator Antonio Lopez, and Assessment Services Division Manager Lora Zimmer for their work and commended them for managing many properties. He opined that there was no desire for people to pay more than they needed to and acknowledged that such things had happened in the County before. He emphasized the need for everyone to be treated fairly and equally, which he believed the WCAO staff did a good job of ensuring.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Sarman for his presentation and commended the WCAO staff for doing so much despite their limited workforce. She congratulated Mr. Sarman and noted that she had accepted an award of national recognition at the National Association of Counties (NACo) Annual Conference on his behalf and for the WCAO. She opined that Mr. Sarman and his team should be proud and explained that Washoe County placed third during a NACo meeting with a special presentation by the Center for Digital Government due to the WCAO's work. She noted that she had previously spoken with Mr. Sarman regarding the WCAO's staffing levels in 2012. She remarked that technology always became more useful as it evolved, became more effective and efficient over time, and was used by everyone in various ways for different reasons. She opined that 100 percent of the parcels across the County needed to be assessed, and inquired about the percentage of parcels the WCAO had been able to assess.

Mr. Sarman responded that Commissioner Andriola had asked a great question. He explained that the WCAO achieved 100 percent during the yearly appraisal process. He noted that the NRS mandated that the WCAO conduct the process once every five years. He believed that such a time frame would lead to loss of valuation and revenue, as well as errors and lawsuits that he did not want to mention, particularly regarding Incline Village. He emphasized that the incident related to Incline Village was significant and something the County never wanted to repeat. He opined that it was critically important for the WCAO to accurately conduct the annual reappraisal process every year to capture any changes in the market. He assured Commissioner Andriola that the WCAO was completing those efforts at 100 percent every year. He noted that when the WCAO was investigating matters of accuracy, such as lapses in permitting or other overlooked inconsistencies, it was found that there was significant value to be assessed. He referred to the slide titled *Valuation Statistics – FY25* and explained that there was a \$1.8 billion increase from new discovery during FY 2025. He reported that the WCAO could not reach its goal of 20 percent of parcels reviewed; instead, it only achieved approximately ten to fifteen percent. He thought there were additional opportunities to be found through further discovery efforts. He noted that for personal property, the audits conducted by the WCAO were currently done through a contracted partnership with Tax Management Associates, Inc. (TMA). He reported that the ROI on those audits was phenomenal but there was a need



to target the facilities missed from the auditing conducted by TMA, which focused primarily on large-scale structures such as casinos. He opined that if the WCAO had an audit team for such matters, they could take advantage of those opportunities and increase the discovery and review of those properties from the current rate of 0 percent. He reiterated that the WCAO achieved 100 percent reappraisal, as the office was bound by statute to complete that process. He noted that the appraisal value was subject to a capped maximum rate, and while market variables might cause property values to double, the property tax rate would remain at the capped 3 or 8 percent. He opined that the real value could be seen through the new discovery process outlined on the *Valuation Statistics – FY25* slide. He elaborated that new discovery represented untouched assets being found and added to the tax roll, whether it was through permits, error review, or another incongruity.

Commissioner Andriola remarked that there would be robust discussions about budgets and related constraints in the future. She explained that it was very helpful to create a business plan to identify what additional resources were needed and what the corresponding ROI would be. She requested that such a business plan be incorporated in preparation for the upcoming discussions to ensure that all of the facts would be available. She thought it was interesting that conversations about government and essential services did not consider funding in the same manner as revenue for a business. She opined that it was important for the Board to look to experts such as Mr. Sarman and the WCAO staff to create a plan to address unexplored opportunities. She thought it was essential to provide the information for the business plan and requested that Mr. Sarman prepare it as he deemed fit. She speculated he would have other suggestions as well.

Commissioner Andriola referred to the slide titled *Conclusion* and noted the text highlighted in yellow. She recounted that Mr. Sarman had mentioned shared services, and she opined that there might be an opportunity to consider how that might be applied. She referred to the slide titled *Future Initiatives* and suggested it would be helpful if there were a way to leverage the services of all elected officials. She disclosed that she and Mr. Sarman had previously discussed the topic. She thought preparing something with more information would be helpful to establish what that collaboration might look like. She opined that everyone needed to begin thinking differently, because having done something one way in the past did not mean it had to continue to be done the same way in the future. She acknowledged that there were significant budgetary constraints that needed to be considered. She believed that it was essential for everyone to research all possible cost savings and revenue opportunities, even those that might seem small initially. She compared this effort to finding spare change in a couch but believed the value the WCAO could find would be much higher. She noted that it would be helpful if Mr. Sarman could build strategies to prevent missing opportunities and leverage inefficiencies. Mr. Sarman affirmed that WCAO staff could do that and would begin those efforts despite the office undergoing significant changes. Commissioner Andriola thanked him for his hard work and congratulated him on the NACo national award. Mr. Sarman remarked that the award was for the County but acknowledged the WCAO's contribution.

Commissioner Garcia noted that she did not have any questions. She was glad the public got to see and hear about the wide breadth of services Mr. Sarman and the

WCAO provided through their skill set and the geographical area they supported. She appreciated his effort and willingness to try to find additional opportunities by leveraging everything he could, because she agreed that the ROI of the WCAO was tremendous. She opined that without the WCAO, the County could not do the work necessary to provide essential services to the constituents. She emphasized that the presentation and discussion were critical and congratulated Mr. Sarman on his hard work. She noted that Mr. Sarman had served in his position for three years and referred to his earlier mention that change was the only constant in his office. She asked what change Mr. Sarman anticipated the WCAO would experience in the following three or four years.

Mr. Sarman answered that since he accepted his position, the WCAO had undergone many changes due to the Korn Ferry study and the recent turnover in the office. He reported that 15 percent of personnel losses were in high-level positions or leadership roles. He emphasized the difficulty of navigating those changes and reclassifications and explained that reconfiguring the organizational chart was a first step. He acknowledged that while significant institutional knowledge was lost with the turnover of many experienced employees, new employees with similar familiarity with the work were still entering the office. He emphasized the WCAO's focus on applying communication channels and developing the office collaboratively by establishing liaison teams within the WCAO. He opined that many new professionals were entering the workforce with skill sets that were much more developed than they used to be. He stated that many of those employees were technologically advanced. He described the WCAO's assessor tech team, noting that the skills required for building out programs and applications, and understanding and communicating about them, were expected to pose a significant challenge for the office.

Mr. Sarman noted that while it was not a challenge, the WCAO would need to stay aware of the office's opportunities and what employees were responsible for before gathering and refining that information. He reported that one of the most significant changes associated with valuations from the WCAO was the increased need for employees to work in the field. He thought it was great that the staff could do a lot of work online but emphasized that there were many times when the office required someone to be in the field to perform duties such as building inspections. He reported that the changes observed with field work included situations where two individuals might need to respond to the same job due to safety or other related considerations, instead of a single person being deployed. He emphasized his belief that the region was still desirable, with demand to live locally persisting despite the area's affordability being a concern. He asserted that the region was continuing to grow, and he had no personal expectation of declining growth or revenues. He asked for confirmation that he had sufficiently answered Commissioner Garcia's question.

Chair Hill thanked Mr. Sarman and stated that the Board was very impressed by him and the WCAO staff. She expressed excitement to hear Mr. Sarman's future plans and his suggestions for how the BCC could support the WCAO. She agreed with the sentiments voiced by the Board regarding the suggestion for Mr. Sarman to develop a proposal for opportunities to target the missing revenue from audits. She opined

that such efforts were essential to determine whether people were not disclosing their home improvements. She agreed that increasing the staff presence in the field was crucial, and recounted that when she worked as a planner, she learned that going out to see what was happening in the community was necessary. She reiterated the Board's desire to support Mr. Sarman and his team in that endeavor.

Chair Hill expressed curiosity about abated and exempted properties, acknowledging that there was additional detail to explore with the information Mr. Sarman's presentation had provided. She thought people forgot that some of the available abatements were associated with green energy and represented a long-term investment for the community. She wondered if the details regarding abated and exempted properties were listed in the book Mr. Sarman previously mentioned. She assured Mr. Sarman that she only asked because she was curious whether the information already existed somewhere to spare him extra work. She inquired whether there might be a pie chart that displayed the different allocations of the \$244 million in abated taxes and \$128 million in exempted taxes. Mr. Sarman confirmed that the WCAO staff should be able to produce those allocation reports for her. Chair Hill remarked that the data would be fascinating because she was curious how much of the \$128 million in tax exemptions was related to economic, governmental, or religious factors and how those funds were divided.

Chair Hill opined that Mr. Sarman had mentioned a good point when he discussed the airport. She thought it would be a very interesting discussion for the community to engage with moving forward, as substantial redevelopment related to the airport was occurring. She emphasized the need to engage in further conversations with Mr. Sarman regarding the \$128 million in tax-exempt properties, as some of them would return to the tax rolls due to the 10 or 20-year abatement periods, as seen with Tesla in Storey County. Mr. Sarman agreed, noting the anticipated tax windfall related to the abatements in Storey County. Chair Hill remarked that Storey County expected the return of the first abatement from Tesla. She noted that some properties in Washoe County would never reappear on the tax rolls, though they still impacted government services and quality of life in the County. Mr. Sarman affirmed Chair Hill's statements, noting that some of the properties she had mentioned offered significant value. Chair Hill stated that she would love to see additional details related to that and reiterated that she did not intend to give him extra work. She emphasized that she would be interested in learning more if he had the information available. She anticipated the ongoing collaboration between the Board and the WCAO, and thanked Mr. Sarman for his service and commitment to the County. Mr. Sarman thanked the Board for hosting him and expressed his appreciation.

**25-0594**      **AGENDA ITEM 6B1** Presentation on the unaudited FY2025 year-end general fund budget-to-actual revenue and expenditures. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

Budget Manager Lori Cooke conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Financial Update; Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Revenues/Sources as of August 21, 2025; Fiscal Year 2025

General Fund Unaudited Consolidated Tax Distributions Through May 2025; Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Expenditures/Uses as of August 21, 2025; Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Fund Balance as of August 21, 2025.

Ms. Cooke explained that the Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 books were not closed, and the information on her presentation, as of August 21, 2025, would change as time progressed. She pointed out that the final audited financials would be provided to the Commissioners by December. She referred to the County's sources and uses on the *Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Revenues/Sources as of August 21, 2025*, slide and said that the consolidated tax (c-tax) was highlighted in orange; however, the State had not yet provided the final c-tax distribution. She noted that the State had a change in its financial system and experienced cyberattack challenges that caused a lack of information for the County. She mentioned that the c-tax was trending at values lower than estimated and that the Supplemental City County Relief Tax (SCCRT) Assembly Bill (AB) 104 was received separately, with all distributions received for that. She noted the c-tax and the SCCRT AB104 variances listed on the slide and said they were the anticipated material variances in funds versus the most up-to-date numbers provided by the State.

Ms. Cooke indicated that the unrealized gains and losses (URGL) were shown as a source of revenue and not considered cash. She said that the URGL increase was reflected in the fund balance; otherwise, it would have been represented by a negative value. She noted that the total resources were \$501 million, which was slightly different from the estimated total because c-tax was approximately 32 percent of all General Fund revenue. She noted one-twelfth of the c-tax was missing in the State reporting. She explained that the end-of-January c-tax distribution was about 60 percent of what was anticipated due to the State's system changes. She mentioned that the c-tax distribution in January was around \$7 million when \$13 million was expected. She said that the Nevada Department of Taxation indicated they would not provide reconciliation for the missing c-tax distribution. NDT stated that as things were fixed with their system, the missing c-tax distributions would trickle into the County along with their other funding distributions. She noted that it was a challenge to project what funding the County would receive and when.

