

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

MAY 19, 2026

PRESENT:

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

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

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

26-0312 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.

Tammy Holt- Still displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She explained that the Board had before them a response from Washoe County regarding her Facebook post from after she spoke before the Board the week prior. The response from Washoe County informed Ms. Holt-Still that she could visit the Registrar of Voters (ROV) website to find her sample ballot. She replied that seniors, lower-income individuals, rural residents, or others might find computer literacy to be an issue in these demographics. She stated she used the Quick-Response (QR) code, which worked fine on her phone, but not on her computer. She said she typed out the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) into the Google bar, which took her to the ROV website, but not to the sample ballot. She stated that when she put it into the actual browser address bar, it took her to the sample ballot as shown in her displayed document. She asked the Board if they saw anything interesting about the sample ballot. She stated that there were stars on the left, and people listed on the right. She noted that on the sample ballot she was displaying, the people were on the left, the bubbles to fill in were on the right, and the instructions were to fill in the bubbles and not deal with the stars. She asked the Board whether they could see how confusing that could be for people. That, she felt, was confusing and could confuse voters. She explained that, during KTVN 2's Your 2 Cents segment, a woman also said the County was making it confusing. Ms. Holt-Still felt the ballots were neither simple, transparent, nor clear. She displayed a map from her cellphone and said she would give more information about District 5. She felt that her map showed

that there were a lot of areas where people did not receive proper internet and were unable to access something so complex. She felt the County needed to do something different, and that the current state of affairs was not correct. She stated that she had sent the Board an email as recently as the previous week, but only one person had replied. She expressed that she felt the Board should be more concerned about the situation because it was unfair to the people.

Terry Brooks read a poem regarding discrimination against those with physical disabilities.

Randi McCourt stated she was with the Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce (the Chamber) Leadership Class. She explained that one of the assignments for their Civic Duty Project was to come before the Board and make a public comment. She noted that was all she had to say.

Kelly McKeon explained that, like the previous speaker, Ms. McCourt, she was in the same leadership class, and that part of their civic project was to make public comment and, she joked, put the students in really uncomfortable situations. She thanked the Board for having them.

Sean Sullivan stated that the Board may have seen his resume, as he had recently applied for one of the two Washoe County Library Board of Trustees (LBT) positions. He shared that he spent a lot of time in the libraries as a child, and that when other kids were out socializing, he was usually in the library, computer lab, or chemistry lab. He added that he was involved in the chess club and thought all those opportunities were very important for children. He noted that his own children now used the library, so he went to the Spanish Springs Library regularly and felt it had a great facility, staff, and a good selection. However, he noted that the Commissioners were all aware of budget issues regarding the selection, and he hoped to work towards improving that situation. He mentioned that he had experience working with older kids. He explained that he was a lab manager at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and so had experience with Generation Z (Gen Z) children. He declared that they were really the best of the best, that he was in the Chemical and Materials Engineering Department, and that he felt they were all great children. He noted that they were all eager to learn and work, and he thought they needed the same opportunities his generation had as children. He stated that libraries were experiencing the same budget shortfalls as many other departments, which was a tough situation that required dedicated work and service to the community, which he noted he was also committed to. He explained that he was an Eagle Scout and that he served in leadership roles in the American Institute of Chemical Engineers Student Chapter during his time at UNR. He added that he was also able to take on series topics like the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), fire codes, and other engineering topics, which he had gotten used to while working at Ormat Technologies, Inc. for seven years. He noted that he had also handled a decent amount of money building pipelines and various other projects for that same company, which he felt qualified him to handle a budget, as he had written budgets for plant managers. He hoped the Board had seen his letter of recommendation and noted that the gentleman who wrote the letter had known him for a long time. Mr. Sullivan added

that the person was a mentor in the Boy Scouts of America and that he had learned a lot from him. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the person had experience on many boards, and he hoped the Board would consider the recommendation as a serious one. Mr. Sullivan added that the individual was also very serious and busy. He stated that, for his closing remarks, his goal was to give everyone access to all books, whether they were controversial or not. He felt that controversial books were good for the library, even if they simply drew attention to the library and brought in more people. He declared that he wanted to give back to the community for the kids.

Jacob Clodfelter stated that he was also part of the Chamber Leadership Class of 2026. Reiterating what the earlier commenter said, he noted that, for the class, the students got to be in fun, uncomfortable positions. He noted that he had done similar tasks in his normal job with the Nevada Department of Veterans Services, but that those were typically in a different form. He explained that his current comment was part of their civic project to provide a public comment at one of the local boards.

Laura Wetherington stated that she loved the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) and wanted to tell the Commissioners why. She asked them to forgive her for going big, but she felt the library was a beacon of democracy. She believed they lived in a pluralistic democracy, meaning there were competing interests in how things were run. She thought this was part of what made them strong and that the library reflected it. She stated that the library's mission was to connect people with information, ideas, and experiences to support and enrich an engaged community, one person at a time. She expressed that the last part of what she just said, *one person at a time*, was what felt so energizing to her. She explained that it meant the library strove to reflect back to the community the diverse beliefs and interests of its populace, one person at a time. She stated that, for her, it was about the range of books, but also about librarian services. She shared a story about meeting a public librarian 20 years ago in another country, who said that many people did not realize librarians were not simply offering books but, in some sense, were like frontline social workers helping people with job searches and finding resources in the community. She stated that in Washoe County last year, one staff report included the anecdote of a person who had been released from a long prison sentence and needed help setting up an email address. She felt that librarians were public servants in the highest degree, and she therefore wanted to commend the Commissioners for all the support they lent the library system. She knew that being in a pluralistic democracy meant there were other people in the community who disagreed with her, and that while she supported their right to disagree, she did not think a more restrictive library system would be as democratic as the one they had currently. She wanted her child, who was learning to read, to have access to all the books that she and her family deemed appropriate in their household. She did not think this was a question that the government should be trying to solve for everyone, though she did recognize that raising a child was one of the most complex problems many people faced. For her, she felt restricting access to library materials and services was like her going into a restaurant and then objecting to the menu because she was a vegetarian and there were meat options on the menu. She thought the library was a menu and should have all the options, since it was for everyone. She thanked Chair Andriola for the Budget 101 presentation, as it helped her understand that there were complex problems equal to

those of child rearing. She commended the Board for the hard work they did and for the transparency and invitation to the public to understand what they did. She expressed regret that she could not stay for the workshop, as she loved workshops and joked that it appeared they had good snacks.

Penny Brock stated she was before the Board to address the previous meeting's Agenda Item 14, which was to be a data transparency project. She announced that the PowerPoint that was shown was still not available for the public to see. She asserted that a few people had already contacted her wanting to look at that PowerPoint, but could not find it. She stated that due to this, there was a transparency problem from the beginning. The other thing she wondered was if there was a contract. She alleged it was revealed there was a cost to taxpayers, and that despite Vice Chair Garcia's questioning what it would cost taxpayers, the ROV told Vice Chair Garcia the cost was none. She noted that in the Washoe County report from a day or so later, it said there would be a cost to taxpayers because it would involve staff in the project, but did not disclose the cost or how many staff were needed. That, she stated, was another transparency project. She added that not knowing what the Center for Internet Security (CIS) would do with the data they received was another transparency project. She thought it would encompass more than just the voter data and would probably encompass election data. She asked what they were going to do with that data. She expressed that, as a taxpayer, she did not want that organization to have her voter data, and she thought that many voters felt the same and did not want the CIS to have their data because they did not know what the CIS would do with it. She declared that data was a huge commodity currently and could be sold. She suspected that the reason the CIS would not charge Washoe County was that they planned to sell the data. She thought that another issue was that the Board as a body had not voted on the project. It appeared to her that the Commission Chair had just put the project in place unilaterally, which was not the way it was supposed to work. Another reason, she felt, was that public comment was not allowed even though taxpayer funds were involved. She expressed that it should have been voted on by the Board and that there should have been public comment. She stated that, as shown by the previous week, there was a lack of transparency, which was a huge issue. She related another issue, brought up at the end of the meeting after the final public comment, which meant she could not comment on it, and recalled that Chair Andriola mentioned that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) had ranked Nevada as number two in elections. She felt this was from the liberal perspective. She asked County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas to display her document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, which she said showed that the Heritage Foundation ranked Nevada as 47 in the Nation, which she noted placed them third from the bottom for the worst election.

Alexis Marin stated it was her first time giving public comment, so her heart was beating a little faster than usual. She explained that she was with the Children's Advocacy Alliance and was a new addition to their team. She noted she was a health policy manager and she resided in southern Nevada. She added that she was looking to move to Washoe County in the upcoming months to get to know the northern community. She wanted to let the Board know that they had three pillars: child welfare, children's health, and early childhood. She noted they were very interested in creating policy solutions for Nevada. She wanted to make the Board aware that they were very happy to collaborate and

learn. She mentioned that southern Nevada did not encompass the entire State, so she was very interested in learning how to get more involved with Washoe County, along with the other 15 counties that were part of the State. She reiterated that it was great to be in front of the Board and learn from them.

PUBLIC HEARING

26-0313 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Public hearing, discussion, and possible action on the Washoe County Tentative Budget for Fiscal Year 2027 (July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027) pursuant to NRS 354.596-estimated appropriations [\$1,133,146,149], as well as possible changes to the Tentative Budget and adoption of it as the Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2027 pursuant to NRS 354.598-estimated appropriations [\$1,138,146,582]. The proposed budget incorporates Board priorities of funding for existing contractual obligations, supplies, utilities, personnel costs, capital improvements and operations, and maintaining the County's assets and infrastructure needs. The proposed budget also includes the following actions: 1) To approve the changes to position control for Fiscal Year 2027 indicated on Attachment A-including the reduction of 9.68 Net Full Time Equivalents (FTE), Reclassifications/Evaluations/Other Changes impacting up to 34.0 positions/incumbents and Title Only Changes impacting up to 13.0 positions/incumbents. If necessary to accommodate any material changes desired by the Board as identified during the hearing on the Tentative Budget, this item may be continued to May 26, 2026, at 10:00 AM. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Abbe Yacoben and Budget Division Director Lori Cooke conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Public Hearing Washoe County Fiscal Year 2027 Tentative and Final Budget; General Information; FY 2027 Budget July 1, 2026 – June 30, 2027; Strategic Planning Direction; Highlights; Few Material Changes; FY 2027 Budget Totals \$1.14 Billion; Estimated Expenditures and Other Uses Governmental Funds (2 slides); Proprietary And Non Expendable Trust Funds; FY 2027 Budget: Governmental Funds, by Function; FY 2027 Budget CIP; FY 2027 Budget: Proprietary Funds; Washoe County Authorized FTEs; FY 2027 Budget – General Fund; FY 2027 General Fund Budget; Washoe County FY 2027 General Fund Final Budget; General Fund 5-Year Forecast; General Fund FY 2027 Transfers Out; FY 2027 Budget – Personnel Changes; General Fund Recommended Net New Position FTE's; Other Funds Recommended Net New Position FTE's; Next Steps; Questions/Discussion?; Supplemental Information; Financial Structure (2 slides); FY 2027 Budget: Governmental Funds, by Function & Department (2 slides); Fiscal Year 2027 Outlook: What's Changed?; General Fund – Fund Balance; General Fund Forecast Assumptions; Property Taxes – Overview.