Ms. Cooke noted that the information on the taxable sales through May, listed on the *Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Consolidated Tax Distributions Through May 2025* slide, was available online through NDT's website. She said that for 2025, the taxable sales listed were only through May; however, the taxable sales listed for the other years included the entire year's amount. Based on the State's data, the 2025 numbers reported an increase of 3.9 percent. She explained that distributions had decreased by two percent, which included an offset with the Governmental Services Tax (GST) increase. She mentioned the GST was money that came through the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) for registrations and real property transfer tax (RPTT). She stated that the Basic City County Relief Tax (BCCRT) and the SCCRT were part of AB104 and had decreased by 3.2 percent. She reported that there were sometimes refunds issued that would adjust the taxable sales in a different time period than when the distribution took place. She summarized that there was an increase in taxable sales but a decrease in taxable sales distributions. She said that she was doing her best to have conversations with other local

agencies to share updates regarding the payments from the State. She said that the c-tax distribution affected all agencies across the State, such as the Cities of Reno and Sparks and the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD). She noted that the issue made it difficult to estimate numbers and plan for resources. She added that there should be one more May distribution.

County Comptroller Cathy Hill echoed Ms. Cooke's comments that the County's books were not fully closed and that the information on the *Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Expenditures/Uses as of August 21, 2025* slide would continue to be updated. She reviewed the *Fiscal year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Expenditures/Uses as of August 21, 2025*, slide and said that the County was over budget in salaries and benefits and under budget in services and supplies. She noted that the anticipated total, using salary savings that were not recognized, was \$12.9 million in fund balances, but as of August 21, 2025, the County was at \$13.7 million in use of fund balance. She hoped that the number would get better. She explained that the slide reiterated the use of the fund balance, not the goal of the County to minimize the use of the fund balance. She hoped that the August finance books would be closed by the next budget update presentation. She reiterated that the numbers were unaudited and changed daily. She explained that the final audit should be presented to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) in December.

Chair Hill indicated that the budget numbers were disheartening; however, important to have. She explained that the BCC knew the County would need to use the end-of-fund balance during FY 2025 due to County expenses not keeping up with revenue. She thought that the c-tax distribution decrease was interesting and asked Ms. Cathy Hill and Ms. Cooke to inform the BCC what they could do to support them and their work. She noted that TMFPD and other State agencies were experiencing similar concerns with budget challenges. She asked if the State had organized a plan with the County regarding the decrease in c-tax distributions. Ms. Cathy Hill mentioned that no clear answer was provided by the State, and she was awaiting their conclusion as they worked through their own challenges. She was sure that the State was aware that the decrease in the c-tax distribution affected every agency in the State. She said that there was a rule for financial reporting that required distributions to be made no more than 60 days past the end of the year; therefore, she hoped the funds would be available by August 31, 2025. She indicated that the County's financial landscape would change if the funds were not made available. Chair Hill understood that the County could not request an audit from the State but wondered if there would be precedent to do so. Ms. Cathy Hill explained that the State was audited the same way the County was and noted that she did not know the proper course of action if an individual wanted a specific financial audit.

Commissioner Clark asked if the c-tax distribution tardiness was a Statewide issue. Ms. Cooke said that the delayed distribution was a Statewide concern and that the County had the advantage of the Washoe County Recorder's Office (WCRO) collecting the RPTT. She explained that the GST was recouped by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) before being provided back to the County. She indicated that about 84 percent of the c-tax distribution was directly related to the funds the County was waiting

to receive from the State. She recalled that she was notified the previous week that the State intended to provide the final c-tax distribution that week; however, she was unsure if that would occur since the State was shut down due to a cyberattack. She relayed that the County would be willing to receive a check from the State because the funds did not need to be accepted by electronic transfer; however, she did not know if the State would allow a check.

Commissioner Clark pointed out that County expenses were outweighing the income on the *Fiscal Year 2025 General Fund Unaudited Fund Balance as of August 21, 2025*, slide, which he asserted was a problem the County needed to address. He recalled that Ms. Cooke indicated the c-taxes had increased, but the distribution had decreased. Ms. Cooke clarified that taxable sales had increased. Commissioner Clark thought that the State needed to do a better job and that someone should audit the State to ensure they were paying agencies in a timely fashion. He wanted to see if the County could urge the State to speed up the distribution process and thanked Ms. Cathy Hill and Ms. Cooke for the presentation.

**25-0595**      **AGENDA ITEM 6C1**    Presentation: Department of Agriculture - the Virginia Range horse discussion to possibly include City of Reno project mgr for fencing. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) and Director J.J. Goicoechea conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Virginia Range Feral and Estray Horses; What are the Virginia Range Horses; Where is the Virginia Range; How are the VRE horses managed; Public Safety; Fencing; Questions.

Dr. Goicoechea reviewed the slide titled *What are the Virginia Range Horses?* and explained that the Virginia Range horses were commonly referred to as Virginia Range Estray (VRE) horses. He stated that in 1984, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) declared the Virginia Range to be free of any wild horses. He clarified that VRE horses were not covered under the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971 (WFRHBA). He explained that, following the BLM's actions in 1984, the horses in that area were considered estray. He also noted that the region had supported a large ranching operation for several years, and many of the current horses were likely descendants of that livestock. He said the horses were managed under Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 569, and the Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDA) had the sole authority to manage feral and estray livestock, including horses. He mentioned that the horses had migrated over time, especially before fencing was completed in certain areas. He said that many of the horses were unclaimed descendants of the original ranching operation. He stated that the NDA was aware that horses continued to be released on the Virginia Range, which fell under its jurisdiction. He noted that the NDA managed livestock in all 17 counties in the State. He explained that when stray horses were picked up, they were advertised, and if the owner was not identified, the animals were sold or adopted.

Dr. Goicoechea reviewed the slide titled *Where is the Virginia Range?* and said that the northern boundary of the Virginia Range was Interstate 80 and the eastern boundary was United States (US) Highway 95A near Fernley. The southern boundary was

US Highway 50 and the north outskirts of Carson City, excluding residential areas. The western boundary included Eastlake Boulevard, old US Highway 395, and Veterans Parkway. He noted that areas such as Eastlake Boulevard, Washoe Lake, the Scripps Wildlife Management Area, and other sensitive areas had historically been fenced off, although much of the fencing was now in disrepair. He mentioned that Nevada was a *fence out* or open range State. He acknowledged public safety concerns in the area and said the NDA believed the fencing along Eastlake Boulevard could not be restored, as it would create a location near a heavily traveled roadway where horses were likely to congregate.

Dr. Goicoechea reviewed the slide titled *How are the VRE horses managed?* and said that, because there was no funding available in the General Fund, the horses were managed using money from the Division of Animal Industry programs, including brand recording, brand inspection fees, and estray livestock fees. He stated that the livestock industry funded the program that managed the VRE horses, and that funding was not supplemented daily. He explained that, fortunately, the NDA received funding a few years prior through the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and its partner, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). He indicated that the NDA received additional funding from Congress, with 75 percent of those funds allocated to public safety fencing and ongoing investments in areas requiring additional fencing. He noted that the NDA monitored welfare, relocation, and fertility control efforts. He mentioned that the NDA worked with cooperative partners through agreements that clearly defined their responsibilities. He said that when horses were on roadways or properties where they did not belong, the cooperative partners were contacted to remove them for adoption or relocation to a safer place. He explained that one of the cooperative partners was conducting fertility control efforts across the range, with an agreement in place through September or October of 2026.

Dr. Goicoechea reviewed the slide titled *Public Safety* and said that the Virginia Range was bordered by four major highways and residential areas. He noted that there were 37 reported vehicle collisions in 2024, 42 in 2023, 24 in 2022, 27 in 2021, and 46 in 2020. He explained that when he returned to the agency as the director, the NDA had received numerous comments and concerns from various agencies regarding public safety. He mentioned that the Chief of Police from the City of Reno sent a letter noting that officers continued to respond to collisions on high-speed and heavily congested roads. Dr. Goicoechea said that those concerns were taken seriously, which led to efforts to create separation between congested areas and the horses to protect the public, children, and private property. He emphasized the importance of the census data, noting horse populations of 413 in 1997, 1,274 in 2002, 1,448 in 2008, 1,959 in 2014, 2,951 in 2018, and 3,567 in 2022. He explained that the available range for horses was shrinking due to ongoing development. He stated that no one wanted to see animals suffering or involved in highway accidents, but more importantly, the public needed to be protected. He mentioned that feeding and watering estray livestock was illegal and governed by statute. He said that if the public had concerns regarding estray livestock, they could contact the NDA, which would work with its partners to remove the animals safely.

Dr. Goicoechea reviewed the slide titled *Fencing* and stated that Nevada was a fence-out State. He explained that NRS 569.431 clearly defined what constitutes an illegal fence, and it was the responsibility of property owners to fence their property. He said that the public often claimed that certain property was owned by the BLM, and he clarified that BLM-designated land was considered horse-free. He indicated that the NDA had a good working relationship with the BLM, and when stray or feral livestock were found, a trespass order was issued, and the animals were gathered and removed. He mentioned that under the WFRHBA, those animals did not have a right to be on BLM land. He said that the NDA was in the process of repairing and constructing areas of fencing along the Virginia Range. He commented that for those familiar with the Washoe Valley area, fencing repair started near Jumbo Grade and moved north. He explained that the route was chosen because the NDA coordinated with the City of Reno, which also had a fencing project. He added that the NDA completed their portion in early summer 2025 and stopped at the agreed location to wait for the City of Reno to complete their section. He felt that the fencing would better secure South Reno and other highly congested areas. He thanked the City of Reno for its collaboration and added that they had a great partnership. He said both agencies worked together to adjust plans to ensure that the fence aligned and did not leave funnels, gaps, or corners where livestock could become trapped.

Dr. Goicoechea reviewed the slide titled *Questions* and displayed an informational flier for the public.

Commissioner Clark thanked Dr. Goicoechea for the presentation and felt that it accurately reflected the current situation. He said it was important for the public to understand the NDA's responsibilities and thought that the public may have a different perception of what was occurring. He pointed out that Agenda Item 7E3 was his donation of discretionary funds of \$5,000 to the Northern Nevada Correctional Center (NNCC) to support mustang training. He felt that fencing, fertility control, and adoption contributed to the issue of stray livestock. He hoped that working on those specific issues would reduce the number of wild horses. He believed that the horses caused safety concerns, car crashes, and emergency response vehicle costs to the municipalities. He thought there had to be a better solution than simply shooting or rounding up the horses.

Dr. Goicoechea said that the NDA was committed to working with its partners to address the issue. He mentioned that the NDA had continued discussions with Lyon County, Carson City, and the City of Reno to explore options to mitigate the problem.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Dr. Goicoechea for the presentation. She expressed her appreciation for his efforts to bring back the Nevada State Fair, scheduled for June 11 through 14, 2026. She acknowledged the challenges of managing a program with limited funding and emphasized that resolving the issue would require a collective effort. She recognized the City of Reno and others involved for their collaboration in addressing the issue.



J-U-B Engineers Engineering Manager Garth Oksol conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Wildlife Protection Project; Purpose; Comprehensive Solution; North Phase (2 slides); South Phase; Thank you.

Mr. Oksol explained that J-U-B Engineers, Inc., was hired by the City of Reno several years ago to assist with managing the interaction between wildlife, specifically wild horses, and the urban environment. He indicated that preliminary conversations began nearly five years ago to explore possible solutions. He said that the ongoing community growth in both the City of Reno and Washoe County would bring more developments. He noted that some of those developments, particularly in the South Meadows area near Rio Wrangler Parkway, could potentially limit the horses' access to water along Steamboat Creek.

Mr. Oksol reviewed the slide titled *Purpose* and said that one of the first steps was to explore how public access could be maintained while keeping horses away from urban areas. He indicated that the primary focus was to reduce dependence on human compliance, such as watering and feeding, but also to ensure that the horses could be kept in their natural habitat.

Mr. Oksol reviewed the first slide titled *North Phase* and said the data was assessed to show where gaps existed and where wild horse fencing could be installed. He indicated that the project would have two phases. He pointed out the area south of the red line on the slide and commented that new development would restrict water access. He mentioned that the north end of the project had opened up approximately 3,000 linear feet (ft) of Steamboat Creek, which allowed the horses access to water. He explained that horses could often be found throughout the day on Veterans Parkway and to the east of the small bridge over Alexander Lake Road. He stated that the opening was created as part of the project and stated the fence line continuing north to Mira Loma was in very poor condition. He said that during his time as the project manager for the Southeast Connector, he walked the entire fence line and observed its poor condition. He mentioned that since then, the fencing had been removed and replaced in that location.

Mr. Oksol reviewed the second slide titled *North Phase* and pointed out the area further south where the developers were. He noted that it was not shown clearly on the image, but there was a small red dot in the upper right corner, which was a location between two developments. He described a drainage ditch there that acted as a funnel and mentioned that horses would travel to Rio Wrangler Parkway and were getting hit on Steamboat Parkway. He stated that the access was in the process of being closed off. He said that further south, near the aggregate pit in Southeast Reno, the fence was in various stages of repair. He indicated that the team worked with the property owners to develop a solution that would benefit all parties. He stated that fencing was added around the backside of the aggregate pit and connected to a section of the Toll Brothers fencing that had been recently built, which was a condition of the process with the City of Reno.

Mr. Oksol reviewed the slide titled *South Phase* and said that the area currently under construction was located further south, in the Virginia Highlands. He referred to the slide and noted that the green line indicated the fencing that NDA installed. He stated that during meetings about connecting the purple and green fencing sections, discussions focused on identifying a common location where the fencing partnership could meet. That area was shown on the slide's right-hand side. He noted that fencing was currently being installed through the Geiger Grade area. He explained that there was an agreement with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) to install a cattle guard on Geiger Grade in a location chosen for public safety. He explained that Geiger Grade experienced a high volume of motorcycle traffic. He said that finding a section of road that was straight enough for a cattle guard while avoiding interactions with motorcycles was a significant concern. He noted that extensive negotiations had taken place with property owners to address various concerns and future plans. He commented that some property owners wanted to preserve open space and were unwilling to fence their land, which prevented a straight path for fencing. He said that once the project was complete, the overall goal was to eliminate opportunities for wild horses and other wildlife to access the urban environment. He hoped the project would help resolve the issue and reduce the number of animal-involved collisions, which occurred nearly once per week.

Chair Hill said that the City of Reno had done a lot of great work.

Commissioner Clark thought that the report was very informative.

Chair Hill mentioned that wild horses were a major concern for constituents in Commissioner Clark's district, and she hoped that the information provided was helpful. She noted that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would continue working with the City of Reno and the NDA to find the best way to collaborate to ensure public safety while protecting wildlife.

#### **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 7A1 THROUGH 7F1**

- 25-0596**      **7A1** Recommendation to 1) approve roll change requests, pursuant to NRS 361.765 and/or NRS 361.768, for errors discovered on the 2022/2023, 2023/2024 and 2024/2025 secured and unsecured tax rolls 2) authorize Chair to execute the changes described in Exhibits A and B and 3) direct the Washoe County Treasurer to correct the error(s). [cumulative amount of decrease to all taxing entities \$66,565.13]. Assessor. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0597**      **7A2** Recommendation to approve delimiting one full time Office Specialist position (70000672) pay grade W 11 effective July 1, 2025 and authorize Human Resources to make the necessary changes [net fiscal impact savings \$-116,277]. Assessor. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0598**      **7B1** Recommendation to accept cash donations totaling \$5,681.00: [\$4,998.00 Lazy 5 Summer Music Series, general donations for Regional

Parks and Open Space, Bowers Regional Park, Galena Campfire program, and Lazy 5 Park]; [\$13.00 from the donation drop box at the May Museum]; [\$670.00 to the Arboretum for bricks, general maintenance and support] for Regional Parks and Open Space programs and facilities; and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

- 25-0599**      **7C1** Recommendation to approve the amendment of the Washoe County 457(b) and OBRA Deferred Compensation Plan Document, Section 8.6, Automatic Benefit Payments, to allow for the distribution of de minimis accounts, and Appendix A, Definitions, “Normal Retirement Age”, to remove reporting to the Committee of an alternate Normal Retirement Age as selected by the Participant. [No fiscal impact.] Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0600**      **7D1** Recommendation to accept the FY26 Medical Marijuana subgrant award from the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) in the amount of [\$108,000.00; no county match] to provide support elements of the START program retroactive to July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026; retroactively authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to execute the grant and related documents; and direct the Finance Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0601**      **7D2** Recommendation to accept an FY26 Child Death Review (CDR) subaward from the State of Nevada, Division of Child & Family Services in the amount of [\$12,500.00; no County match] retroactive from July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026 to provide public awareness, education, and services for preventable child fatalities; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute the subaward and related documents; and direct the Finance Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0602**      **7D3** Recommendation to accept an FY26 John H. Chafee Foster Care Program subgrant award from the State of Nevada, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) in the amount of [\$260,376.00; \$65,094.00 county match; including up to \$3,000 for participant gift cards], retroactive from July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026 to support youth who are aging out of the foster care system in Washoe County with achieving greater independence as adults; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to retroactively execute the grant award; and direct the Finance office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 25-0603**      **7D4** Recommendation to accept an FY26 Fund to Assist Former Foster Youth (FAFFY program) subgrant award from the State of Nevada,

Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) in the amount of [\$150,000.00; no county match; including up to \$4,000 for participant gift cards and up to \$1,000 in participant food purchases] retroactive from July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026 to provide case management and related services for youth who aged out of foster care; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to retroactively execute the grant award; and direct the Finance office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

**25-0604**      **7E1** Recommendation to accept a 2026 Nevada State Emergency Response Commission (SERC), Operations, Planning, Training and Equipment (OPTE) grant for [\$32,000.00, no County match required] including funds to be used for food purchases. The OPTE grant aims to further capabilities to prevent, mitigate or respond to hazardous material incidents. Grant term is retroactive to July 1, 2025, through May 30, 2026. If approved, authorize the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) Chair to execute grant documents and authorize the County Manager or their designee, to sign the Washoe County Sub-Grant Agreements [\$28,000 total] between Washoe County and the Reno Fire Department (RFD), on behalf of the TRIAD Hazmat Team, per NRS 244.1505 in the amount of [\$9,370.00] for one (1) 1-Ton Chlorine training device; and REMSA Health, per NRS 244.1505 in the amount of [\$18,630.00] for four (4) SCBA and 6 (six) AV masks; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

**25-0605**      **7E2** Recommendation to accept a 2026 Nevada State Emergency Response Commission (SERC), United We Stand (UWS) grant for [\$32,000.00 no County match required]. The UWS grant is intended to improve state and local government planning, training, and response capabilities to react to Acts of Terrorism. Grant Term is retroactive to July 21, 2025, through May 30, 2026. If approved, authorize the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) Chair to execute grant documents and authorize the County Manager or their designee, to sign the Washoe County Sub-Grant Agreements between Washoe County and REMSA Health, per NRS 244.1505 in the amount of [\$5,128.00] for one (1) Tactical Rope Access and Rescue Equipment; the Reno Police Department, per NRS 244.1505 in the amount of [\$9,318.00] for twelve (12) Avon Protection Voice Unit Gen with Microphone; and Sparks Police Department, per NRS 244.1505, in the amount of [\$10,000.00] for four (4) PepperBall Launchers; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Manager. (All Commission Districts.)

**25-0606**      **7E3** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$5,000.00] for Fiscal Year 2025-2026; District 2 Commissioner Mike Clark recommends a [\$5,000.00] grant to Mustangs of America Foundation - a nonprofit

organization created for charitable, religious, or educational purposes – to support to support the Bureau of Land Management with the Northern Nevada Correctional Center’s wild horse training program; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary disbursement of funds. Manager. (Commission District 2.)

**25-0607**      **7E4** Recommendation in accordance with NRS 244.1505, to approve FY26 Community Support grant award to: Nevada Tahoe Conservation District (NTCD) in the amount of [\$12,390] to support the Tahoe Meadows South Sustainable Recreation and Pedestrian Safety improvements Feasibility Analysis; approve Resolution 25-97 for the same; and direct Comptroller’s Office to make the budget appropriation disbursements. Manager. (Commission Districts 1.)

**25-0608**      **7F1** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$9,568.80; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY26 United Healthcare Fetal Infant Mortality Program, retroactive to July 1, 2025, through February 28, 2026 for the Community and Clinical Health Services (CCHS) Division to support the United Healthcare FIMR Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment on the Consent Agenda Items listed above.

Commissioner Garcia noted that Item 7B1 recommended approving a \$5,681.00 cash donation from several sources for the Regional Parks and Open Space programs and facilities.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7F1 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7F1 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**BLOCK VOTE – 8 THROUGH 10 AND 12 THROUGH 15**

**25-0609**      **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to award Washoe County Bid No. 3275-25 and approve the Agreement for Services to provide custodial services to high security homeless service campuses to one responsive, responsible bidder, [staff recommends Qual-Econ USA., in the amount of \$48,940.00 per month]; and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute a three year agreement on behalf of Washoe County effective October 1, 2025 through September 30, 2028, with two additional one-year renewal options [estimated annual value \$587,280.00 plus cost for call-back]. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock remarked that the report on the state of finances in the County indicated a deficit. She expressed concern about the \$600,000 annual expenditure proposed in Item 8 for a cleaning contract at the Cares Campus. She questioned whether three requests for proposal (RFP) were done. She noted that the contract was initially for three years and would automatically get two one-year renewals. She mentioned there could be additional costs incurred for callbacks. She was concerned that taxpayers did not really know how much was being spent to clean the Cares Campus. She said that it was not clear how many square feet were being cleaned at the Cares Campus, and she did not know if the contract included Safe Camp. She commented that \$88 million was already being spent each year on services for the homeless, and she wondered if the cleaning contract outlined in Agenda Item 8 was included in the \$88 million. She summarized that taxpayers had a lot of questions about the homeless and the Cares Campus, and she asked that Agenda Item 8 be tabled so more information could be obtained.

Commissioner Clark stated his wish for more time to consider custodial service options. He envisioned the County fully managing the program and having Cares Campus residents do the work on a paid basis. He thought opportunities should be explored beyond just hiring outside contractors. He felt that outside contractors sometimes made sense, but other times, they did not. He theorized that of the hundreds of Cares Campus residents, there were probably at least 30 who were able-bodied and interested in getting a job. He wanted to see Agenda Item 8 pulled from the Block vote, and he conveyed his lack of support.

Chair Hill asked if Commissioner Clark wanted to hear some background on the item from staff.

Commissioner Clark advised that his point remained about the abundance of able-bodied people at the Cares Campus who might be interested in having a job instead of sitting around doing whatever they currently did during the day.

Community Services Department (CSD) Operations Division Director Aaron Smith reviewed the proposed award of custodial services contract. He said it was being handled as a high-security contract and was currently awarded to a vendor. He advised that there were not sufficient resources within the County to undertake the work at that time. He explained that conversations with County operations staff would be needed to accommodate any use of program attendees or individuals living at the campuses. He clarified that the award of custodial services contract outlined in the item was for Our Place and the Cares Campus.

Chair Hill commented that Commissioner Clark brought up an interesting idea. She recognized that questions about equipment and legal liability would need to be addressed, but she believed that the concept could be explored in the future. She asked if Commissioner Clark wanted to add anything.

Commissioner Clark pointed out that the contract was considered high-security, and he supposed that the residents who lived there were cleared to be there just by virtue of their residency. He clarified that his proposal differed from simply picking people off the street and suggested hiring people who lived in those locations and putting them to work. He surmised other County employees could act in a supervisory capacity. He agreed with Chair Hill's point about supplies that would be needed, but he thought the cost of supplies would be comparatively small. He said that he supported the other items in the Block vote but opposed Agenda Item 8. He understood that a motion had been made and seconded. He asked if there could be a month-to-month contract with the firm to continue their work until the County was able to explore other avenues and opportunities.

Mr. Smith advised that the vendor recommended for the award was the vendor currently providing the services. He said that a month-to-month contract could be explored and added that ideally, an award-to-bid would be executed to ensure cost savings and hold the vendor accountable.