Ms. Yacoben displayed the slide titled *Public Hearing Washoe County Fiscal Year 2027 Tentative and Final Budget*. She introduced herself and Ms. Cooke, noting that Agenda Item 4 was a public hearing on the tentative budget as certified by the

State of Nevada Department of Taxation (NDT). She explained that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would conduct the public hearing and then immediately proceed to deliberation on the adoption of the final budget. She displayed the slide titled *General Information*, which outlined the statutory framework under which the budgetary process operated. She indicated that the presentation for Agenda Item 4 would provide a broad overview, with the goals of solidifying the budget, discussing changes implemented since the previous presentation to the BCC on April 14, 2026, and enabling adoption of the final budget on July 1, 2026.

Ms. Yacoben introduced the *FY 2027 Budget July 1, 2026 – June 30, 2027* slide and reiterated that she and Ms. Cooke would not discuss the topic in heavy detail during the presentation. She reported that an appendix was included at the end of the presentation to detail the economic indicators and many other factors that would normally be presented. She noted that those details had also been provided at the April 14, 2026, BCC meeting. She displayed the slide titled *Strategic Planning Direction*. She reminded the Board that staff tailored the budget based on the long-term goals and objectives of the BCC, which were mental health, senior services, and infrastructure. She recalled that the Board held a great workshop meeting the previous month and acknowledged that another one would be conducted in June to discuss priorities for the upcoming several fiscal years (FYs). She stated that staff looked forward to tailoring future budgets to the new long-term objectives. She reported that the BCC's continued goals were to maintain services, keep employees working, and use County resources as wisely as needed.

Ms. Yacoben showed the *Highlights* slide. She explained that no technical changes had been made to the tentative budget since the presentation on April 14, 2026, with only some adjustments to the language. She reported that there were no net new positions in any fund and explained that the term *net* referred to the possibility of transfers between departments, but that no new positions would be added. She noted that an overall decline in positions had been noticed. She stated that General Fund salary savings of approximately 3 percent were being budgeted across all departments for the second consecutive year. She explained that if a position upgrade were approved through the job evaluation committee process, which was collectively bargained for and used across the County for the past 20 years, it would be absorbed by the departments and provide permanent offsets by reducing expenditures in other areas. She reported that FY 2027 would be the first year the library budget would be entirely budgeted in the General Fund. She explained that, while the change was not operationally impactful, it was still a budgetary shift, moving the library budget from the Expansion Fund to the General Fund. She noted that the General Fund transfer to Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH) was increased from approximately \$9.5 million to \$10.5 million in FY 2026, and that staff were proposing to increase the transfer to \$11.5 million in the final FY 2027 budget. She explained that the increase was due to uncertainty in the NNPH's financial forecast and revenue receipts. She reported that the General Fund transfer to the roads fund was increased by \$4 million, after having been increased by \$5 million the year prior. She noted that the \$4 million transfer for FY 2027 was being made in addition to the \$1.6 million that the County transferred to the fund for administrative costs used to ensure that the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score did not further decline from the BCC's policy goal of 73. She

stated that the remaining positions funded by the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) using that grant would be transferred to the General Fund and offset by the interest that had already accrued on those ARPA funds. She explained that the current 1.5 percent General Fund contingency was proposed to be increased to 2 percent for FY 2027. She noted that the five-year forecast anticipated further increasing the General Fund contingency to the 3 percent statutory maximum.

Ms. Yacoben introduced the *Few Material Changes* slide. She reported that the slide listed changes since the tentative budget that was reviewed in depth during the April 14, 2026, BCC meeting. She stated that she considered the changes de minimis in a budget totaling \$1.1 billion. She noted her intent to review those details for transparency and to ensure the Board was fully informed about those factors when voting on the budget. She reported that there would be one new full-time equivalent (FTE) position in the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) for the Alternative Sentencing unit. She explained that since the previous presentation on the tentative FY 2027 budget, it had been determined that the new unit needed casework support, so staff were proposing to increase that by adding a case manager position in that area, at a cost of approximately \$128,000. She reminded the Board that the General Fund would still reflect a net decrease of 2.78 FTE positions. She reported that, as staff reviewed tentative and final figures and estimates for revenue and expenditures, they found that there was a decrease of approximately \$100,000 in use of fund balance for 2027, which was a positive trend that was discovered after reviewing the additional 30 days of data that staff could access since providing the previous presentation. She stated that Ms. Cooke would provide information about the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) during her presentation for Agenda Item 5. She noted that the parks capital fund included four projects that were intended to apply for grants, and as staff reflected that grant revenue in the budget, those projects would also need to be given the spending authority to utilize that funding. She clarified that those funds would not be spent unless the grant revenues were received.

Ms. Cooke displayed the *FY 2027 Budget Totals \$1.14 Billion* slide. She explained that the slide listed details outlining the County's FY 2027 final budget for all funds, which she noted was very similar to the tentative budget. She reported that figures for the FY 2026 final budget were also shown on the slide. She noted that variances between the final budget for the previous FY, adopted on July 1, 2025, and the recommended FY 2027 budget, which would begin on July 1, 2026, were listed in a column on the slide's chart. She stated that, within that period, there was an increase in appropriations of approximately 5 percent in governmental funds and approximately 12 percent in internal service funds, for a total appropriation increase of approximately 6 percent across all funds. She noted that total appropriations included expenditures, transfers out, and contingency. She explained that the \$987 million figure for total expenditures, not including contingencies and transfers out, was listed at the bottom of the slide. She noted that the data on the slide did not include fund balance. She acknowledged that, while some agencies would present their fund balances in addition to their overall expenditures as their total budget, an entity could not spend its fund balance in the State of Nevada unless certain criteria were met.

Ms. Cooke showed the first slide titled *Estimated Expenditures and Other Uses Governmental Funds*. She noted that the County's funds were separated into governmental and proprietary funds, with proprietary funds treated differently for budgeting and for recording expenses in the books. She referred to the chart on the slide and explained that the largest governmental fund was listed at the top. She noted that the special revenue funds were also included on the chart, with the *Health* category including NNPH expenditures. She reported that the *Library Expansion* category was listed with \$0 in total appropriations. She noted that an augmentation was made the previous week to ensure that the fund could be spent in its entirety by the end of the current FY on June 30, 2026. She stated that she would not describe all of the funds included on the chart in detail. She displayed the second *Estimated Expenditures and Other Uses Governmental Funds* slide. She reported that capital funds were included as a part of the governmental funds, which were listed in the slide's chart. She referred to the categories of the *Capital Facilities Tax* and *Capital Improvements Fund* and explained that she would discuss those in further detail during her related presentation for Agenda Item 5, which would also cover the five-year CIP. She noted that the chart also listed the County's debt funds, including ad valorem, which was associated with property tax (p-tax), base operating debt, and Special Assessment District (SAD) debt.

Ms. Cooke introduced the *Proprietary and Non Expendable Trust Funds* slide. She explained that the chart provided the total appropriations for the County's proprietary funds. She stated that the *Building & Safety* and *Golf Course* categories were listed at the top, noting that they were both enterprise funds. She explained that enterprise funds received no subsidies from the General Fund, as they operated on user fees they generated, similar to the *Utilities* category, which was funded by user fees and ratepayer connection fees. She reported that the largest variance in the listed data relative to the previous FY was the golf fund, which she recalled describing during her previous presentation as a one-time transfer with some repayment from the operator for improvements at the Sierra Sage Golf Course. She explained that the health benefits fund, risk management fund, and the equipment services fund were internal service funds that received charges from the County's other funds, which were internal to Washoe County operations. She noted that the health benefits fund covered all County employees and retirees. She reported that the risk management fund and the equipment services fund were almost entirely attributed to the County's fleet. She noted that there was a mechanism that budgeted the funding of County vehicle replacement to allow those resources to be purchased through the equipment services fund.

Ms. Cooke displayed the slide titled *FY 2027 Budget: Governmental Funds, by Function*. She acknowledged that there were often questions regarding what functions the budget supported. She explained that all of the governmental funds she had described for the two *Estimated Expenditures and Other Uses Governmental Funds* slides were included in the two charts on the current slide. She noted that while she had not listed the various funds in order of their total appropriations on the charts, they would be listed in order of the largest number first when separated by department at a later point in her presentation. She stated that the public safety and welfare functions had the highest appropriations on the list, with their combined total accounting for 54 percent of the

County's total governmental fund appropriations. She explained that the judicial and general government functions were the next highest contributors towards the total governmental funds appropriations. She noted that the majority of those budget appropriations were focused on public safety and welfare, which she did not find surprising given the Board's direction and Strategic Plan for community needs.

Ms. Cooke referred to the *FY 2027 Budget CIP* slide and noted that she would discuss capital improvements. She explained that the slide included details on the capital budget appropriations for the capital funds and for other associated funds. She noted that a variance between a capital improvement project and a capital expenditure was that a capital improvement project was defined as projects costing \$100,000 or more, with a useful life of one year or more, while capital expenditures were defined as expenditures greater than \$10,000. She explained that the table titled *FY27 Capital Budget, by Fund (Other Funds)*, was separated due to the County having capital expenditure authority in the General Fund for special revenue funds associated with entities like NNPH, Washoe County Regional Animal Services (WCRAS), and Child Protective Services (CPS), which were some of the many different special revenue funds that made capital purchases, but had not been listed in the same way because they did not necessarily meet the threshold for a capital improvement project. She explained that the State of Nevada required the County to report those appropriations as she had described, which she attributed to the cause of any confusion on the matter. She showed the *FY 2027 Budget: Proprietary Funds* slide. She noted that the slide provided details on the various proprietary fund functions and listed them by the percentage they represented of the total enterprise funds and internal service funds budgets. She reported that the utilities fund accounted for the largest share of the enterprise funds budget, followed by the golf fund and the building and safety fund. She explained that the health benefits fund accounted for the largest share of the internal service funds budget, with the equipment services fund and the risk management fund the next-largest functions.

Ms. Cooke displayed the slide titled *Washoe County Authorized FTEs*. She referred to Ms. Yacoben's brief comments mentioning FTEs previously in the presentation, noting that she would provide additional information on the topic. She explained that the slide's graph began with FY 2008 because that was the year the County had the highest FTEs and represented the period before the 2008 Great Recession. She reported that there were 3,179 FTEs in FY 2008. She clarified that FTE counts reflected only full-time equivalent employees and did not represent all job positions, as the County had departments with part-time employees or other position classifications. She noted that the NNPH and the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) were two such departmental examples. She stated that other departments used a pooled position system, with those employees reflected on the County's books but categorized as part-time or temporary positions. She recalled that election workers were an example of employees who had been pooled or worked on a contractual basis in the past, depending on decisions made by Human Resources (HR) and the requirements of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). She provided an example to demonstrate that FTE data was not indicative of the number of employee positions, noting that if a department hypothetically had a budget of \$10 and the prospective employee was paid \$10 per hour, that would allow for that employee to work

for one hour, with that hour being converted into a fractional number reflected in the FTE data.

Ms. Cooke continued reviewing the *Washoe County Authorized FTEs* slide and stated that it presented data on the number of FTEs across various FYs, with population statistics from the Nevada State Demographer included beneath it for comparison. She noted that between 2008 and 2027, Washoe County's population increased by approximately 21 percent while the total number of FTEs decreased by 23, or 0.7 percent. She noted that the number of FTE's per capita had decreased by almost 22 percent in that period, and the number of residents supported by one FTE had increased by 27.9 percent. She reported that the demand for services had increased with the County's expanded service delivery, including regional homelessness efforts, but noted that those operations were being conducted with fewer FTEs. She explained that achieving such a feat was accomplished by the departments and their employees developing different, more efficient ways to address those needs. She noted that more was being achieved with fewer resources and that costs were increasing. She opined that the data she had described was a testament to the County's ability not only to maintain but also to further expand service delivery without increasing headcount.