Commissioner Clark noted that there appeared to be only one responsive bidder for the contract. He viewed the need for custodial services as an opportunity for the County to oversee the work and provide job training, which he thought could offer paid work for people while potentially saving the County money. He theorized that somebody could discover that they liked the work and become successful in similar employment elsewhere in the future. He advocated giving people an opportunity to work in the place where they lived.

Chair Hill thanked Mr. Smith for the background information and for his work on the item. She stated her intent to move forward with a vote in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. She advised that if the motion failed, discussion could take place. She suggested that the County Homeless Services team would be happy to sit down with Commissioner Clark to speak with him about his suggestion. She thought it was an interesting concept, but mentioned that she had toured the Cares Campus with the City of South Salt Lake the previous day, at which time she observed that many of the residents were disabled, seniors, or both.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8 be awarded, approved, and authorized.

**25-0610**      **AGENDA ITEM 9**      Recommendation to authorize Interim County Manager Kate Thomas to award the construction agreement for the Huffaker Hills Reservoir HDPE Liner Repair Project (estimated total construction repair cost \$2,000,000 which includes \$500,000 in project contingency) to the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder following the procedures identified in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 338 for competitive bidding. This recommendation is made recognizing the limited time available to initiate and complete the repair work prior to increasing

reservoir water levels that would make the work area inaccessible. Community Services Department. (Commission District 5.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be authorized.

**25-0611**      **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to approve Amendment No. 2 to an Agreement for Professional Consulting Services between Washoe County and HDR Engineering, Inc., [in the amount of \$898,133.03 for a total contract amount of \$6,203,710.30] for the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation 2020 Facility Expansion Project within the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility service territory which receives and treats wastewater from both unincorporated Washoe County and areas of the City of Reno in the South Truckee Meadows. Amendment No. 2 addresses the increased costs related to unanticipated impacts resulting in project cost escalations, and increased project schedule duration. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be approved.

**25-0612**      **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to award, on behalf of Second Judicial District Court, Washoe County Bid No. 3276-25 for drug and alcohol testing services to AverTest, LLC dba AverHealth, and if awarded, acknowledge execution of contract for time October 1, 2025 through September 30, 2028 with the option to renew two (2) additional, one (1) year periods for such services in the approximate total amount of [\$1,112,440.00] for FY 2026. If approved, authorize Finance to process a cross functional budget appropriation transfer [net impact to the general fund 0.00] District Court (All Commission Districts).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be awarded, acknowledged, and authorized.

**25-0613**      **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to approve Resolution R25-95, providing for the transfer of Washoe County's share of Local Government's 2025 Private Activity Bond Volume Cap [\$7,607,975.17] to the Nevada



Rural Housing Authority for support of the organization's affordable housing programs; and other matters related thereto. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 13 be approved.

**25-0614**      **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to approve a Sole Source Waiver and retroactively execute a contract with New Hope Placement, PLLC aka Well Care Services Reno for a term of thirteen (13) months commencing January 1, 2025 through January 31, 2026 in an amount not to exceed [\$522,254]; and if approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the Agreement and subsequent amendments. This Agreement will provide supportive housing of persons with intellectual or developmental disabilities or mental health conditions that impede their ability to live with complete independence. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be approved, executed, and authorized.

**25-0615**      **AGENDA ITEM 15** Recommendation to approve the sole source, five-year agreement between Washoe County and RapidSOS, Inc. for a Next Generation 911 (NG911) technology solution to enhance emergency and non-emergency call handling at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Communications Center, Reno Emergency Communications Center, and City of Sparks Communications Center, including improved caller location accuracy, PSAP-initiated text and video, AI-driven enhancements, and real-time transcription tools; for a cost not to exceed [\$1,125,200]. If approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the agreement. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 15 be approved and authorized.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chair Hill announced that the Board would consider Agenda Item 11, then take a brief lunch break, after which they would reconvene for the public hearing. She acknowledged that many people were waiting to hear Agenda Item 16, either in Chambers or online.

\* \* \* \* \*

**25-0616**      **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to approve the appointment of one (1) candidate to fill a partial term beginning on the date of appointment and ending on June 30, 2027, for the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission. Applicants for the vacancy include: Paola Agramon, Breanne Antos, Will Arndt, Michael Bosma, Patricia Cashman, Matthew DeMartini, Brian Erbis, Nicole Flangas, Gregg Gehlert, Patrick Gubbins, Sophia Heidrich, John Henderson, Jean Johnson, George Jostlin, Matthew Kaempfe, Kody Kendrick, Austin Lorenz, Michael Pintar, Matt Polley, Tami Rougeau, Michael Skolnick, James Stewart, Jennifer Uvira, Rita Vinci and Beau Walker. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Community Outreach Coordinator Alexandra Wilson said the item was for a partial appointment on the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (WCOSRPC). She mentioned that there were 25 candidates, and the Board would select their top three candidates. She noted that if there was a clear winner, the Board would take a vote; if not, there would be subsequent voting.

On the call for public comment, Mr. George Jostlin thanked the Board for allowing him to express his interest in the open position on the WCOSRPC. He explained that he had lived in Washoe County since January 2007, when he accepted a promotion to become the Regional Director of Government Affairs and Public Relations for Charter Communications. He said that he reported directly to Mr. Manny Martinez and indirectly to the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) past colleague, former Commissioner Marsha Berkgigler. He mentioned that he was an avid sportsman and had played various sports. He stated that he grew up in upstate New York and attended Syracuse University. He noted that prior to moving to Washoe County, he lived in Southern California for over 20 years. He explained that he had lived in Northern Nevada for the past 18 years and had come to love the San Francisco Giants, Reno Aces, and the Wolf Pack. He mentioned that he was a proud Silver Circle Member of the beloved Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) Reno, which he referred to as KNPB, and stated that his good friend and account station manager, Kurt Mische, worked there. Regarding the potential role with WCOSRPC, he said he believed it was important to protect the open beauty of Northern Nevada. He said that while he understood the need to support growth, growth should be done in a controlled manner so the beauty of the area would not be lost. He felt that by keeping the current and future facilities state-of-the-art, it would help aid growth. He mentioned that he was retired and felt the need to serve the County and his neighbors, since he would have the time to do so.

Mr. Austen Lorenz said it would be great to be considered for the WCOSRPC and to be among other great candidates. He felt it was important to share his background, prior experience, and his reason for applying to the WCOSRPC. He recalled deciding to move to Washoe County while hiking at Mammoth Lakes, where he met a doctor who mentioned that Washoe County was a hidden gem and had almost every recreation opportunity imaginable. He said it was at that point that he knew that he wanted to move to Washoe County. He noted that when his wife was looking for a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) program, she chose to attend the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). He explained that when she graduated, they decided to stay and raise their family in Washoe County because of the outdoor recreation opportunities. He stated that he was a scientist specializing in spatial analysis and had spent the past eight years working as a civil servant with the United States Geological Survey (USGS). He mentioned that his work focused on wildlife conservation, improving hunting, and recreation and wildlife on wildlife refuges and other public lands. He explained it was in that role that he discovered a passion for bringing diverse groups together to seek common-sense solutions. He stated that he had worked with various people, including private landowners, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the State, the federal government, and international governments. He informed that science taught him to see data as an opportunity, and from that perspective, he saw many opportunities to bring new voices, people, and funding to parks and open spaces. He explained that in preparation for the meeting, he found some excellent examples from across the Country to keep recreation high and improve revenues for parks and open spaces. He said he would be honored to serve on the WCOSRPC and share his expertise as an outdoor enthusiast, parent, and scientist, while supporting the people of Washoe County to enjoy parks and open spaces.

Ms. Jennifer Uvira said that she was applying for the open seat on the WCOSRPC and was honored to have the opportunity to share her background and reasons for applying. She mentioned that although her background was in environmental engineering, she had made a career transition to run the Clean Up the Lake organization. She noted that the program was a Lake Tahoe-based non-profit that conducted scuba dives to collect submerged litter, which she felt made her a glorified underwater trash collector. She explained that in her role, she utilized her skills in project management, community engagement, and technical problem-solving. She noted that her work involved coordinating large teams of volunteers, fostering partnerships with local governments and businesses, and ensuring projects were carried out from planning to completion. She believed that those experiences strengthened her ability to balance long-term vision with attention to day-to-day details, which were skills she thought would directly benefit the WCOSRPC. She said that she knew the WCOSRPC was already tackling important initiatives, including the Truckee Meadows Trails Plan, the Open Space and Natural Resources Management Plan, and park district exploration. She explained that those programs resonated with her because she had seen how long-term planning and dedicated funding could cause success or failure in a community's ability to care for its natural spaces. She felt that, if structured well, a parks district could provide sustainable support for trails, facilities, and conservation while giving residents a stronger voice in how their resources were managed. She mentioned that if she were to be selected, one of her priorities would be to expand youth engagement in parks. She thought that education was the only way to create real, lasting change. She

remarked that when young people were provided with the tools and opportunities to connect with nature, they not only participated in programs, but they also developed a sense of ownership and responsibility for open spaces. She stated that she saw firsthand in Lake Tahoe the students and young volunteers light up when given the opportunity to dive, hike, and take part in hands-on stewardship. She noted that by fostering relationships early, lifelong stewards could be inspired to ensure that the values of conservation and community were carried forward for future generations. She thanked Chair Hill and the Commissioners for their leadership and for welcoming her perspective. She shared that she would be grateful for the opportunity to bring her background, energy, and commitment to the WCOSRPC for the service of Washoe County's open spaces and parks.

Mr. Matthew DeMartini said that he was a lifelong resident of Washoe County, currently living in District 3, and an applicant for the WCOSRPC. He noted that he worked for a local engineering company. He explained that in his free time, he was a runner and while running 40 miles per week, he had spent a lot of time in open spaces and parks. He stated that he realized that the parks and open spaces in the community were not just the trails, but that they also provided historical and cultural resources. He felt that he aligned with the mission of the WCOSRPC in preserving and making resources available to all community members. He said that in 2024, he ran for the Reno City Council, and as part of his campaign, he interacted with thousands of community members and realized how vital access to parks and open spaces was to the community. He believed that he would be a good fit for the position.

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

Chair Hill said that the Board needed to select its top three candidates. She explained that the decision would be difficult because there were so many strong candidates.

Commissioner Andriola indicated that the Staff Report did not include the districts of the existing appointees and asked whether any districts were not represented.

Ms. Wilson said she did not have that information readily available and explained that the WCOSRPC was not district-specific. She mentioned that the Community Services Director stated that they tried to include a mixture of districts. She informed the Board that she could gather the district information while they voted.

Chair Hill suggested that, in the future, the district for each candidate be listed so that Commissioners have that information readily available.

Commissioner Andriola informed Commissioner Garcia that Mr. Mark Neumann, who was vacating the seat, represented District 3. She thought that his departure would leave District 3 without representation.

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the Commissioner's votes aloud, naming Ms. Uvira as the selected candidate.

Chair Hill congratulated Ms. Uvira and acknowledged the incredible group of candidates. She encouraged the public to continue applying for opportunities at Washoe County and to stay involved. She stated that there were many talented individuals in the community and added that there were many options for participation on various boards and the Washoe County Leadership Academy (WCLA).

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Chair Hill, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Vice Chair Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 11 be approved.

**12:44 p.m.**     **The Board recessed.**

**1:18 p.m.**     **The Board reconvened with Vice Chair Herman absent.**

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**25-0617**     **AGENDA ITEM 16** Public Hearing: (1) Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending the Washoe County Code at Chapter 110 (Development Code) to update Articles 220 Tahoe Area and 220.1 Tahoe Area Design Standards. These updates include adding a section to establish standards for affordable, moderate, and achievable housing in multifamily areas. These updates also include amending various sections to: amend references to the prior Washoe County master plan and update organizational names; clarify application requirements for amendments to Articles 220 and 220.1; update references to the TRPA's code of ordinances related to land coverage; update maximum height and minimum residential density in town centers; add standards for height, parking, density and coverage for affordable, moderate, and achievable housing in town centers; update standards for bicycle storage; provide for reductions in parking minimums for affordable, moderate, and achievable housing, and add standards for the submittal and review of the required parking analysis; modify minimum lot width and setbacks for residential and mixed use developments in preferred affordable areas; modify requirements for encroachment into front yard setbacks on corner and sloped lots; modify standards for accessory dwelling units; modify standards for temporary uses; require development within avalanche hazard areas to record a hold harmless agreement; modify explanation of use tables to clarify the meaning of "A" and add administrative review permit; modify permitting requirements for multiple family dwellings in Crystal Bay Tourist, Incline Village Tourist, and Incline Village Commercial; add Schools-Kindergarten through Secondary Schools as a special use in Incline Village Tourist; add multiple family dwellings and employee housing as allowed uses and update special policies in the Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone; allow

single family dwellings by right in the Incline Village 5, Crystal Bay, and East Shore regulatory zones, and require a hold harmless agreement for development in the Incline Village 5 and Crystal Bay regulatory zones; and update special policies for Crystal Bay; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto; and (2) Adopt an amendment to the Tahoe Area Plan (the Washoe County Master Plan for Washoe Tahoe) to add the Tahoe Transportation District to the development of a parking management plan; update a section related to transit; update a section related to pedestrian, bicycle, and multi-modal facilities; update planned roadway network project details; update references to University of Nevada, Reno at Tahoe; and add dates to data tables as adopted by the Planning Commission; and if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect. The master plan amendment is subject to approval and a finding of conformance with the Tahoe Regional Plan by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the title for Ordinance No. 1743, Bill No. 1934.

Community Services Department (CSD) Senior Planner Katherine Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed the *Summary* slide. She offered to review a brief version of her presentation, then answer questions or provide further details if the Commissioners wanted more information. Chair Hill supported that approach.

Ms. Oakley showed her *Summary* slide and described that Agenda Item 16 contained two different items for Commissioners to consider. The first was the second reading and potential adoption of a Washoe County Development Code (WCDC) amendment, which was the most substantial part of the Tahoe Area Plan (TAP) update. She explained that there was also an associated Master Plan Amendment (MPA) that would change some text in the Washoe County Master Plan for Washoe Tahoe. She said that the MPA and WCDC amendments were both approved by the Planning Commission and were now before the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for consideration. She highlighted that one of the most significant elements of the update was the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Phase 2 Housing Amendments (P2HA). She informed that the P2HA were incentives for affordable, moderate, and attainable housing targeted at town centers. She clarified that the P2HA primarily related to the downtown areas of Incline Village, Crystal Bay, and areas zoned for multi-family housing. She stated that the amendments were adopted by the TRPA in 2023 and constituted a mandate to local jurisdictions. At that time, the TRPA communicated that the incentives were adopted, and that by the end of the following year, local jurisdictions needed to either adopt them as written by the TRPA or propose an alternative that could be shown to have an equal or greater effect on decreasing the cost of building deed-restricted housing. She noted that there were other components of the TAP update. She disclosed that a significant amount of public outreach was conducted on the proposed updates, and the P2HA was the topic County staff heard the most about from constituents. She revealed that the County explored an alternative to the P2HA with the TRPA, but ultimately received feedback that the alternative would not be

accepted because it did not sufficiently demonstrate capacity to lower the cost of affordable housing. As a result, the package presented that day was effectively the P2HA, as-written. She highlighted that the County added some elements, to the extent that they could, to address concerns raised in the public outreach efforts. She specified that one of those additions was the creation of a process and standards to analyze and review parking with the goal of requesting a reduction in parking. She emphasized that the County tried to make it clear that they had the authority to approve or not approve that request, which was an important piece that they added as a part of the overall package. She mentioned that the package included a proposed change to expand allowances for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and various other development code amendments, including some cleanups and improvements identified since the adoption of the TAP in 2021. She noted the County wanted to take the opportunity to implement those.

Ms. Oakley noted that the P2HA and all of the amendments in the package did not impact the TRPA's growth management system. She elaborated that the growth management system outlined development rights and required that construction, whether of a housing unit or another type of construction, have a development right to build. She noted that the previously established limit to the number of development rights for the Tahoe basin was not impacted by the P2HA. She said that the intent of these incentives was to direct development, to the extent possible, to be deed-restricted and help address the affordable housing issue in the Tahoe basin. She mentioned that housing affordability was an item the BCC asked staff to prioritize, and it was now before the Board for a decision. She mentioned that because the P2HA adoption was a mandate from the TRPA, TRPA had the power to adopt the amendments without agreement from the County. Ms. Oakley pointed out that the date established by the TRPA for adoption had passed, but the TRPA continued to work with the County on a solution because the County was actively moving towards adopting the P2HA. She reiterated that whether or not the County progressed towards adoption, the TRPA had the authority to adopt the amendments at the regional level. She offered to answer any questions.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Oakley and commended her for listening to the community and trying to incorporate its concerns as part of the package. She disclosed that Commissioners had received many public comments giving Ms. Oakley accolades. Chair Hill viewed the parking allowance and final County sign-off as wins, and she thanked Ms. Oakley for her deep investment and extensive work on the project.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Jack Dalton, an eleven-year resident of Incline Village, expressed strong opposition to vertical sprawl, citing concerns about evacuation and the lack of affordable housing. He mentioned that if he owned a large house with more space than he needed, he could build an ADU for himself and could convert his main home into a permitted short-term rental (STR). He explained that he wanted to prohibit STRs but felt that the Board was not addressing that issue. He believed that Incline Village was overpopulated, specifically during the summer months. He alleged that the current evacuation plans did not account for when the area had an influx of visitors. He said that evacuations would be difficult and nearly impossible in an overly crowded area. He speculated that, during the summer, leaving Crystal Bay could take half an hour. He

referenced an opinion article written by Ms. Pamela Tsigdinos, published in the *Reno Gazette-Journal*. He asserted that 50 million people visited Lake Tahoe each year, which significantly increased traffic in the basin. He stated that homeowners' insurance premiums at one condominium complex had risen by \$8,000 over the past three years, which he believed contributed to some residents leaving the area. He argued that approving Agenda Item 16 would not address the concerns. He mentioned that the United States Forest Service (USFS) recently reported 350 lightning strikes and eight fires, and that the most recent fire had nearly crossed over the mountain. He was concerned that such a fire could eliminate his community. He expressed his opposition to any agenda items related to Incline Village and Crystal Bay.

Mr. Stephen Dolan alleged that, according to an insurance industry analysis, the fire in Oakland was caused by high-density housing located on narrow hillside streets. He felt that Incline Village and many other communities around Lake Tahoe shared similar characteristics, including high-density development. He stated that the TRPA played a significant role in the current housing issue and believed that the Board was familiar with the terms, which he felt were manipulative. He explained that continuity started in California and would work its way around Lake Tahoe until the ADUs were changed in Nevada. He stated that workforce housing would not be utilized in an appropriate way within the proposed amendment and changes. He noted that achievable housing did not mean low-income housing. He believed that the Board was aware that the proposed amendments would not benefit those who earned low wages. He thought that the changes that would be made would negatively impact businesses in Reno, Sparks, and Verdi, and would monetize North Lake Tahoe. He assumed that the gaming revenue would be used in Lake Tahoe instead of locally, which he thought the Board should be concerned about.

Ms. Roxanna Dunn said she had lived in Incline Village for ten years and served as chair of the Incline Village and Crystal Bay Citizen Advisory Board (CAB). She mentioned that she had previously addressed the Board regarding evacuation dangers in Incline Village. She pointed out that the proposed amendments would not create the type of housing that local workers needed. She explained that when she purchased her home ten years ago, she was \$1 million short of being able to afford a property with a lake view. She felt that the 65-foot-tall buildings allowed under the proposed amendments would have a lake view. She thought those units would not be utilized for workforce housing and would not be affordable. She believed the requirements lacked adequate restrictions related to pricing, income eligibility, and unit size. She said that much of the local workforce consisted of seasonal workers who needed apartments, not multimillion-dollar condominiums with a lake view. She stated that because of the nature of the area, it seemed to attract a younger population who spent their time enjoying the area's activities. She recalled a recent conversation with an employee from Diamond Peak who was reluctant to sign the petition she presented to him because he was moving out of the area. She relayed that he told her that he could no longer afford to live in Incline Village. She explained that much of the workforce consisted of foreign and permanent workers who worked in lower-wage positions that would never allow them to purchase a home; however, those people wished to live where they worked. She felt the Sugar Pine Village Complex in South Lake Tahoe, developed under the Saint Joseph Community Land Trust, was a successful



example of affordable housing. She said that she supported land trusts and thought that type of development would work for the Incline Village area. She stated that she was disappointed that the TRPA decided on the current amendments instead of pursuing a land trust option. She mentioned that workforce housing was needed but questioned how the proposed amendments would result in anything other than high-priced condominiums that would be purchased by people who did not work in the area and likely did not need assistance. She urged the Board to vote against the proposed amendments. She commended the Planning Department staff and thanked them for their hard work.

Ms. Kristina Hill said she had spent over forty years in Lake Tahoe environmental planning as a TRPA planner, Chair of the Washoe County Board of Adjustments (BOA), and a consultant. She believed that the proposed amendments to the TAP would pose a serious threat to the region's integrity. She felt that the amendments used misleading labels that promoted workforce and achievable housing but actually enabled market-rate condominiums. She thought that there was no enforceable mechanism to ensure income-based occupancy of the units. She indicated that achievable, or workforce housing, could not be attained through multi-million-dollar units. She said that STRs needed to be limited in the Crystal Bay and Incline Village areas to achieve affordable and workforce housing. She explained that the amendments would have negative environmental impacts. She thought that 100 percent land coverage was being proposed, but lacked a clear plan for stormwater treatment. She stated that runoff from impervious surfaces was a major contributor to lake degradation. She alleged that the only environmental analysis that had been done for the current proposed amendments was completed in 1987, which was 38 years ago. She mentioned that the world had changed substantially since then and found it unbelievable that such outdated data would be used to justify the adequacy of roads and population levels. She indicated that the Lake Tahoe Basin had changed since the pandemic, and remote work had supported more attractions to accommodate more tourists. She said that visitors from all over the world traveled to Lake Tahoe to explore the Tahoe East Shore Trail. She believed the amendments would drive the already deteriorated near-shore water quality in decline and would increase harmful algae blooms and microplastics. She stated that trash accumulation and wildfire evacuation challenges were worsening, and Lake Tahoe's ecological capacity had been exceeded, as confirmed by the State of the Lake Report. She felt that the TRPA had shifted its mission from environmental protection to promoting development, and she alleged that scientists had been replaced by public relations professionals.

Mr. Alexander Tsigdinos provided and read a document that outlined his concerns regarding workforce housing, insufficient parking options, and emergency fire evacuation. Copies of the document were placed on file with the Clerk.

North Tahoe Preservation Alliance Member Ann Nichols noted that she had lived in the Incline Village area for 54 years and mentioned that she strongly opposed the TAP amendments. She said that the TAP amendments were unlawful and fueled growth without true affordability. She believed the amendments did not consider wildfire and evacuation planning and that an environmental review, which was required by law, had not been done. She thought that the TRPA and the BCC were attempting to create unlimited

density with no minimum parking. She expressed shock that the amendments were considered and said that Phase 3 would increase units to create more available housing with an increased cap. She believed that each phase was worse than the one before it and that the BCC had been forced to consider them. She did not think the TAP amendments were defensible due to new, unanalyzed information from *Tahoe Clean Air*. She explained that Incline Village evacuations would take six hours, with no research done as to how long it would take the entirety of Lake Tahoe to evacuate. She felt that the BCC pushed the amendments through with no discussion. She appreciated Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Herman's comments.