Ms. Cooke introduced the *FY 2027 Budget – General Fund* slide, noting that she would discuss the General Fund in more detail. She showed the slide titled *FY 2027 General Fund Budget* and reported that consolidated tax (c-tax) and p-tax were the two largest revenue sources in the General Fund. She stated that p-tax was the largest source of revenue across the County's entire budget. She noted that c-tax and p-tax were two sources that the General Fund heavily relied upon. She explained that c-tax was more volatile and closely followed economic trends based on leading economic indicators, while p-tax was more stable and offered options associated with abatement, as the positive aspect of abatement was that even if the assessed valuation did not increase as quickly as expected and the County utilized some of the abatement, it could still observe growth at a percentage higher than that of the assessed valuation growth. She explained that the two charts on the slide depicted the sources and uses of the General Fund, with the difference between them representing the budgeted use of fund balance.

Ms. Cooke displayed the slide titled *Washoe County FY 2027 General Fund Final Budget*, which contained the same information she had already shown in the previous slide, but presented in a table format. She reminded the Board that there were some one-time revenues and expenditures in FY 2027. She explained that the category titled *Miscellaneous – One Time* in the table on the right reflected the County's estimate for fundraising of the Washoe County Behavioral Health Center (WCBHC) and pre-funding the moving of the ARPA-funded positions Ms. Yacoben had discussed previously. Ms. Cooke noted that there were also one-time transfers out of the General Fund, including \$3 million for the Sierra Sage Golf Course, for which the County would receive repayment from the operator, and approximately \$400,000 for the Capital Improvement Fund. She showed the *General Fund 5-Year Forecast* slide. She noted that the five-year forecast on the slide had been updated since her previous presentation on the tentative and recommended final FY 2027 budgets. She reported that the anticipated rate of growth in

revenues and sources was slower than in expenditures and transfers out. She noted that the FY 2025 results had been better than anticipated, providing an opportunity to prepare for FY 2027. She stated that, if the same trend held in the final results of FY 2026, it would allow the County the same opportunity in subsequent years. She stated that the unassigned fund balance remained within the BCC's reserve policy limit of 10 to 17 percent through FY 2029, but the chart demonstrated that it was expected to decline, and the structural deficit could grow in the later years of the forecast. She reminded the Board that the forecast represented a baseline projection that assumed the continuation of existing service levels and revenue structures if no changes were to be implemented. She noted that additional details regarding those assumptions were provided in the presentation's appendix with supplemental information on the slide titled *General Fund Forecast Assumptions*. She explained that when the actual results for each FY were received, or when staff noticed or anticipated changes, the forecast would be updated accordingly.

Ms. Cooke showed the *General Fund FY 2027 Transfers Out* slide. She noted that a large portion of the General Fund budget's transfers out listed on the slide existed to support expenditures and other funds. She explained that the funds in the table were listed in numerical order from highest amount to lowest rather than in priority order. She stated that the indigent services fund and homelessness fund were related to welfare, which contributed to the welfare function comprising 25 percent of the FY 2027 total governmental funds appropriations, as discussed earlier in the presentation. She referred to the *Road Maintenance* category, noting that it was associated with the County's roads fund. She explained that the *Debt Service* row on the table was associated with transfers, noting that it was comprised of both the p-tax base and the other revenue c-tax base, representing everything being transferred from the General Fund to support debt. She referred to the senior services fund and golf fund, then explained that the regional Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) and Records Management System (RMS) fund was associated with the County's requirement to transfer money for its portion of regional support efforts. She acknowledged that regionalization and the expansion of services were another of the County's commitments, but that they came at an increased cost. She stated that the total for transfers out of the General Fund was approximately \$96 million.

Ms. Cooke referred to the slide titled *General Fund Recommended Net New Position FTE's*. She explained that personnel was the County's largest expenditure. She reported that the General Fund had a total recommended FTE change of negative 2.78 for FY 2027, and she reiterated that there was a difference between FTEs and positions. She noted that there were 34 recommended changes for reclassifications, evaluations, and title changes in the General Fund. She explained that title changes did not affect the position's pay grade, but only the name. She displayed the *Other Funds Recommended Net New Position FTE's* slide. She reported that there was a recommended change in the County's other funds of negative 6.9 FTEs. She reminded the Board that the BCC direction required that positions be authorized only if they were funded. She stated that it was undesirable to have many unfunded positions on the books, with the listed changes in the *Judicial* row of the right table demonstrating that. She reported that when grant funding for the District Attorney's (DA) Office was not provided or renewed, the affected positions remained vacant. She emphasized that those vacant positions did not represent active employees

being laid off, but rather unfilled positions that the County recommended be removed from the books. She reported that there were 13 recommended reclassifications, evaluations, and title changes for the County's other funds.

Ms. Cooke showed the *Next Steps* slide. She stated that the budget encompassed many things, including the County's legally approved appropriations, which were subject to certain statutes that needed to be adhered to if there was any intention to alter them. She noted that the budget also served as the County's financial plan and operations guide. She reported that on June 1, 2026, the County was required to submit the FY 2027 final budget to the NDT. She explained that a review of the Washoe County Checkbook would be presented in July or August of 2026. She noted that, within the next few months, the County would need to submit its five-year CIP to the NDT, which she would discuss further during her presentation for Agenda Item 5. She explained that the County was also required to provide its Debt Management Policy and Statement of Indebtedness to the NDT, which were slated to come before the BCC for approval on June 23, 2026. She displayed the *Questions/Discussion* slide, concluded her presentation, and thanked the Board.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Commissioner Hill commended Ms. Yacoben and Ms. Cooke for their great presentation. She referred to the indigent tax levy and asked whether they could remind her of its history. She acknowledged that Ms. Cooke had substantial knowledge of the topic and asked Ms. Cooke to help her remember when the tax was instituted and what it taxed. She recalled that operating transfers out of the General Fund for indigent services were reported at approximately \$26 million, while total appropriations for the indigent tax levy were listed as approximately \$49 million. She asked whether the appropriations reached that total after adding the homeless services funds. Ms. Cooke explained that the indigent tax levy was a legislative override that would not expire. She noted that the ad valorem tax rate for indigent care could range from \$0.06 to \$0.10, but because of the overlapping p-tax rate cap of 3.66, if the indigent tax levy were increased from \$0.06, the County would have to reduce its operating rate. She stated that the County was required to transfer a portion of that tax to be shared with the State of Nevada and the Cities of Reno and Sparks, as reflected in the \$26 million figure Commissioner Hill had referred to. She noted that the figure she mentioned comprised the \$0.06 portion of p-tax, as well as any other indigent matters for which transfers might be made, such as Medicaid administration billing, grant revenues, and other factors related to that fund. She explained that there were various sources of revenue for the indigent services fund, which included the General Fund transfer in and the p-tax levy. She noted that the County had to pay for many things associated with the indigent services fund, including the Long Term Care County Match Program for nursing home care or unmet care needs in Washoe County.

Commissioner Hill commented on the hospital, and Ms. Cooke clarified that Washoe County did not pay the hospital directly for those matters, though she acknowledged that funds for the unmet care did come through indigent funding, as well as indigent burials and various other programmatic areas. She confirmed that the indigent

fund transferred money into the homelessness fund. She explained that the homelessness fund included transfers in from the indigent fund, the General Fund, and other revenue sources, such as Medicaid administration billing or other grants. Commissioner Hill asked whether indigent funds were being used for children at all, or if that tax levy was specifically used for adults. Ms. Cooke expressed uncertainty about whether those funds were also used for children. County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas suspected that because the fund supported indigent burials, it would also support children's need for those services. She noted that Assistant County Manager (ACM) Ryan Gustafson, who had formerly served as the Division Director of the Human Services Agency (HSA), had nodded his agreement with her statement. CM Thomas thanked ACM Gustafson. She suspected the tax levy was instituted in 1985, but was unsure of the exact date. Commissioner Hill agreed, stating that it had been in place for a long time. Ms. Cooke reminded CM Thomas and Commissioner Hill that those funds were previously limited to indigent medical services, but, through the legislative process, they were expanded to include indigent services as well. She noted that, while she did not have the exact details immediately accessible to her at that time to confirm, she believed that, for children's services, indigent transfers went to the CPS fund rather than those expenditures impacting the indigent fund. Commissioner Hill asked whether most of the services provided by that fund were used by adults, which Ms. Cooke confirmed, and clarified that senior support was also located in the indigent fund. Commissioner Hill stated that she had no further questions and noted that she had only wanted clarification on that matter.

Commissioner Clark referenced the *Washoe County Authorized FTEs* slide and commended County staff for doing more work to account for there being a larger resident population and fewer employees in the County's workforce. He asked whether staff anticipated a time in the future when there would be diminishing returns as a result of County employees no longer being able to successfully manage that discrepancy. He acknowledged that there were only so many hours in each day and a limited number of days in each week for those employees to work. He asked when those limits would be reached and what the impacts of such events might be. He opined that it could reach a point where people could no longer meet the workload the County expected of its employees. Ms. Yacoben thanked Commissioner Clark for his question and stated that his concerns demonstrated why Ms. Cooke had suggested her idea several years prior of changing the budget process by increasing the involvement of departments through the implementation of the budget congress, which had allowed the process to be more collaborative. She opined that Commissioner Clark had asked a good question. She agreed with what he had suspected would happen at some point in the future, and echoed his belief that technology alone could not counter the demands of future population growth, but she believed that collaboration among departments would make a difference in addressing those concerns. Commissioner Clark agreed and asked when Ms. Yacoben anticipated that the threshold for meeting the service demands he had described would be exceeded. He acknowledged that while artificial intelligence (AI) was a tool that could be used for many purposes, it could not give employees extra days to work each week.

Commissioner Clark asked how the County would ensure that necessary services continue to be delivered to citizens without inundating staff with extra work. He

asked how that issue could be addressed beyond just collaborating among the County's various divisions, and opined that additional staff would likely be needed. He asked whether Ms. Yacoben could estimate when such action might be needed and noted that he would not consider her answer final, as he only wanted an answer for future boards and management to consider. Ms. Yacoben noted that she did not have a technical answer to provide. She stated that finding a solution would be about leadership, listening to staff, understanding the workload demands, and considering growth or changes in key performance indicators (KPIs) while keeping staffing levels static and monitoring for the point at which technological assistance stopped matching performance trends. She explained that she did not have an estimate for what year that might happen, reiterated that listening to feedback and working collaboratively would be the solution, and opined that Commissioner Clark's assumptions could be correct. Commissioner Clark inquired whether Ms. Yacoben recognized the issue as a possibility, noting that, while the exact timeframe was currently unknown, he believed the County would consider the issue from a different perspective in the future. Ms. Yacoben agreed and explained that when Ms. Cooke had referred to the five-year forecast, she had acknowledged the need to make changes in order to ensure the budget remained sustainable. She noted that the five-year forecast would need to be changed once staff noticed the trends he had described beginning to occur.