Ms. Pamela Mahoney Tsigdinos noted that she was a full-time resident. She commented that the meeting was the first in-person BCC meeting she had attended. She said that the BCC's vote would be incredibly consequential to Lake Tahoe's history. She asked the Board to oppose the TAP amendments because the Code was far-reaching, grave, and should be backed by significant environmental analysis, comprehensive traffic research, visitation data, and evacuation impact research. She thought that the public had consistently voiced serious concerns regarding the dangers that extensive development in a geographically constrained basin would pose to residents, visitors, and workers. She felt that the TAP amendments were a naked attempt to serve growth and the agendas of developers, at all costs. She said that the changes would endanger residents and visitors because they would all compete to escape during an emergency. She believed that history had shown that when officials ignored risks, disaster and regret followed. She did not think that the community could afford to wait until after a tragedy to act. She indicated that the will to act responsibly remained with the BCC, and she urged them to require comprehensive evacuation modeling and an environmental impact study that analyzed the risks and harms to Lake Tahoe. She urged the Board to explore changes to the STR ordinance that would unlock existing housing. She said that approving amendments without the necessary knowledge jeopardized the community's safety. She requested that the BCC be an advocate for public safety and the health of the lake.

Ms. Penny Brock indicated that the BCC was responsible for the protection of Lake Tahoe and the Incline Village community. She said that a moratorium should occur to maintain preservation. She mentioned that the Washoe County Emergency Management (EM) team was conducting a fire evacuation study and that she, as the South Valleys CAB Chair, was informed of heightened communal fear after the Davis Fire. She wondered how individuals would evacuate from Mt. Rose Highway, Arrowcreek Parkway, and the Incline Village area should a fire extend into the basin. She suggested that the BCC table Agenda Item 16 until the fire study was concluded.

Mr. Jim McNamara mentioned that he was the appointed representative on the TRPA and had tried his best to compile residents' concerns regarding evacuations, insurability, and housing. He supported the County's TAP goals and recalled meetings in which residents expressed their needs regarding housing, evacuation, and first responder agencies. He said that there were residents of Incline Village who had been in emergency management careers for about 40 years and understood that the TRPA wished to change the existing developments and housing. He noted that buildings and developments from

the 1960s through the 1980s would not be allowed and would be deemed unsafe by today's standards. He indicated that evacuation concerns existed throughout all of Incline Village because there were many homes that were indefensible due to the terrain. He said that the TRPA wished to redevelop a small area around the town center to provide protection and added housing for essential workers who otherwise would not be able to afford to live and work in the area.

Ms. Ellie Waller read from a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, regarding her concerns related to the TAP amendments, preservation of Lake Tahoe, development, public land acquisitions, and natural area conservation.

Mr. John Eppolito provided documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk, and said that he had been a Lake Tahoe real estate broker for 27 years. He recalled that the highest-ranked elected official on the TRPA was Secretary of State (SOS) Francisco Aguilar, who voted against the TAP amendments because he felt that the TRPA needed to listen to the community. He noted that some Incline Village residents had created a low to moderate-income housing plan for central Incline Village in the past; however, a developer bought one of the parcels by mistake. He stated that Chair Hill changed the zoning requirements for the developer's parcel to build \$2 to \$5 million condominiums. He agreed with many previous public commenters and expressed concern regarding fire evacuations. He believed that there was no way to evacuate the region and referred to articles by *The Big Story*, the *Reno Gazette-Journal (RGJ)*, and the *Nevada Current*. He recalled that when he first moved to Lake Tahoe, he would tell clients that the basin would never be overdeveloped because of the TRPA; however, he felt that the TRPA started to collaborate with developers. He urged the BCC to oppose Agenda Item 16.

Mr. Steven Johnson reported that he had lived in Incline Village for 25 years and expressed concern about parking. He said that no intelligent study had ever been performed regarding the allocation of sufficient parking spaces. He noted that vehicles were parked throughout public streets because there were insufficient spaces on private properties. He explained that during the busy summer months, the shortage of parking spaces was compounded by the addition of trailers, boats, and recreation vehicles (RVs). He indicated that STRs created five to six additional vehicles on the streets, sidewalks, and public parking areas. He recalled public parking restrictions during the winter that created illegal parking, prevented proper snow clearing, and added to soil erosion. He said that the County used to issue parking violations when he first moved to Incline Village and noted the ticketing of vehicles would be a burden on low-income residents. He believed that one to two parking allocations per unit were inadequate because he felt that the TAP amendments failed to recognize that affordable housing units exceeded the intended rates. He said that many condos had more than one family residing in them, with multiple adults who owned vehicles. He asserted that additional high-density housing accrued more residents and that the TAP amendment would reduce parking requirements to .7 spaces per unit. He asked the BCC to drive Southwood or Northwood Boulevard to witness his concerns. He relayed that the TAP amendment would provide bicycle parking in lieu of vehicle parking, which he speculated might work during the summer but would not work during the winter.

Ms. Helen Neff introduced herself as a resident of Incline Village. She stated that the proposed amendments to the TAP for Incline Village and Crystal Bay did not reflect the safety values and needs of the residents. She noted that the key issues raised by the community were clearly stated in the Staff Report. She listed the concerns, including worries about wildfire evacuation in an area that was highly vulnerable with limited escape routes, impacts on the character of the community by proposing taller buildings that altered the landscape, reduced parking standards that ignored the needs of essential workers whose livelihoods depended on their vehicles, the definition of achievable housing lacking income requirements and instead creating incentives for a market-rate project rather than affordable apartments, and continued apprehension about deed restriction enforcement which had historically been weak and lacking transparency. She asserted that many of the objections she mentioned had been voiced the previous fall to the TRPA. She believed the objections were largely dismissed, as the phase 2 amendments to the TAP were passed through committees until the governing board approved them in December. She opined that the disregard for evacuation safety and a universally applied approach to code amendments ignored the vast differences between the different shores of Lake Tahoe. She clarified that while residents of the region strongly supported affordable housing for the workforce, she believed that approving amendments that allowed taller buildings with reduced parking in an effort towards achievable housing would not have the desired outcome. She emphasized that residents advocated public safety, which included evacuation planning and transportation safety changes to roads in the area. She stated that those matters required priority attention before approving amendments to the TAP that would allow taller buildings and higher population density. She opined that community trust depended on transparency, responsiveness, and collaboration, with stronger outcomes resulting from listening to those most impacted rather than providing pre-determined solutions. She urged the BCC to listen to residents by opposing the amendments and advocating for a process that respected their input. She thanked the Board.

Mr. Scott Tieche greeted the Board and reported that he moved to Crystal Bay in 1980. He explained that when someone landed at the Reno-Tahoe International Airport, they would see a sign that said *the future of Reno is more*. He remarked that the sign did not mention Incline Village being more. He opined that Reno received the *future* mentioned by the quote on the sign, while Incline Village was only given the *more* from that sign. He encouraged the Board to vote in opposition to the amendments. He described Incline Village as an annuity for the County. He questioned whether the Commissioner representing District 1 fought for the residents and suggested that it did not appear the Commissioner did. He speculated that there had been peace-making with other Board members in the interest of maintaining a political career rather than maintaining Incline Village. He reported having voted in a way that contributed to those actions, though he now felt deceived. He explained that residents were told that the TRPA was forcing Washoe County to adopt the community plan, but he suspected that Washoe County could make its own decision. He advised the Board not to approve a plan that would be detrimental due to unlimited growth, undefined housing, a lack of parking requirements, traffic similar to what is found in the San Francisco Bay Area, and restricted infrastructure. He doubted that families with children, dogs, and skis would utilize public transportation. He asked about evacuation and suggested that such matters were a question of when they

would happen rather than whether they would. He stated there was no clear evacuation plan for the residents already living in the area. He questioned the security of residents in the region if thousands of additional cars were to be brought there. He opined that Incline Village and north Lake Tahoe would be changed forever for the worse and urged the Board to vote against the amendments.

Ms. Lynn Whetstone introduced herself, noting that she lived on Apollo Way in the northern portion of Incline Village. She explained that a previous speaker had labeled the area as indefensible during wildfires. She stated that her primary concern with the proposed amendments was wildfire evacuation. She wanted to inform the Board of recent developments that she believed would be another reason to reject the TAP amendments. She acknowledged that the Board would likely be aware that a major partner to local government in the event of a wildfire was the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU), which was part of the USFS. She noted that recent reductions and layoffs at the USFS had been well-publicized, with the United States (US) Secretary of Agriculture announcing a reorganization plan on July 24, 2025, which included further restrictions and alterations to the management structure of the USFS. She reported the upcoming closure of the USFS Regional Office in Vallejo, California, which managed all USFS units in the Sierra region, and an additional office in Oregon. She assumed that the LTBMU would report to the nearest office in Salt Lake City, Utah. She opined that there would be a significant loss of management knowledge regarding wildfire and environmental issues in the basin and the Sierra Nevada Mountain region, further harming the LTBMU's ability to respond to local wildfires effectively. She recounted that as a longtime government executive for the State of California, she believed when she purchased her home in 1997 that she could trust the government to keep her safe. She asserted that she had lost protection from the TRPA, losing confidence in the LTBMU, and was scared. She reflected on the Caldor Fire and Davis Fire, which had spread to only four miles away from her home. She asserted that residents were looking to Washoe County as the only entity in a position to prevent things from worsening. She urged the Board to reject the proposed TAP amendments and thanked them.

Mr. Tim Delaney introduced himself and opined that it was nice to hear everyone's public comments. He apologized for his fatigue, noting that he had been driving through the Santa Cruz mountains since 5:00 a.m. to understand why people were focused on his money. He aimed to help wealthy residents in Incline Village who might be afraid to speak out because of buzzwords that could make others uncomfortable. He invited people to direct any criticism to him, as he had worked his way up economically from the bottom to a better position. He reflected on his past, describing his childhood as enormously difficult and disclosing that he had been in and out of jail. He reported that his best friends throughout life had been combat veterans and law enforcement officers in his family. He expressed frustration that American society would not listen to him despite his escape from the mentioned conditions and earning an engineering and physics degree funded by the Pell Grant. He referred to the cultural practices of throwing colored powders in South Asia and speculated whether he could convince those who engaged in that activity to listen to his advice opposing the practice after he described his life experiences and industrial work. He opined that such actions would not be smart and compared his

hypothetical story to the Board's actions with Incline Village. He expressed frustration with members of the BCC and speculated that they would destroy Incline Village by building structures in the area that were taller than the surrounding trees. He wanted the Board to consider how having structures below the trees enabled him to see the wind blowing the foliage back and forth and collecting snow, which helped him by giving him a reason to live. He emphasized that as a young man, he experienced 15 officers pointing firearms at him but reiterated that he achieved a physics and engineering degree and had done a lot of good work for the government. He expressed concern and disagreement with people becoming involved with his finances after he had achieved those goals, purchased property, and saved money. He voiced further frustrations regarding the Board's actions and agenda before thanking them.

Mr. Aaron Vanderpool introduced himself and opined that it was nice to speak after someone who grew up in Incline Village within a similar socioeconomic class and was also an academic. He emphasized that he had grown up in the region and spent over four decades there. He opined that the amendments would destroy the future of everybody listening to the meeting. He noted that he had sent a letter via email, which was received and placed on file. He opined that what the Board was doing would only make things more affordable in the short term. He explained that he would discuss the four primary points he had included in his emailed letter. He opined that ADUs significantly increased wealth inequality. He thought that if an ADU were placed on a property, the land's value would increase past an affordable point. He asserted that building more units did not work in a system where more money was continually given to the wealthy. He asked how many parcels were owned by Mr. David Duffield or Mr. Larry Ellison under the names of their various Limited Liability Companies (LLCs). He referred to the stock market concept called *low float*, which he described as a process where a small number of individuals purchased all the stock, causing the market to become highly volatile and inflating prices. He argued against deed restrictions and speculated that if such restrictions were enforced in a neighborhood like his, but not in an adjacent area housing some of the wealthiest individuals in the Nation, the restricted neighborhood would likely decline and be filled with renters governed by their more affluent neighbors. He opined that it did not make sense for the poor to be limited while the wealthy were unrestricted. He reported that during a previous affordable housing workshop, the TRPA said they did not know about the continued funding of programs such as Placemate, which provided \$7,000 in funds generated by taxes to a wealthy owner of an empty home. He asked why his tax dollars were taken and given to the affluent without taxing them for the homes they owned, which remained empty. He remarked that someone had told him that Incline Village had a population of 9,100, which caused Mr. Vanderpool to wonder why people could not be found to fill the vacancies at his local post office. He reported that the houses in the area continued to grow larger. He opined that he was lucky to have purchased a condominium with his mother, investing all their money, as it was the only reason he still lived in the area. He did not believe he could continue to afford to reside in the region, as fees from the Homeowners Association (HOA) kept increasing and fire insurance was unavailable. He opined that owning a home did not seem like a possibility. He described the situation as ridiculous and expressed frustration about the prospect of living in the area in the future. He opined that nobody wanted to live in a condominium with HOA fees, as everyone

wanted a single-family home, though he could not afford that. He noted that he had much more to say but had run out of time. He reported that his HOA had outlawed STRs and mentioned they had workforce housing. He asked why similar actions were not being taken elsewhere.

Mr. Steven Ross introduced himself as a resident of Incline Village. He urged the Board to advocate for the community, the environment, Lake Tahoe, and residents of Incline Village and Crystal Bay. He also emphasized support for actions he believed the BCC knew were necessary for residents who might need to evacuate during emergencies. He urged the Board to vote in the interest of those matters, rather than for developers or those looking to make money off the TAP. He explained that residents wanted to maintain the water quality of Lake Tahoe because their drinking water was sourced from it. He opined that it was inappropriate to continue paving over areas in the community, as it increased waste runoff into the lake, was non-beneficial, and harmed water quality. He thanked the Board and urged them to do what was right for the community.

Ms. Nyamsuren Uudus greeted the Board and introduced herself. She explained that she had lived on the upper end of Tyner Way full-time since 2011 and noted that the area was mentioned by previous speakers regarding fire evacuations. She explained that the nearby roads only allowed traffic to move one way, and if there were an emergency, she would not know how to exit the region to escape. She believed the TAP amendments would cause many environmental issues, such as wildfires, decreased water quality, and worsened traffic. She speculated that the amendments would increase traffic and make finding parking spaces problematic. She provided an example she thought had occurred in 2023, when her vehicle was stopped in traffic while trying to drive two miles from Incline Village to Crystal Bay using Nevada State Route (SR) 28. She emphasized that there had been no way to exit SR 28 because a gas leak led to construction work on the highway, which closed the road. She recounted that there was no way to exit the highway or return home during that incident. She speculated that traffic issues would worsen if the TAP amendments were approved. She asked the Board to vote against the amendments and the high vertical sprawl in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. She urged them to vote in support of keeping Lake Tahoe pristine and safe for the residents.

Mr. John Feliz introduced himself as an Incline Village property owner since 1987. He opined that the workforce housing section of the TAP amendment would not support the true housing needs of the workforce in his community. He asserted that housing for workers was historically low, and the proposed amendment did not adequately address that. He asked how the pricing structure of the proposal would be enforced since he believed the current STR violations were not monitored or enforced, with occupancy volumes and parking restrictions continuously overlooked. He stated that problems related to traffic congestion and resident safety were growing while solid emergency evacuation studies and plans were ignored, lacked approval, or remained unplanned. He believed that the earlier comments from a previous speaker, one of the community's TRPA representatives, regarding the initial growth of Incline Village housing in the 1960s and 1970s, were somewhat valid. Mr. Feliz elaborated that while those comments suggested

that the original approach might not be currently suitable, he emphasized the importance of respecting the existing framework to avoid contributing to overdevelopment. He asserted that the TAP amendments increased the potential for loss of life while lowering the quality of life in the basin and would be devastating for many. He requested that the Board show their constituents and future generations that the amendments would be stopped. He urged the BCC to choose, support, and promote good governance for the communities' future by helping to eliminate the possibility of anyone being responsible for injury or harm. He thanked the Board for their time.

Ms. Ronda Tycer greeted the Board and introduced herself as a resident of Incline Village. She informed the BCC that she had already submitted over 200 petitions signed by community members asking the Board to forgo approval of the TRPA-mandated amendments until the Commissioners had studied the local condition of fire evacuations. She acknowledged that the Board was in the process of reviewing those matters and noted her intent to repeat her previous pleas. She explained that she wanted to share additional information regarding ADUs. She suspected that the Board knew of her prior protests of ADUs because of the area's crooked streets and small, deformed lots. She speculated that the Board believed they were under pressure from the State to approve the proposed amendments. She reported that Assembly Bill (AB) 396, which she noted had been approved by the Nevada Legislature in 2025, mandated that Washoe County enact ordinances authorizing ADUs on residential properties. She further explained that if such an ordinance were not adopted, then ADUs were authorized by State law on any residentially zoned property without restriction. She noted that although one might think the Board needed to adopt an ordinance to control the issues caused by the TAP amendments because of the language of AB396, the bill included a provision stipulating that an ordinance was not necessary in a region, county, or city where a regional planning agency had been established through an interstate compact. She explained that because the only regional planning agency she was aware of was the TRPA, the State mandate for counties requiring ordinances for ADUs did not apply to Incline Village. She asked the BCC not to crowd the acreage of Incline Village with additional housing that would overuse the community's water supply and utilities while crowding the streets during evacuations. She thanked the Board.

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland stated that emailed public comment was received and placed on file.

Chair Hill asked for clarification from Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large in response to statements made about the County's requirements to adopt the P2HA. She wanted to know what that entailed and thought it would be helpful for CDDA Large to discuss his understanding of the adoption requirements.

CDDA Large acknowledged the complexity of the issue and said that he understood the passion that drove a lot of the concern from constituents. He relayed that, from a legal standpoint, as Ms. Oakley explained during her presentation and a number of public commenters shared, the amendments were mandated by the TRPA. He said the TRPA housing amendments preempted local regulatory authority, and the County did not



have a choice. Whether the BCC voted no or yes on the item, the P2HA would go into effect. He added that the practical effect of a no vote would be that County staff's proposals and concessions negotiated with the TRPA would not go into effect, nor would the cleanup components of the bill. He stated that a no vote would also jeopardize the ability of the County to make any changes to its Area Plan. He said the TRPA could assume control over all planning in Incline Village and Crystal Bay, and Washoe County would have no input until they passed the P2HA. He explained that the structure of the TRPA gave them the ability to pass their own code of ordinances, which were binding on other area jurisdictions. He described that, as reflected in the Staff Report, County staff tried to address points of community concern with workarounds in their proposal, but those were rejected by the TRPA. He summarized that the County was left with the choice between passing the P2HA or not passing it, but the housing amendments would go into effect regardless of the vote of the BCC. He said the question was whether the County could preserve control over planning in the Incline Village and Crystal Bay area, and he thought Ms. Oakley could speak to that better than he could.

Ms. Oakley agreed with the summary CDDA Large gave. She stated that the TRPA ultimately had the authority to determine whether or not the County Area Plan, as it applied to the Tahoe area, was in conformance with the TRPA regional documents. She added that if the County did not adopt the P2HA, they were obviously not in conformance, and that would potentially affect the ability of the County to exercise the local regulatory authority that the Area Plan enabled the County to have on other issues. She determined that adopting the P2HA was important to preserve whatever local authority the County had over the Tahoe basin.

CDDA Large advised that an evacuation study would not impact the mandate from the TRPA to adopt the P2HA. He addressed the idea of tabling the matter until a later date, which had been brought up. He understood that the TRPA required the County to adopt certain incentives, and the adoption mandate did not include criteria regarding evacuation. Accordingly, the TRPA housing amendments would not be influenced by any recommendations developed through an evacuation study. He reasoned that the TRPA might eventually want to make changes based on findings from the evacuation study, and he hoped that potential evacuation scenarios could be improved; however, he affirmed that evacuation plans did not affect the P2HA that was before the Board for approval that day. He pointed out that, as Ms. Oakley mentioned earlier, the deadline for the County to implement the P2HA was December 2024, but allowance was given because the County had worked with the TRPA staff throughout that period. He restated the possibility that if the BCC did not pass the P2HA, the TRPA could decide to impose the P2HA without the support of the County.

Commissioner Garcia spoke about the challenge of addressing both the legal requirements and the extensive public comments that Commissioners received. She recognized the outpouring of concern from constituents and valid points that were made and said she relied on the advice given by the County's legal counsel to make her decisions. She validated the concerns people shared and thanked them for speaking out. She discerned that fire evacuation was a common theme among the concerns expressed, and she wanted

to share what the County was doing to address that. She noted that BCC members also served as Fire Commissioners for the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD). Due to that and her own residence in a part of unincorporated Washoe County with limited ingress and egress, she felt the concerns of those who had spoken that day. She asked Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro to provide a quick update to assure constituents that those concerns were being taken seriously and the County was working on solutions. She remarked that the Board looked forward to making progress on the subject.

ACM Solaro thought it was important for people to understand that Washoe County was always working through emergency management needs and issues, and he pointed out that August was proclaimed as Emergency Management Awareness Month in the meeting that morning. He said there were 13 identified hazards in the area, and fire was one of those. He explained that studies and planning took all of those hazards into account. He wanted people to understand that the donation to the County, accepted on February 25, 2025, to create an evacuation study would identify the most vulnerable locations in area communities, whether that was Incline Village, Caughlin Ranch, or Reno. He said that, depending on where hazards were identified, staff could devise mitigation strategies for those areas and address possible evacuation needs. He acknowledged concerns expressed in public comment about the lack of evacuation routes in and out, and he offered that those concerns pertained to many locations in the County. He noted that Cold Springs was an example of a community where there were two ways in and out, which was one less access road than the Incline Village area had. He explained that the study would consider other factors, like fuel loading and opportunities for mitigation for vulnerable locations within Washoe County, which would inform future staff planning efforts. He noted that the study would affect planning in the County, but, as CDDA Large mentioned, the plan to conduct the study did not have any effect on the TAP.

Chair Hill appreciated Commissioner Garcia asking ACM Solaro about the evacuation study. She queried if he knew the timing of the study.

ACM Solaro responded that the County was working through the Request for Quotation (RFQ) process. He reported that staff met with stakeholders from other fire districts and Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs) to inform the scope of work, not only for the evacuation study, but also for the analysis of evacuation routes and related matters. He remarked that the study was extensive and pertained to all of the County, including Reno and Sparks.

Commissioner Andriola echoed the remarks Commissioner Garcia shared about her reliance on legal counsel from the County when making difficult choices. Commissioner Andriola commented that the handbook explaining the duties of a Commissioner outlined that the role sometimes called upon Commissioners to create a judicial framework in response to a hearing similar to the one in Agenda Item 16. She elaborated that even though Commissioners were not judges or attorneys, they depended on legal counsel for guidance. She supposed that all Commissioners had the opportunity to meet with staff in advance, and she divulged that one of her questions was about what

would happen if the Board voted no. She affirmed that constituent concerns were valid, but she understood that even if the BCC voted no, the TRPA would ignore that and move forward with the P2HA. Furthermore, if the BCC did what she thought was theoretically the right thing, which would be to stand up to the TRPA and vote no, or create conditions to address County concerns, the TRPA did not have to abide by that. She said that as of December 2024, the TRPA could have instituted all of the conditions and housing amendments as they wanted them, but Washoe County staff listened to the residents and worked to modify some of the components of the P2HA. She spoke about parking as an example and disclosed that when she met with staff, she learned that the County reduced the parking allowance recommended by the TRPA. She summarized that the provisions the County tried to put into place aligned with the concerns expressed by the area's residents.

Commissioner Andriola did not think it was prudent to restrict the ability of the County to have a say in the Washoe County Master Plan that governed Incline Village. She warned that if the BCC voted no, the TRPA would take the authority of the County away, and the County would be constrained to whatever the TRPA said. She viewed parking as an example in which the County's approach would make things better for residents than the TRPA plan. She appreciated that Chair Hill asked for legal clarification, and she thought it was important for everyone to hear that the County did not have the ability to override the TRPA. She advised that the P2HA adoption extension from December 2024 to the present allowed for some County-specific provisions to be developed. She suggested that residents could redirect some of their energy and evaluate the authority the TRPA had and the implications on the governance of the County. She compared the governance landscape to the way that anything that was defined and determined by the Legislature had to be changed at the Legislature rather than at the local level. She stated that the BCC did not have the authority to override the Legislature and, in the matter currently being decided, the BCC did not have the authority to override the TRPA.