Commissioner Clark referred to the table on the *General Fund FY 2027 Transfers Out* slide. He asked why indigent services had been separated from the homelessness fund, noting that his question had been raised regularly in the past. He stated that most people viewed those classifications as being interchangeable and inquired why the County had divided those groups. He acknowledged that he had heard an explanation of that decision in the past, but he wanted those who had not listened to previous discussions to understand the difference between the two funds, as they appeared to account for two very similar situations. Ms. Cooke explained that the homelessness fund was one of the most recently created special revenue funds and was intended to track the expenditures associated with supporting homelessness initiatives within the County. She recalled that, prior to the creation of the homelessness fund, those expenditures might have been included in the indigent fund, service fund, or the General Fund. She noted that there had previously been General Fund positions that supported those initiatives. She invited ACM Gustafson to correct any of her statements, as she was unsure of their accuracy. She stated that indigent was a broader category than that of homelessness, as there were indigent services that were not exclusively directed towards homeless services. She thought that there were populations, such as homeless working individuals, who might not be considered indigent under the standard definition. She explained that the homelessness fund was created to focus on, better identify, and financially demonstrate what the funds support looked like in its totality, rather than having it distributed across 9 to 10 different funds or departments. She reiterated previous comments on the indigent fund's previous classification as the indigent medical fund, and reported that the indigent fund had changed over time. She noted that the indigent fund had expanded through the legislative process to provide indigent services. She recalled that former Commissioners on the BCC had been very vocal on the matter during their service and had sought increased transparency regarding that funding. She acknowledged that there could be overlap between the

populations served by the homelessness fund and the indigent fund, though she clarified that the funds were not intended to be the same.

Commissioner Clark stated that there was clear differentiation in the public safety function between services like law enforcement and public health. He noted that, while they were included under the same category, there was still a substantial difference between them. He indicated that the same person could receive services from both the indigent fund and the homelessness fund on the same day. He opined that the distinction between the two funds was unclear and that they intersected regularly. Ms. Cooke stated that she could provide an itemized list of the program areas within those funds, though she noted that those details were not available to her at that time. She provided several examples of programs within the homelessness fund, including an initiative with the WCSO to provide outreach and homeless shelters such as the Cares Campus and Safe Camp, as well as the HSA's Our Place Shelter and the Temporary Assistance for Displaced Seniors (TADS) program. She explained that there were defined, differentiated program areas with a degree of specificity, though she reiterated that she did not have the specific details prepared. She offered to provide Commissioner Clark with an itemized list of those details at another time. Commissioner Clark clarified that he had not intended to pressure Ms. Cooke to provide him with an answer unexpectedly. He noted that for the programs she had described within the homelessness fund, such as at the Cares Campus, an individual could also receive indigent services at that location. Ms. Cooke corrected that the process would not work in the way he had implied, because if an individual was receiving case management services through Cares Campus, they would only be accessing that program model. She stated that she did not believe the two funds would overlap or intersect as he had described. She acknowledged that she was not a subject matter expert in that field, but it was her understanding that the resource center and case management program were separate.

Chair Andriola noted that she did not want to interrupt Commissioner Clark and invited him to continue the discussion if he would like to, but she opined that CM Thomas might have additional information that could help clarify his questions if he wanted to hear what she had to say. CM Thomas opined that Commissioner Clark had asked a good question and commended Ms. Cooke for the answer she had provided. She noted that public defense was another service associated with indigency. She stated that the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) defined the care of indigent patients and referred to people who met specific criteria related to insurance coverage, program eligibility, income thresholds, or ineligibility for Medicare or Medicaid. She explained that those qualifying individuals could still qualify with certain income levels, meaning they were not always homeless. She noted that the County's courts could determine indigency to decide whether to provide public defense services. She reported that the County had taken over certain homelessness services in 2021 after being asked to do so, which was approximately the same time the fund was created. She acknowledged that questions regarding that matter and how much the County had spent on that had been raised, and that by separating the homelessness fund and the indigent fund, staff could more easily determine those costs and access relevant information without having to separate those expenses from a much larger comprehensive fund.

Vice Chair Garcia acknowledged that several members of the public in attendance at the meeting were very passionate and concerned about the future of the WCLS. She recalled that the Washoe County Question Number One (WC-1) ballot measure did not pass in 2024, and the Board had passed an augmentation the previous week to spend the remainder of the Library Expansion Fund balance by June 30, 2026. She asked what could be expected for those operations. She stated that many people were unaware that the BCC did not oversee all daily operations of the budget, as there was some distance between what the BCC discussed and what the WCLS Library Board of Trustees (LBT) discussed. She asked Ms. Cooke to provide a brief overview of what the public could expect to change over the following year. Ms. Cooke explained that what Vice Chair Garcia had mentioned represented a substantial budgetary change. She reported that the library fund was moved from the Expansion Fund to the General Fund, and she clarified that a lot of time was spent throughout the previous year to conduct an extensive operational study to ensure that those matters were optimized and that the proposal for moving that portion of the budget into the General Fund was the correct course of action. She explained that, from an operational perspective, the WCLS would be treated the same as all other departments, and that, regarding the budget, the WCLS would no longer have a special revenue fund with the \$0.02 tax revenue source from the WC-1 measure.

Commissioner Hill referred to the topic raised by Vice Chair Garcia and emphasized that no department would receive additional funding during FY 2027, including the WCLS. She stated that the Board would be happy to give everyone those additional funds in ideal circumstances, but unfortunately, the County's budget was losing money due to the tax system. She reiterated that while no one would receive extra money, the Board was not cutting funds from the WCLS. Ms. Cooke clarified that certain departments had received above-base request recommendations, and that when the Board voted on Agenda Item 4 for the budget, they would be approving those recommendations. She explained that the WCLS was treated the same as all other departments in those recommendations. She noted that some specific examples of the above base requests had been approved, while others were denied on the basis of how closely connected they were to the BCC's Strategic Plan and the operations of the County.

Commissioner Hill asked for confirmation on whether most of the above base request recommendations were made because of the changes associated with the Department of Alternative Sentencing (DAS). Ms. Cooke explained that the above base requests that received approval did not fund positions and were predominantly related to operational increases. She noted that the requests had been submitted by departments for necessities required for continuing operations or to test the potential of different technological solutions. She noted that one such example was the Public Defender's Office's request for a one-time above-base transfer, which was a technology solution that they intended to test in order to determine whether it would be useful for their department and whether it had potential usefulness for other judicial functions, such as the Alternate Public Defender (APD) or the DA's Office. She clarified that she was not attempting to tell those departments how to run their operations, but that investments in those solutions could help determine whether the technological implementations could do the work a person might normally do. She noted that the timing in which some of those requests were

received was why they were ultimately deemed to be above base, as her team had not known of them in time so they could be incorporated into the base. She reported that many of those requests would have otherwise been more contract-based or more closely associated with the services and supplies fund. She explained that the bulk of the above base requests her team received were associated with FTEs, personnel, and the related costs, which were ultimately not approved. She referenced Commissioner Hill's previous question and explained that the portion of the budget that had initially been designated in the Expansion Fund had been transferred to the General Fund. She clarified that the transfer was not a reduction in positions or budget authority, but rather reflected that those funds were now being accounted for in the General Fund with the tax offset they had discussed.

Chair Andriola thanked Ms. Cooke and Ms. Yacoben. She noted that the growth results they had reported on were not what she had wanted to see. She opined that the comments about achieving more with the same amount of resources should instead have indicated that more needed to be achieved with fewer resources. She agreed with the previously expressed sentiment that technology could only do so much to address the issues that had been mentioned. She commended Ms. Yacoben, Ms. Cooke, and their team for continuing to consider a hybrid, priority-based budgeting process, which she believed could be a tool to assist them. She referred to the *General Fund – Fund Balance* slide and described the figures on it as alarming. She acknowledged that Ms. Cooke had mentioned that those projections were indicative of what would be expected if no changes were implemented, and Chair Andriola emphasized that the County would not continue doing the same things. She expressed hope that Ms. Cooke and Ms. Yacoben would continue to keep the Board informed by sharing the final numbers and reports with them as they were received by staff.

Chair Andriola thanked CM Thomas and Ms. Yacoben's team for their work on the budget congress to review the budgetary process, ensuring that everyone across departments could feel equally responsible for understanding the County's financial constraints and learning how to work within them. She believed that, as they moved through the upcoming FY, CM Thomas would be dedicated to making that budgetary process more transparent for all departments, especially regarding the previously made comments concerning FTEs, with HR's guidance. She clarified that she was not claiming that the current process had not been followed, but she suspected that adjustments could be made to present a clearer picture, since some people might have understood it differently. She opined that having a policy document that everyone could follow would aid planning and understanding of how those things worked. She thanked Ms. Cooke for scheduling presentations in advance of a budget overview and a review of the Washoe County Checkbook. She expressed her appreciation, noting that everyone was appreciative as well, and that everyone was committed to transparency and valued those efforts.

11:03 a.m. **Commissioner Clark left the meeting.**

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Clark absent, it was ordered that the Final Budget for Fiscal Year 2027 pursuant to NRS 354.598-estimated appropriations [\$1,138,146,582] be adopted and certified. The proposed budget incorporates Board priorities of funding for existing contractual obligations, supplies, utilities, personnel costs, capital improvements and operations, and maintaining the County's assets and infrastructure needs. The proposed budget also includes the following actions: 1) To approve the changes to position control for Fiscal Year 2027 indicated on Attachment A-including the reduction of 9.68 Net Full Time Equivalents (FTE), Reclassifications/Evaluations/Other Changes impacting up to 34.0 positions/incumbents and Title Only Changes impacting up to 13.0 positions/incumbents.

26-0314 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Discussion and possible action on the County Manager's recommended Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2027-2031 and direct the County Manager to submit the CIP to the State of Nevada and others by August 1, 2026 as required by NRS 354.5945 [FY 2027 total appropriations of \$123,236,701] which requires all local governments annually to prepare a five-year capital improvement plan to be submitted to the State Department of Taxation and County Debt Management Commission by August 1st of each year. The CIP is a five-year plan for the County's capital improvements for park facilities, including trails, open space, and regional parks; libraries; roads under purview of the County; purchase of light and heavy fleet equipment; utilities infrastructure; capital outlay for major equipment; and County buildings and other facilities. The CIP is limited to capital projects with an estimated cost of \$100,000 or more for assets that have a life-span of more than one year, as part of the reporting requirements of the State and under Board of County Commissioner (BCC) policies. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

11:06 a.m. **Commissioner Clark returned to the meeting.**

Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Abbe Yacoben and Budget Division Director Lori Cooke conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Fiscal Year 2027-2031 County Manager Recommended Capital Improvement Plan; Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan; Infrastructure Scorecard; CIP Committee; FY 2027 Recommended Projects – Capital Improvements Fund; Total FY 2027 CIP Fund; FY 2027 Parks Capital Fund; FY 2027 Utilities Fund; FY 2027 Recommended Projects – Roads; FY 2027 Capital Facilities Tax; Long Term Capital Needs; Questions/Discussion?.

Ms. Cooke introduced herself to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and displayed the *Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan* slide. She explained that the County was required by the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) to submit a five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to the State of Nevada Department of Taxation (NDT) and the County Debt Management Commission (DMC). She stated that the CIP served as

the County's planning tool for the next five years. She reiterated that the final budget for fiscal year (FY) 2027, adopted during Agenda Item 4, was only applicable to the first year of the CIP and would involve no decisions on the second through fifth years. She reiterated that the Board had adopted a one-year budget, but the County was required to submit a five-year CIP.

Ms. Cooke explained that a capital improvement project was defined as one costing \$100,000 or more and having a useful life of one year or more, with such purchases typically including construction and building improvements, and, occasionally, land replacement, large equipment, or technology systems. She stated that the CIP included new implementations or upgrades to technology systems, such as case management systems. She reported that the County was currently working on an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Modernization Project. She noted that another element of the CIP was the maintenance of the County's current physical assets. She acknowledged that the Board would occasionally see bids brought before them for related projects, such as Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system repairs for one of the housing units at the Washoe County Regional Detention Facility (WCRDF).

Ms. Cooke showed the *Infrastructure Scorecard* slide. She explained that the table on the slide represented the County's infrastructure scorecard, which would be updated again at the end of FY 2026. She reported that the scorecard showed the overall grade for the current state of the County's infrastructure as of June 30, 2026. She noted that, upon comparing the results from FY 2024 on the left side of the scorecard with those from FY 2025 on the right, most condition grades had remained the same. She stated that while the grade for the *Sewer Collection* category had decreased slightly, the grade for *Sewer Treatment* had increased slightly. She noted that both of those categories were associated with the County's utility fund, and the associated projects would be funded through that source. She reported that the baseline for capital infrastructure maintenance and repairs was approximately \$18 million annually, excluding technology expenses. She noted that the baseline she had described would continue to grow alongside costs. She noted that the General Fund base transfer to the Capital Improvements Fund would be \$14 million for FY 2027, and one of the assumptions in the General Fund forecast she had provided during her presentation for Agenda Item 4 was that the transfer would increase by \$1 million per year until the annual required contribution was met to reach the \$18 million baseline.

Ms. Cooke displayed the slide titled *CIP Committee*. She stated that the chart at the top of the slide summarized the County's capital funds, and she listed each fund in the chart. She reported that the CIP Committee was composed of the Assistant County Managers (ACMs), the CFO, the Chief Information Officer (CIO), the Comptroller, the Budget Division Director, and the Community Services Director. She explained that there had not been many departmental submissions for FY 2027 and in recent years prior due to American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) projects and other time-sensitive grants being initiated. She reported that there were still infrastructure and technology submissions, but they were not broad requests from departments to address needs within their offices. She noted that the CIP Committee would be discussing how to proceed with FY 2028, but the

recommendations for FY 2027 were based on submitted requests and available funding, without individual department submissions.

Ms. Cooke showed the *FY 2027 Recommended Projects – Capital Improvements Fund* slide. She explained that the newest projects in the Capital Improvements Fund were listed at the top of the slide's chart and clarified that the slide included only the new recommended projects, not all projects in the CIP. She reported that the listed data was the same as that included in her previous presentation to the Board in April, but she opined that it was still notable. She described several of the listed projects, including the Registrar of Voters' (ROV) warehouse, the Building Automation Systems Upgrade, and the ERP Modernization Project. She noted that the carryover cost from existing projects was currently estimated at approximately \$10.735 million, attributable to ongoing projects that could have begun one or two years prior and would carry forward into FY 2027. She noted that all of those existing projects would be listed in the five-year summary that would be submitted to the NDT. She reported that the total for the Capital Improvements Fund was \$32.4 million. She introduced the *Total FY 2027 CIP Fund* slide, noting that the chart presented an alternative way to depict the data in the table from the previous slide. She explained that the chart showed the fund separated into categories associated with ROV projects, facilities and building projects, and technology infrastructure projects, which included the Project 25 (P25) public safety radio system.

Ms. Cooke displayed the *FY 2027 Parks Capital Fund* slide. She noted that the table on the slide represented the parks capital fund. She explained that the two projects listed at the top of the table, the Roberts Z. Hawkins Amphitheater and the North Valleys Regional Park, were the recommended new projects for the fund. She noted that the projects listed with an asterisk beside their names on the slide would need to receive budget authority, as they were pending grant funding outside the parks capital fund. She referred to the slide titled *FY 2027 Utilities Fund* and explained that the utilities fund contained many of the large CIP projects. She noted that each of the listed projects in the slide's table also cited the funding source for each listed project. She reported that the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility (STMWRF) projects were continuing and would be funded by either utility rates or the associated utility connection fees. She explained that there were different funding sources within the utilities funds for the listed projects. She noted that some of the listed projects were funded by State Revolving Fund (SRF) loans, which she described as bonds issued through the State of Nevada that the County received at advantageous interest rates.

Ms. Cooke showed the slide titled *FY 2027 Recommended Projects – Roads*. She described the County's roads fund and noted that she could defer discussion on the topic to staff from the Community Services Department (CSD) if desired. She reported that there were still some pending FY 2027 areas associated with the slurry seal project, and an item would be brought before the Board the following week for a bid for slurry seal, which was related to the FY 2026 budget. She explained that the *Equipment Services Capital* category included the County's heavy and light vehicle fleet and involved equipment replacement for road maintenance and patrol vehicles. She noted that the *Other*

Fund Projects category was associated with the items that met the capital purchase threshold within the County's special revenue funds and the General Fund.

Ms. Cooke displayed the *FY 2027 Capital Facilities Tax* slide. She explained that the capital facilities tax appropriations were not included in the calculation for the capital projects total of \$132.2 million because that tax did not fund capital improvement projects. She reported that the capital facilities tax was a \$0.05 property tax (p-tax) that was collected and deposited into the capital facilities tax fund. She noted that approximately 60 percent, or about \$7.6 million, of the revenue from that tax was transferred to the State of Nevada Highway Fund, and approximately 11.25 percent, or around \$1.4 million, went to the Cities of Reno and Sparks. She explained that, following those two transfers, the County distributed a portion of the remainder from that tax to the roads fund. She noted that all financial activity and budget associated with the roads were located in the roads fund, so staff would not need to track down expenditures across various funds or split them between multiple funds. She stated that the capital facilities tax also included minimal service and supply costs.

Ms. Cooke referred to the slide titled *Long Term Capital Needs*. She stated that the County's long-term capital needs were an important topic for the BCC and acknowledged that the Board had held separate workshops on the matter. She noted that the slide included a list of the significant outstanding needs. She reported that funding sources for all items on the list had not yet been fully identified, though staff had made progress in addressing information technology (IT) infrastructure needs through the ERP Modernization Project. She explained that while small projects could occasionally be implemented to help address some of the more urgent capital needs, the majority of those needs required the County to wait for \$400 million to \$600 million to complete the related projects. She noted that those estimates were based on past reports and would likely be higher if calculated more recently, given current cost increases. She noted that no final decisions had been made on projects to address the listed needs and that the Board's vote to approve the CIP would not directly result in approving funding for the listed projects in the later years of the five-year plan. She clarified that the listed needs were included in the CIP because they may need to be reviewed if the County were to issue debt. She explained that even if the County had the capacity for such action, it would still be necessary to maintain the ability to repay those funds, which required identifying a repayment source not being used for any other purpose.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Commissioner Clark referred to the *FY 2027 Capital Facilities Tax* slide and asked what percentage of the payments to the State of Nevada Highway Fund were used exclusively in the County. Ms. Cooke agreed that it would be great to have that information. She noted that staff could not receive accounting for some of the funding sources transferred to the State General Fund, such as the Governmental Services Tax (GST). She elaborated that not having received the information in the past did not mean staff could not try again, but she presumed there was no requirement or specific report detailing how much of those funds were spent within specific borders after they were

distributed to the State Highway Fund. Commissioner Clark asked Ms. Cooke whether it was possible to determine how much Clark County comparatively remitted to the State of Nevada. Ms. Cooke stated that she could find out more information on that matter. She noted that Clark County also had supplemental GST, so she was unsure of that funding structure or whether it operated similarly due to the difference in size between the two counties. She assured him that she would research the matter further. Commissioner Clark acknowledged that the size was disproportionate to the population and that other factors were involved, but he stated that it would be interesting to verify whether those percentages were comparable to the amount Washoe County sent to the State of Nevada.

Commissioner Herman reported that she had heard speculation that the economy might be stagnating in the near future. She asked how the County could protect itself. She stated that she was already aware that the County needed to budget in accordance with the available information, but asked about the potential impacts of those economic changes and how they might affect the County's operations. Ms. Yacoben thanked Commissioner Herman for the question and noted that the concerns she raised underscored the importance of the five-year budget forecast she presented during Agenda Item 4. She noted that staff had not seen any decline in p-tax and consolidated tax (c-tax) revenue, which comprised 80 to 82 percent of the County's total General Fund revenue, but the growth in those revenue sources had noticeably slowed. She explained that such a discrepancy in those estimates was the reason staff provided the Board with both the budget for the current FY and five years of financial forecasting, as it ensured that staff could make informed decisions with the collaboration of all 24 of the County's departments. She emphasized that her team was trying to remain as nimble as possible by providing the BCC with forecast information, reviewing it routinely, and presenting the Board with their ideas. She explained that staff were aware of those concerns and had noted them when Doctor (Dr.) Eugenia Larmore presented those economic changes to the Board during a previous BCC workshop meeting in January. She recalled that Dr. Larmore had indicated that the previously used prediction methods were broken and the process that had helped staff predict the five-year forecast in the past would no longer work. She acknowledged that staff needed to be creative and nimble in those efforts. Commissioner Herman thanked Ms. Yacoben.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that the County Manager's recommended Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2027-2031 be adopted and the County Manager be directed to submit the CIP to the State of Nevada and others by August 1, 2026 as required by NRS 354.5945 [FY 2027 total appropriations of \$123,236,701] which requires all local governments annually to prepare a five-year capital improvement plan to be submitted to the State Department of Taxation and County Debt Management Commission by August 1st of each year.

11:19 a.m. **The Board recessed.**

11:28 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

26-0315 **AGENDA ITEM 6** STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP AND UPDATES TO THE BOARD (Workshop Item) - The purpose of the Strategic Planning Workshop is to provide the Board with information and receive guidance for a unified vision of success and expected outcomes. Topics of discussion include: clarifying Washoe County’s role and the role of partners in building housing capacity; concepts to be aware of and are important for constraints on future growth; and concepts for possibly prioritizing residential growth areas, including incentives, funding, benefits, and tradeoffs. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas introduced Agenda Item 6 to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and opined that the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) discussion from Agenda Item 5 was a great way to lead into the current item’s broad discussion on housing growth and infrastructure, particularly for those who had not been able to participate in the BCC’s two previous workshop meetings. She stated that the current item represented the second of three planned strategic planning workshops intended to discuss strategic priorities and topics as the Board explored areas they might be interested in developing strategies to address.

CM Thomas recalled that the BCC had previously hosted an immersive budget workshop meeting as the first strategic planning meeting, with the current item representing infrastructure as the topic of the second workshop in the series, while the third and final strategic planning workshop, which would be related to data governance, was scheduled for June 2, 2026. She acknowledged that important members of the community were present at the meeting to discuss the topics she had described. She stated that she wanted to ensure everyone understood that Agenda Item 6 was not an action item and was intended to facilitate collaborative idea development and allow the Board to provide input.

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro and Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) Director of Regional Planning, Doctor (Dr.) Jeremy Smith conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Growth, Housing, & Infrastructure; Agenda; Washoe County’s Role in Regional Housing; Housing Discussion Flow; Washoe County housing and partnerships; Washoe County housing efforts achieved; Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA); Regional Plan Structure; Regional Form Objectives; Tier Change Example; Housing Our Future.

ACM Solaro introduced himself and stated that with him were Dr. Hilary Lopez, Executive Director of the Reno Housing Authority (RHA), and Dr. Smith. He stated they would very briefly step into the first topic, as they felt the topic flowed between all three of the discussion topics on Washoe County and regional housing planning for constrained growth. Then they would prioritize discussion, which they were calling prioritized development areas.

ACM Solaro shared the slide, titled *Washoe County housing and partnerships*, and said the Commissioners would recall that there had been extensive discussion around housing and Washoe County’s role. He stated that, as a region, they had

discussed housing for quite some time and that all the local jurisdictions really understood the needs and gaps. He thought they also knew that a single entity could not solve the problem, instead it required a number of people to work through it. He added that they had experts in attendance to help guide them through that. He noted that they had the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Housing Study in 2016, which identified some needs. He added that the Commissioners had moved forward with some of the recommendations outlined in those studies, including establishing the Washoe County Affordable Housing Trust Fund. He felt that was a big step in the region, trying to spur growth and solutions that Washoe County needed. He pointed out that there was also a discussion about public resource investment, focusing on where the County invested its funds in infrastructure to not only lower costs but also reduce maintenance costs over time. He stated they would hear some good discussion around that. He explained that, by Board direction, they had adopted the Envision Washoe 2040 Master Plan, along with the current Washoe County Strategic Plan, which had set the tone for the unincorporated portions of Washoe County. He said that what they were doing in the current meeting was specific to how they could influence housing in unincorporated Washoe County, and was not a discussion around homeless services, emergency shelter, or permanent supportive housing. He added that was the right-hand side of the housing continuum, which they had put into place.

ACM Solaro shared the slide, titled *Washoe County housing efforts achieved*, and stated that it was a recap of the Washoe County strategic initiatives they had put in place over the years, along with all the things the Board had provided direction on through the Strategic Plan that had been or were nearly realized. He expressed that the items were among the things they had been able to do, such as doing their part in the missing middle housing study and diversifying the housing types in unincorporated Washoe County. He noted that those things allowed developers to come in because it was not only government entities and residents, but also developers, who were their partners throughout the process. So, he added, they worked with residents, developers, and the whole community to define and create a toolbox of solutions. He stated he would turn the discussion over to Dr. Smith to set the stage for what regional planning was and how the TMRPA fit into it.

Dr. Smith shared the slide, titled *Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA)*, and introduced himself. He stated that the principal function of the TMRPA was to create and administer the regional plan. He noted that it was the cover of the document on the slide he was displaying. He clarified that the TMRPA was first established by State statute in 1989 and had been substantively updated every five years, with a major overhaul in 2019. He noted that many of the Commissioners served on that board and were there during the overhaul, so they would be aware of what happened, but added that it was intended to foster collaboration among the three jurisdictions in Truckee Meadows regarding master planning. He stated that the goal of the regional plan was to be a collaborative effort that brought everyone together, including what they called affected entities, which were organizations such as the school district or the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), to make sure that they were all aware of similar planning initiatives and keep everyone in alignment.

Dr. Smith referred to his slide and pointed out the TMRPA's jurisdiction, which he noted was the shape on the left in the middle of the slide. He stated the Board might be familiar with that area, such as Washoe County. He added that their jurisdiction extended to the Oregon border, but that most of what they dealt with focused on the TMSA, which he described as the gray blob at the bottom of Washoe County on his slide. He noted that if they switched to the topographic shaded relief map, they could see a black outline with many colors inside, representing the intensity of development across that service area. He believed this was created from a National Land Cover Database (NLCD) set in the past. He clarified that some of the shown areas were currently underdeveloped, but that within the boundary, about 99 percent of the population resided. He defined the boundary as the area within which one could expect municipal services to be adequate and available, or within a 20-year time frame, based on planned infrastructure. He noted that the area inside the boundary was their focus area, but that they sometimes worked in the rural area.

Dr. Smith explained that their organization had three levels. The top, he clarified, was the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB). He stated that the Commissioners had either been part of that board or could be part of it. He noted that it was elected officials from three jurisdictions who came together to preside over amendments to the plan budget, the agency's administration, and any appeals. He explained that most of the technical work was done at the level below, which was the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission (TMRPC), composed of three members from the planning commissions of each local jurisdiction. He noted there was also a five- to six-person staff, and that they had a good number of interns at the moment. He added that it was a small staff, but they were trying to do as much as they could with what they had.

Dr. Smith shared the slide, titled *Regional Plan Structure*, and clarified that, in terms of regulatory role and casework, a few factors triggered their formal regulatory process, including master plan conformance review. That, he noted, was anytime the Board or any jurisdictions or affected entities wanted to change their master plan or facilities plan, which required a conformance review. That, he pointed out, was the majority of the work that they did. He noted that there were also cases where the master plan did not need to be changed, but the project was of significant size, and those were called projects of regional significance. He clarified that type of project would also require review against the regional plan. He gave the example of a threshold of 625 or more housing units in a subdivision, which would trigger their process. He noted there were many triggers. He pointed out that there were also regional plan amendments, where if they were going to change the plan, they had to go through a collaborative process.

Referring to his slide, Dr. Smith stated that his team had done a lot of work on three pillars, with regional plans at the top. That, he added, was the policy document, which was how they addressed the changes in the conformance review. But underpinning it, he noted, was a natural resources document and data warehouse that provided a foundation for their natural resource policies. He stated that they had narratives on different natural resource topics and a public infrastructure document that covered some of the topics raised in the previous agenda item, such as who did what in the region across certain infrastructure domains, along with how and where the TMRPA was spending. He

explained that they were working on the third pillar, which concerned population and housing, and that it was part of their mandate under State law to do so. He summarized it all as the regulatory structure.

Dr. Smith shared the slide, titled *Regional Form Objectives*, and stated that in 2019, when they substantially revamped the plan, they developed the regional form map he was presenting, which was map two of the regional plan. He detailed how, in an attempt to stay regional and non-jurisdictional, in collaboration with all the jurisdictions and entities, they designated their tiering system, which they called Regional Land Designations. He noted there were five tiers. Referring to his slide, he explained that the darkest blue area in the center was Mixed-Use Core (MUC) and was where they actually saw the minimum requirements for housing density. He clarified that meant they did not want to put large lots in the downtown area, but instead wanted to see the density where they had already built it. He explained that the next shade of blue was Tier 1 Lands, which was basically the McCarran ring area, as well as the old transit-oriented development corridors along Virginia, north and south, all the way out to the Stead Airport and down to the Summit Mall and Redfield areas. He noted that it was an area they wanted to see grow, with no minimum or maximum. He added that they could leverage the infrastructure investments already made in those areas. He explained that the lighter blue was Tier 2, which was a suburban tier limited to a maximum of 30 dwelling units per acre, per the regional plan. That, he stated, was where one could expect to see a majority in the region, especially for single-family housing. He explained that the gray area was Tier 3, much of which corresponded with unincorporated Washoe County. He noted that the areas in Tier Three were either built to low density or, at the current time, lacked the necessary infrastructure and service provisions to support growth.

Dr. Smith explained that there was a process to change tiering through a regional plan amendment, and that for good ideas that met general criteria, they could figure out how to afford to implement them. He explained that, finally, everything outside the TMSA was called the Rural Area, which had five-acre lot minimums, along with Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH) requirements for well and septic control, and so they consisted of large lots, ranches, and similar properties. He pointed out that they were not an authority on the Tahoe Basin or tribal lands.

Dr. Smith shared the slide, titled *Tier Change Example*, and stated that he wanted to give an example of the tiers. He explained that since being established in 2019, they had seen approximately a one to two percent change in the tiers. The tier system and regional land designations, he noted, were really based on three things: data analysis of where they had density, where they had infrastructure, and where they were planning for infrastructure; what the local jurisdiction master plans said, and what those designations were; and the negotiations between jurisdictions used to achieve the outcomes. He stated that they wanted to ensure they had a criteria-based path to change tiers when good ideas arose. He shared an example from a few years prior, of Chocolate Drive in unincorporated Washoe County in Sun Valley. He referred to the map and stated that if they looked at the first map on the left, there was a medium blue color representing Sun Valley, and that there was some orange on the left side, which was the subject site for Chocolate Drive. He related that they had drawn a buffer along Sun Valley Boulevard of approximately half a mile,

which was how they created the Tier 1 geography, but then an affordable housing project came through seeking funds. The TMRPA thought it was a good idea that they wanted to support, and felt that the project would help the facilities and services in the area, and housing choices in the region. He stated that, through collaboration with staff at Washoe County, they initiated the tier change process, completed the criteria, and achieved the change to Tier 2, enabling at least 240 affordable housing units in Sun Valley. He felt it was exciting and was exactly what was intended with the process. He added that prior to the 2019 plan, it would not have been possible because, due to the settlement agreement via regional planning and legal things that occurred, unincorporated Washoe County was limited to a maximum of five dwelling units per acre. That project, he noted, was six dwelling units per acre, so it would have been diminished, and therefore they would not have had as many affordable units. But by creating a criteria-based process in which they all worked together, he explained, they could support good ideas, such as the example he had just relayed.

Dr. Smith shared the slide, titled *Housing Our Future*, and noted that at that same time the TMRPA was updating the plan, they were also participating in a community effort, which ended up being called Housing Our Future, which was a regional strategy for housing affordability, working with Enterprise Community Partners, a Nationwide nonprofit that was an expert in affordable housing methods, protocols, and strategies. He added that they also worked with Truckee Meadows Healthy Communities and all jurisdiction partners, with significant community input, including banks that invested large sums in the project, all of which gave the TMRPA a profile in the community.

Dr. Smith noted that in 2017 to 2018, they understood median incomes, home prices, and the needs, and also had a list of strategies to protect and preserve affordable housing. Finally, he noted, they also created a set of over 30 action items for the community. He mentioned that one action was for them to create a map of where affordable housing properties were in town, which they had done, and was shown in the picture at the top right of his slide. He explained that many of them had been accomplished, even though some might not have been appropriate in the end or were still things they wanted to try to achieve. He stated that he would turn the presentation over to Dr. Lopez.

Chair Andriola asked if Vice Chair Garcia could ask some questions.

Referring back to the tier rankings, Vice Chair Garcia asked if the tiers were established in 2019.

Dr. Smith said that was correct.

Vice Chair Garcia stated that she represented Sun Valley all the way down to Wooster, Keystone, and east McCarran, and that much of the development discussed was in her district. She stated she was keenly aware of the struggles that many of her constituents faced. She shared that she was in Hidden Valley the day prior, and when one looked at the infrastructure in an unincorporated part of Washoe County, with wider streets, no sidewalks, no lighting, plus culverts and ditches, she felt those made more sense in the

unincorporated areas. But, she explained, they had the same situation in Sun Valley, though with 20,000 or more people. She asked at what point did TMRPA, as an organization, look at the population increase from 2019, when it was originally discussed and approved in Sun Valley, to what it was facing and feeling currently in terms of traffic and population growth. She stated that, prior to her being on the Board, they made the move to increase the density and designate it as a place that had no minimums and no maximums as a goal they wanted to target. But, she continued, she was feeling some anxiety over the changing colors on the maps, particularly in those areas, because she thought it was geographically constrained. She noted they had outdated or no infrastructure because it was an unplanned development, unlike many other parts of Washoe County. She felt that history was unique in how Sun Valley came to be. She stated that there were very few places in the County where one could see multi-jurisdictional spaces. She added that they had the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), County roads, and private roads, along with all the serial parceling that happened in between. She asked whether there was a point at which traffic flow and peak hours became too congested and chaotic. She noted that they did not have any stormwater drainage, which they were looking to improve if they received the \$25 million in federal funding to improve Sun Valley Boulevard. She worried that, even though they had designated the area as Tier 2, changing the map was imposing additional constraints on the existing weak infrastructure. At what point, she wondered, would they decide enough was enough.

Dr. Smith felt that was a good question and agreed that there was a limit to density, and that existing infrastructure and service systems could be overwhelmed. He felt that in the case of Sun Valley, if he thought back to 2019, the thinking was that it was relatively close to the core. It was served by transit, and to some degree already served lower-income populations, and there was already density there. He clarified that this was potential density, not required density, but that, through the development process and investment in higher-density projects, one could achieve some of the improvements that helped address what was being discussed. He thought that was the thinking of going up instead of out, which led to that designation. He reiterated that it was not a requirement and noted that it was a change from what would have previously been an arbitrary limitation of five dwelling units per acre in that whole area, which may have been appropriate, but did not necessarily bring the level of investment that would lead to some of those improvements that were needed.

Vice Chair Garcia agreed and thought that she and Commissioner Herman had really wanted to bring attention to the possibilities and potential along the commercial corridor of Sun Valley Boulevard. She clarified that she was speaking about housing developments that were putting increasing strain on a very stressed infrastructure system, and wanted to bring attention to the day-to-day experiences and know what the process was for it to ever go back to a Tier 3.

ACM Solaro added that the regional plan was an enabling document by that point, as it allowed Washoe County and the Commissioners to make those policy decisions. He added that they did not go in and change any zoning or anything associated with any of the land uses around Sun Valley or any other parts of Washoe County where they had a

tier change. He noted that they were essentially two different things, but that they had had many conversations with staff about what it would look like if they intensified certain areas. He felt the discussion would come up later in the meeting, and they could talk through some of the constraints and the tools available. He stated that the majority of the area was still considered Tier 3 because they had not updated their zoning and Master Plan at the County level.

Vice Chair Garcia shared that the Board recently had a very controversial agenda item regarding a development within the TMSA boundary and noted that many constituents, including herself, had never really looked at the dotted line in the Master Plan that defined the TMSA boundary. She asked whether the boundary ever changed or remained relatively static.

Dr. Smith replied that it was mostly static, though it could be changed. He explained that they entertained amendments to the TMSA once a year, around October through December, but that since he had been involved around 2011, they had seen very little change, such as small expansions to accommodate a school and a single development in Sparks, along with some removal of the TMSA in the Spring Mountain area.

Dr. Lopez conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Reno Housing Authority; Who We Are; Affordable Housing Overview; Funding and Challenges (2 slides); Development; Partnerships; How RHA is Different; Looking Forward; Questions?.

Dr. Lopez mentioned that RHA Deputy Executive Directors Heidi McKendree and JD Klippenstein were in attendance. She said that she appreciated the opportunity to speak with the Board and to share more about the RHA and the many ways that the RHA team worked to serve the community. She addressed a prior comment made by Dr. Smith regarding the regional housing strategy roadmap and shared that the document had been recently reviewed. She mentioned that the RHA was determining which of the designated strategies identified for the RHA had been achieved, which remained valid, and which needed to be revisited due to changes in the community. She noted that her presentation showed the RHA had been tasked with increasing capacity rather than undertaking development, which she felt had been accomplished. She said that the RHA was poised to facilitate conversations if the community was interested in revisiting the remaining strategies.

Dr. Lopez reviewed the slide titled *Who We Are* and said the RHA was created by the City of Reno in 1943, but since then, the service area had grown to include all of Washoe County. She explained that, in collaboration with the County and City Managers, the RHA was working to implement State legislation that would transform and transition the governance structure to provide for more formal regional representation. She shared that Vice Chair Garcia was recently appointed to the RHA Board and would represent the Commissioners. She stated that through the RHA and its subsidiary, Washoe Affordable Housing Corporation (WAHC), approximately 11,000 Nevadans were served annually as a bedrock for local housing solutions. She said that, through the Moving to

Work (MTW) designation, received in 2013 from the United States (US) Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the RHA served as a National Housing Policy Lab, finding ways to evolve and maximize its impact.

Dr. Lopez reviewed the slide titled *Affordable Housing Overview* and said it provided an overview of affordable housing, although most people associated the RHA with traditional public housing and the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV), formerly Section 8, and added that the RHA offered so much more. She mentioned that, in addition to those programs, the RHA had used various federal, State, and local funds, to acquire and develop over 900 additional affordable housing units spread throughout the County. She explained that most of the developments housed extremely low-income or very low-income seniors, veterans, disabled households, and families who would otherwise struggle to afford housing. She noted that because of the RHA, tenants and clients had access to attractive, high-quality housing that met their needs throughout the County.

Dr. Lopez reviewed the first slide titled *Funding and Challenges* and said that while the RHA worked to serve as many families as possible through its voucher programs, demand for those services greatly exceeded supply. She shared that there were about 10,000 unduplicated households on the waitlists, and although staff were constantly working through applications, it could take between 18 to 24 months or longer for a family to receive voucher assistance. She mentioned that at the federal level, insufficient funding for the Emergency Housing Voucher (EHV) Program meant the RHA had to shift and prioritize moving vulnerable households into the regular HCV Program. She said the effect was that the RHA needed to slow the release of turnover vouchers to new families, meaning families would need to wait longer on the waitlist before receiving assistance. She stated that in most years, the federal government prorated HCV administrative funding, and unrestricted funds or reserves were used to fully operate the program. She noted that public housing had been underfunded for many years, and though the RHA maintained high-quality public housing, it had to strategically begin repositioning the properties to enable holistic rehabilitation, preserving the critical units while ensuring the future financial viability of the properties.

Dr. Lopez reviewed the second slide titled *Funding and Challenges* and said that, given the significant need for more affordable and attainable housing throughout the County, the RHA had recently taken on a larger role in preserving and developing housing. She explained that recent funding and land-acquisition opportunities, such as the State's Home Means Nevada initiative and the City of Reno's fee waivers, helped advance those efforts. She shared that those funds were dwindling, that the reserves were limited, and that the RHA needed to seek other ways to fill funding gaps or reduce project costs. She suggested that local governments could help the RHA sustain momentum by allocating local funds to the RHA, donating excess land, or reducing regulatory fees or barriers, such as zoning requirements.

Dr. Lopez reviewed the slide titled *Development* and said that the RHA had tried to take on a larger role in preserving public housing and undertaking new development in recent years. She thought those strategies had created a noticeable difference in affordable housing while also infusing approximately \$200 million into the local economy,

leveraging over \$68 million in private equity funding, and providing local construction and property management jobs. She mentioned that economic development was slated to continue through pipeline projects shown on the slide, such as Hope Landing, which was planned to break ground on 15 new community-driven, permanent supportive housing units in late May. She added that the Reno Avenue Project, when fully funded, would create 42 apartments in a high-opportunity neighborhood.

Dr. Lopez reviewed the slide titled *Partnerships* and said that addressing the region's housing problems required more than one strategy and that the RHA could not fix all the issues alone. She explained that to best leverage the RHA's human and financial resources, the RHA routinely partnered with the three jurisdictions, the local continuum of care, local nonprofits, and other stakeholders to ensure it made the greatest impact and progress in addressing the affordable housing crisis. She noted that the partnerships listed on the slide demonstrated the breadth of the program supported through funds, project-based vouchers, resource and referral efforts, and the development of community-driven housing. She mentioned that the RHA had recently partnered with Washoe County to provide funding towards Housing and Homeless Services (HHS). She said that the RHA had recently taken on property management of the Cares Campus, a permanent supportive housing property. She stated that the RHA was also working with all jurisdictions on changes across the continuum of care, as well as a variety of other projects.

Dr. Lopez reviewed the slide titled *How RHA is Different* and said that the RHA was committed to community-driven housing and its goal was to work with the local jurisdictions, their elected bodies, and the RHA's Board to undertake demonstration projects, development, and preservation that best met local needs and filled the void within the local housing market. She noted that the RHA was a public steward of high-quality, permanently-affordable housing and focused on serving those with the lowest incomes, including seniors on fixed incomes, veterans, and households with disabilities. She pointed out that part of the RHA's mission was to provide stable, affordable housing, which was the foundation that enabled those being assisted to move towards economic self-sufficiency through participating in programs such as Pathways to Prosperity, where educational enhancement, workforce development training, nutrition and wellness, and other skills were offered to help clients transform their lives. She mentioned that she had provided the Board with handouts on some of the RHA's programs ahead of time to provide additional information and added that she could return at another time to provide more.

Dr. Lopez reviewed the slide titled *Looking Forward* and said that the RHA would continue to be a regional leader and partner in advancing housing solutions and policy. She stated that the RHA could be the regional leader by continuing to reposition critical public housing for long-term sustainability, acting as a convener to bring groups together, and facilitating regional discussions and solutions to the community's housing challenges. She added that the RHA hoped to increase the supply of much-needed permanent supportive housing and other income-targeted housing. She indicated that the RHA needed to work to secure key parcels and, regionally, to either self-develop or partner with others to build new community-driven housing. She emphasized the importance of being innovative in developing new funding streams, utilizing cutting-edge construction

practices, expanding resident programming to support the RHA's mission, and making housing more attainable for Washoe County residents.

Dr. Lopez thanked the Board for their time and the County for their partnership and willingness to discuss ways that Washoe County could support the RHA and its efforts to make housing more attainable.

Chair Andriola introduced Kamryn Onorato, the Principal Strategist from OnStrategy. Chair Andriola thanked Dr. Lopez for her presentation and stated that the goal was for everyone to work together.

ACM Solaro mentioned that the intention was to collaborate and to address community concerns that the Board had heard from its constituents in unincorporated Washoe County regarding housing capacity to help shape part of the Strategic Plan.

Commissioner Hill thanked the presenters for joining the Workshop. She expressed her appreciation for Dr. Lopez and her team. She indicated that Dr. Lopez had been a great partner on projects in Incline Village and Crystal Bay through the Lease to Locals Program and had served as a fiscal agent. She thanked Dr. Lopez for the many projects that the RHA was doing with fewer resources. She said she looked forward to collaborating with the RHA to develop a workforce housing project through a Request for Proposal (RFP) if the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) supported it. She indicated that although the project would take some time, it would greatly benefit the Lake Tahoe area. She mentioned that her constituents had said they enjoyed living in the community, but that the infrastructure was not keeping pace with growth. She stated that there were not enough parks for families and that the amount of traffic made the roads unsafe. She felt that although the area continued to grow, it was important to keep the community safe. She shared that the community was concerned about the lack of available housing. She indicated that some housing units in Incline Village had been vacant for many years. She thought some of those owners were finding ways to reduce their tax liability or using their properties as short-term rentals (STRs). She explained that although some restrictions had been put in place, it was difficult to restrict the use of private properties, which she believed was not unique to Incline Village. She emphasized the importance of creating more housing options. She suggested exploring incentives for property owners who had invested in housing to encourage them to rent out properties rather than leave them vacant. She proposed that investors consider not purchasing rental properties so other families could have access to that housing.

Dr. Lopez thanked Commissioner Hill for her thoughtful words. She said the RHA was happy to partner with Washoe County on various projects. She explained that when the RHA looked for locations for their development projects, they sought either infill sites or other parcels near public transportation, amenities, employment centers, existing community resources, and infrastructure.

Dr. Smith said that his next presentation would include efforts to synthesize how the TMRPA provided infrastructure and services, along with investments. He

described it as an attempt to bring together many separate jurisdictions and organizations that all provided services. He emphasized the importance of collecting the information, the consensus at the bottom, and memorializing it at the top so that it reflected a collective vision. He thought the essential details should be handled locally, but suggested creating the infrastructure to maintain the existing quality of life and accommodate growth.

Vice Chair Garcia thanked the presenters. She shared that she was unaware that the RHA had been active for over 80 years, which she found historic. She admired that the RHA provided not only housing but also wraparound services for individuals of all ages, and that it understood how interconnected housing, education, health care, and social determinants of health were critical to people's ability to stay in their homes. She complimented Dr. Lopez and the RHA team for their understanding of the holistic perspective on housing. She mentioned that her constituents were concerned about the lack of diverse housing types. She shared that when she moved to Washoe County in 1998 for college, the only housing options were single-family or multifamily homes. She suggested that housing had not changed much in nearly 30 years and added that Washoe Valley was largely populated with single-family homes. She noted that recently, more condominiums and townhouses had become available in the housing market, which she felt would offer a different option, at various price points, for families. She said that the County had been focused on allowing more duplexes, fourplexes, and cottage courts. She mentioned that she had a discussion with Dr. Lopez, focusing on multigenerational housing types in which families could have their aging relatives live on their property to prevent senior isolation. She opined that recent college graduates had no affordable housing available. She explained that she purchased her first home with her brothers in 2007, before the economic downturn. She emphasized the importance of all jurisdictions working together to prioritize different housing types. She questioned whether certain types of homes were more expensive or more difficult to build than others and added that she commonly suggested building condominiums and townhouses. She mentioned that policymakers needed to understand that information.

Dr. Smith stated that it had been some time since he had reviewed the development pro formas of different housing types, and added that it was a focus during a housing study in 2016. He believed that developers often developed what they knew, which was likely single-family homes. He suggested that there were costs and trade-offs in terms of achieving a missing middle, which was higher density, and he wondered if there was infrastructure investment there to serve those needs. He indicated that in 2016, a consultant in Portland tested a model to determine what would occur if there were no zoning restrictions. He noted that the TMRPA reviewed nearly 21,000 parcels that appeared shovel-ready and were located within suitable zones for certain housing types. He said that by allowing that model to develop, nearly 300,000 garden apartments were built because it was, at that time, the most economically efficient. He suggested that having that information to understand the costs of different development types and to understand those typologies would aid in decision-making when rehabilitating a new area. He indicated that the single-family product was no longer as prominent.

Vice Chair Garcia said she had benefited from the Tier 2 change when she purchased a higher-density townhome in Sun Valley. She believed that constituents would support products they could purchase and take pride in. She assumed that homeownership proved successful because when someone invested, they were likely to stay long-term, and the neighborhood and the quality of life around that development would remain in good condition. She thought that most people associated high density with multi-story buildings, high-density multifamily housing, or single-family housing. She indicated that constituents would support the middle housing option. She shared her concern that, with population projections for seniors over the next 20 years, the housing inventory would not keep up with the needs and demands of the aging population.

Dr. Lopez mentioned the Village at Hawk View Project and added that, while the properties were rentals, the project offered a variety of rental housing types, including larger multi-story buildings, garden-style units, and townhomes. She explained that the Village at Hawk View Project was designed to offer a more community-like feel and to provide a range of housing types that would best meet residents' needs. She stated that one of the goals of the RHA Board was to undertake a homeownership project development for first-time homebuyers and lower-income community members in the North Valleys. She added that the proposed project would include either a townhome design or a design that maximized density. She said that the RHA was also discussing what multi-generational housing would look like and how to meet those needs within the community in the future. She mentioned that typical affordable housing funding was geared more toward the rental market and a certain type of multifamily housing, which was challenging. She shared that recently, Assembly Bill (AB) 540 was enacted, which made funding available for homeownership and other affordable housing projects.

Chair Andriola explained that basic economics was market-driven and that a 40 percent increase in construction costs would be a deterrent when building. She recalled the workshop in January, when Dr. Eugenia Larmore spoke about the demographic moving into the County, which was above the national average for 18- to 35-year-olds. She noted that those needs differed from those of other age groups. She suggested that she would have thought the demographic would be retirees moving to Washoe County for its high quality of life. She explained that the economy was a balance of market forces, and there could be certain incentives to streamline the process and cut costs. She mentioned that, to be in compliance with anything approved, there were legal requirements. She said that she looked forward to the discussion regarding infrastructure. She stated that developers were driven by market forces and any business needed to be profitable to be successful. She asked Dr. Smith to share information about his team of jurisdictional representatives who discussed the regional framework. She indicated that while there was a market-driven opportunity, fewer people were having children. She thought there were opportunities to encourage efficiency by removing bureaucratic roadblocks. She expressed her appreciation for the Washoe County team for their work on the housing packages for AB 540 and addressing AB 241. She felt that, oftentimes, there seemed to be a siloed approach rather than an interconnected one with economics, and if there was an opportunity in the market that had not been addressed, somebody would discover it. She believed that reflected basic economics and was what the Country was based on. She hoped that Dr. Smith could share

information about the group he assembled to examine what all the jurisdictions were doing and how to address it from a regional perspective.

Dr. Smith agreed with Chair Andriola and said that the goal was to work together. He explained that in advance of the 2019 Regional Plan, there was a group called the Regional Plan Update Working Group, composed of local jurisdiction planning staff, engineering and public works staff, and affected entities. He mentioned that through regional collaboration efforts, the group became permanent and would meet quarterly. He noted that another discussion would be held on wage considerations versus housing prices, as well as on the community's needs and how those needs could be met. He indicated that there would be regional discussions and that updates could be made as market opportunities changed. He indicated that many parcels of land had received zoning and building approvals but had not yet been developed. He said that those old market assumptions applied to products that had been approved previously and could not be removed legally. He noted they would not meet current needs because of the lack of foundational structures. He shared that he would discuss later how the TMRPA had prepared for various approvals to address current challenges.

Chair Andriola expressed her appreciation to Dr. Lopez and congratulated Vice Chair Garcia for joining the RHA Board.

Dr. Lopez welcomed the opportunity to work with other jurisdictions and emphasized the importance of continuing to strengthen those partnerships. She expressed her appreciation for the County and its collaboration. She explained that as federal funding continued to change, it became increasingly important to look regionally at how all entities could work together to maximize available resources to address community needs. She suggested that, as information was received on the federal level about potential changes to funding, the community could continue to be served as best as possible.

Chair Andriola stated that accessibility was important and shared that constituents were concerned about traffic volume. She hoped the discussions would generate new ideas and approaches, recognizing Dr. Lopez and Dr. Smith as the primary drivers of those efforts. She suggested that, as a State, through the Legislature and the Governor's guidance, it needed to determine investment alternatives, which she believed AB 540 did. She acknowledged that some out-of-state real estate purchases made for individuals who did not live in Washoe County raised prices and that Washoe County was not seeing the economic multiplier as would be the case for individuals who lived in the area and supported the community in various capacities. She mentioned that the County might benefit if out-of-state property owners paid property tax (p-tax) at market value, rather than receiving benefits designed for local residents.

Commissioner Clark said that Dr. Smith had mentioned something he had brought up multiple times, that subdivisions had received continuous extension approvals for many years. He thought that the approved subdivisions might not be viable in the current market. He requested that the topic be placed on a future agenda to establish a moratorium or to limit the number of extensions a subdivision receives, rather than a

continuous cycle of extensions for a project that may no longer be viable in the market. He questioned why the County would continue to grant extensions for something that might never be built. He thought that creating the extension limit would ensure that a development could be built more quickly to help address the lack of housing inventory. He explained that financing for any type of housing included paying for the principal, interest, taxes, insurance, and homeowner's association (HOA) dues. He mentioned that potential homeowners needed to qualify to purchase a property, and although the price might seem affordable, once all the costs were factored in, the home would cost much more. He thought potential homeowners needed to consider all the associated costs. He said there were still some original entry-level homes in Washoe County with a single-car garage and smaller homes with one bathroom, but they were no longer available. He compared those homes to buying a new vehicle, noting that new vehicles were no longer basic and now had leather interiors and upgrades. He thought that from a builder's standpoint, the focus was profitability, which he suggested was capitalism. He alleged that it was difficult to justify building basic, quality entry-level homes without adding upgrades that would raise the home's price. He said that in Washoe County, it was difficult to build or find affordable housing, but he felt that there were affordable options in other rural areas.

Chair Andriola thanked the presenters and acknowledged that positive changes were being made for the community.

ACM Solaro, Division Director of Engineering and Capital Projects Dwayne Smith, and Dr. Smith conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Planning for Constrained Growth; Planning Discussion Flow; Public Infrastructure Plan (PIP); TMRPA Facility and Service Domains; Public Providers and Official Entities; How We Classify Investment; All 5 Service Domains; Regional Plan Policy PF 1; Scenario Planning; Spatial Modeling; Public Infrastructure Responsibility; Understanding Our Constraints; Washoe County at a Critical Infrastructure Juncture; The Relationship between Future Growth and Infrastructure; Infrastructure Considerations and Responsibility; The Rising Costs of Forever; The Reality of Growth; Future Growth and Infrastructure; Discussion Prompts. ACM Solaro introduced Dr. Smith and Mr. Smith for the infrastructure presentation and believed that they could provide insightful information. Mr. Smith indicated that he was looking forward to the infrastructure presentation and discussion. He referred to the *Planning Discussion Flow* slide and hoped it contained thought-provoking topics for the Board.

Dr. Smith referenced the *Public Infrastructure Plan (PIP)* slide and said that the TMRPA attempted to collaborate regionally and ensure that partnering agencies shared a common goal. He explained that the Public Infrastructure Plan (PIP) was not necessarily a plan created by the TMRPA, but rather an assembly of different plans, CIPs, and visions for future infrastructure provisioning. He said that the PIP was available on tmrpa.org, which also included discussions of which agencies were performing which duties in terms of service provisions, and it allowed the public to find more information on the corresponding agency or organization website. He said that the TMRPA was mandated by Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 278.0274 regarding the regional plan and that the TMRPA needed to be involved in certain infrastructure aspects.

Dr. Smith read from the *TMRPA Facility and Service Domains* slide and reported that five infrastructure domains were identified in the NRS, including potable water, schools, stormwater and flood control, transportation, and wastewater. He asserted that the TMRPA collected information, organized it, and analyzed whether the domains needed to be changed to ensure they were working efficiently. He referred to the *Public Providers and Official Entities* slide, which listed the agencies and organizations with which the TMRPA collaborated for the PIP.

Dr. Smith read from the slide titled *How We Classify Investment* and said that the TMRPA created a dashboard that displayed information from annual comprehensive financial reports (ACFRs). He explained that the TMRPA attempted not to add work, but instead to take work that had already been performed and present it differently. He said that every year, all organizations create an ACFR that reports capital improvement assets added to the depreciation list. He reported that the TMRPA worked with staff at each agency to better understand their capital and CIP processes. He noted that the TMRPA considered two main categories in researching CIPs, including reinvestment versus growth. He said that the reinvestment category included rehabilitation, maintenance, replacement, and all measures that maintained the quality of service or life in that area at the same level or better, while the growth category included new projects.

Dr. Smith referred to the *All 5 Service Domains* slide and reiterated that the tmrpa.org website included a dashboard that had been under development for two years and was continuously updated. He explained that the dashboard focused on spatial locations, with an overlay showing where the region had growth areas and where it was investing in infrastructure. He said that the