Commissioner Andriola thanked County staff for working diligently on the issues and thanked the TRPA for giving County staff the time to work through the concerns of the constituents. She wanted everyone to understand that it was difficult for Commissioners to comply with requirements at times. She thanked CDDA Large for providing clarity about what authority the BCC had and what authority the TRPA had in that region. She said it was important that the voice of the constituents was heard, but Commissioners could only respond within their legal capacity to act. She disclosed that it was hard, but she believed that if the evacuation study revealed various things that needed to be changed to accommodate public safety, the TRPA would take those findings into consideration. Commissioner Andriola communicated that she spoke with legal counsel to ensure that if there was any provision that put people's safety in jeopardy, the County could bring it to the TRPA and implement accommodations to address whatever needed to change. She understood that could happen; however, the ultimate authority fell with the TRPA. She perceived sentiments from commenters that the way the TRPA served residents and exercised authority might have morphed over the years, and she suggested that if that was the case, there were opportunities for residents to look at how to effect change at a high level. She restated that the BCC did not have the authority to make changes, but she

thanked people for sharing their concerns. She said she was eager to learn what the study revealed, and she hoped that if there were concerns, they would be reviewed by the TRPA.

Commissioner Clark remarked that many people provided public comment that day, including a former chair of the TRPA, which he found insightful. He had many concerns, including the potential effect on water quality. He opined that he was voted into office by the citizens of the County, not by anybody at the TRPA. He believed that the citizens of the County expected their Commissioners to advocate for them, and he did not think that was going to happen on Agenda Item 16. He predicted that Commissioners would rationalize what would happen if they did not vote in support of the P2HA. He felt that the courageous thing to do would be to support County residents and stand up to the TRPA. He theorized that citizens did not have much of a voice with the County and had even less of a voice with the TRPA. He opined that Commissioners might be able to have a voice with the TRPA and get some things straightened out. He stated his opposition to adopting the P2HA. He reasoned that laws and rules were made by men and women, and laws and rules could be changed by men and women. He suggested that Commissioners stand together in support of their citizens and go to the TRPA to negotiate a mutually agreeable plan. He said he was primarily concerned about the impacts of the P2HA on public safety, particularly due to the already narrow roads and high density in the affected areas. He felt that, strictly from a public safety standpoint, Commissioners should support the residents of the area who would be affected by the changes. He noted that property owners in the areas affected by the P2HA paid some of the highest property taxes in the County.

Chair Hill expressed her appreciation for everyone's comments. She knew that there were concerns in the community, and she said that the capacity for effective evacuation of the area was very important to the BCC. She relayed that Commissioners had been pushing staff to get the evacuation study done, and that it was moving forward. She said she was excited to get the results of that. She noted the work of the County Emergency Management team, who collaborated with area fire departments, the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), and other agencies in the region to conduct emergency exercises and evacuation work. She thought it was inappropriate to claim that there were no plans to address an emergency in Incline Village or Crystal Bay. She informed that the Emergency Management team took those things seriously and utilized tabletop exercises, physical exercises, and real evacuations in the community to maintain readiness. She reasoned that conversations about environmental impacts should consider that vehicles were a major contributor to lake clarity, and having people live in the community that they served was very important. She related that there were many people in the Incline Village and Crystal Bay communities who could not attend BCC meetings but would love to live in the communities that they served. She gave examples of school principals, hospital staff, and grocery store clerks who would appreciate having better public transportation. She observed that better public transportation occurred with higher densities. She noted that there were business owners who wanted their employees who preferred to live in the Tahoe Basin to be able to live there. She did not think there would be projects in Incline Village that were similar to the skyscrapers of Manhattan, and she noted that there were very few parcels that could likely be developed in the way outlined in the P2HA. She reiterated that all housing development enabled by the P2HA needed to be deed-restricted. She thought

the point about the County working with the TRPA on deed restrictions was a good and fair point. She said that she had been in conversation with County staff about that, and she thought that there was still some work to be done on the matter, but she felt that the TRPA had done an excellent job managing the deed restrictions. She concluded that adopting the P2HA was the right move for Incline Village and Crystal Bay. She thought that it would improve the quality of life for everyone and ensure the potential to house a workforce in the community.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Vice Chair Herman absent and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1743, Bill No. 1934, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

**25-0618      AGENDA ITEM 17 Public Comment.**

Ms. Katherine Yriarte relayed that she and her husband had been horse trainers for the past ten years. She indicated that she had trained over 100 mustangs, with about 24 being Virginia Range horses. She said that she used to volunteer with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), performing range land management and assisting with adoptions. She explained that the Virginia Range horses were not under federal protection and lived in a gray area between livestock and wild horses, which she felt was a disservice to the horses and the residents. She believed that the reason the horses were overpopulated was due to a lack of management and ineffective birth control. She said that fencing was valid; however, the horses needed to be classified. She reported that the horses were degrading the land and that the nonprofits were selective about Virginia Range horse management. She mentioned that she had witnessed Silver Springs horses with genetic defects continuing to breed and asserted that proper horse management could ensure healthy animals on the range.

Ms. Penny Brock reported that the State had experienced a cyberattack the previous day, and as a result, it had shut down. She wondered if the attack affected the County because the Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office relayed voter registration information to the State. She noted that the Department of Justice (DOJ) was investigating the State's elections from 2020 onward. She said that the Secretary of State (SOS) Francisco Aguilar stated that the SOS would undergo a Dominion Voting Systems update that would cause election data to be lost. She believed that the County's job was to preserve voter records for five years and requested that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) investigate whether the voting records from the last five years were still held. She recalled that she submitted a public records request (PRR) regarding the voting records; however, she was told that Dominion Voting Systems was last updated in 2023. She said that 15 counties used Dominion Voting Systems, with 2 utilizing Election Systems and Software (ESS). She expressed concern and asked the BCC to oversee the ROV; otherwise, she felt that the DOJ would investigate concerns. She added that the Dominion Voting Systems update was supposed to take place by the end of August and wanted to know if voter records would be lost.

Ms. Pamela Mahoney Tsigdinos recalled that some of the Board had indicated that the County should investigate the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and the State. She said that individuals who attended the TRPA and State Legislature meetings to provide feedback and research did not have the same authority as Commissioners. She asserted that residents had expressed concerns repeatedly and that the BCC was the community's last resort for help and support against the TRPA. She relayed the BCC's mission to work together and provide and sustain a safe, secure, and healthy community and thanked Commissioner Clark for following that mission. She said that those who voted for Agenda Item 16 did not uphold the BCC's mission and that the constituents paid the Board's salary. She expressed shock at what she felt was cowardice demonstrated on the dais. She did not think that Commissioners should be in public roles if they were not willing to work hard to address constituent needs. She said that she asked the BCC for help but felt ignored.

Ms. Roxanna Dunn said that the BCC should fight the TRPA alongside the residents of Incline Village, even if it were contentious. She believed that the County ignored fire evacuation dangers to allow for luxury buildings disguised as workforce housing. She expressed disappointment because she felt that the BCC used the excuse that the TRPA had made them approve Agenda Item 16. She thanked Commissioner Clark for supporting the Incline Village community.

Mr. Alexander Tsigdinos was saddened to hear some of the comments made regarding the Tahoe Area Plan (TAP) amendments. He said that the Board voted based on expedience and not what was right. In addition to being a retired military officer, he relayed that he spent two decades in corporate communications at two internationally recognized companies. He noted that he had written many testimonies to the United States (US) Congress and the European (EU) Parliament that provided him with the experience to know that counsel might provide comment and feedback on policies but did not dictate policies. He said that dictating policy was the sole responsibility of corporate officers and public officials. He thought that if the BCC was concerned about workforce housing, the Board should reconsider the Short Term Rental (STR) policy and implement restrictions and a cap. He asserted that the available housing units needed to be open for workers instead of tourists.

Mr. Doug Flaherty expressed that he was not mad or concerned; however, he was disgusted. He said that he grew up near Peavine and recalled that his stepfather was a turn-of-the-century Nevada cowboy, leather maker, carpenter, and horse breaker who provided food for his family. He believed that the BCC, except for Commissioner Clark, had shamed the State. Chair Hill asked Ms. Flaherty to address the Commission as a whole. Mr. Flaherty felt that Chair Hill shut down his right to speak many times and speculated that she feared the truth. He said that situations such as Agenda Item 16 were why the court system existed, and he believed that the BCC was not responsive to its constituents. He explained that during the 1960 Winter Olympics, he was transported to Squaw Valley to learn how to ski by the former Stead Ski School. He thanked Commissioner Clark for his vote and was saddened that the other Commissioners did not share his views.

Ms. Ellie Waller said that she lived in Douglas County for 6 years, Placer County for 20 years, and had attended BCC meetings. She felt that the TRPA hijacked the Legislative Committee for the Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Marlette Lake Water System (MLWS) session. She recalled that she had begged for a citizen's day, which was denied by Senator Richard *Skip* Daly. She thanked Commissioner Clark and thought that residents did their best to raise concerns that the rest of the public had not heard about. She indicated that she was thanked for attending meetings while she pleaded with Commissioners and supervisors on her own personal time. She felt that the BCC did not listen or do enough for the community. She believed that the District Attorney's (DAs) comment was conflicting and confusing, and that the BCC could challenge the TRPA. She asserted that the meeting made her feel irrelevant because the Board said they needed to listen to the DA's clarification instead of the community's concerns. She said that the BCC could oppose the TRPA, and by approving Agenda Item 16, the community's only chance of change was through a lawsuit. She appreciated Commissioner Clark's opposition and hoped other Commissioners would deny the Phase 3 Housing Amendment.

North Tahoe Preservation Alliance Member Ann Nichols expressed confusion regarding the use of the words *attainable housing* in Agenda Item 16. She said that Senior Planner Katherine Oakley indicated that the TRPA defined housing as achievable. She wondered if the BCC approved *attainable* or *achievable* housing because she noted that *achievable* did not require an income cap, while *attainable* housing required 150 percent of the average median income (AMI). She asserted that Chair Hill was the BCC's representative on the TRPA, and Ms. Nichols felt that Chair Hill had never gone against the will of the TRPA. She urged the BCC to figure out what they voted for because she opined that *achievable* and *attainable* had different definitions and requirements.

Mr. John Eppolito was disappointed by the BCC's actions. He believed the BCC acted like they cared; however, he thought that they would have voted with Commissioner Clark if they did. He felt that Chair Hill had not represented Incline Village residents in a long time. He thought that Ms. Pam Darr and Ms. Waller articulated their comments better than he could and added that there was housing in Incline Village that was not fully covered by fire insurance. He opined that obtaining fire insurance would be more challenging if large buildings were built near existing complexes. He asserted that the BCC should oppose the TRPA and speculated that the Board did not support the community. He recalled previous TRPA meetings and felt that Chair Hill should have opposed Agenda Item 16 because the TRPA did not control the County or pay her salary. He said that the DA and the BCC were not supposed to represent the TRPA, and he felt they had failed the community.

**25-0619      AGENDA ITEM 18 Announcements/Reports.**

Commissioner Clark expressed his disappointment with what took place at the meeting that day. He argued that Commissioners were supposed to stand up for the citizens of the County, and nobody could predict what the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) was going to do. He observed that people guessed what the TRPA might

do, but he opined that Commissioners needed to advocate for their people and tell the TRPA that the citizens did not support what the TRPA wanted to do. He said the TRPA should come up with an alternative, and that he did not want the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) to be threatened with action the TRPA might take. He reasoned that if the TRPA did something that the BCC had not agreed to, the BCC could blame TRPA in the event of a future disaster. He determined that the BCC was now in collusion with the TRPA, and he stated his opposition to that collusion. He hoped that the residents of District 1 understood his position.

\* \* \* \* \*

**3:09 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:*  
*Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk*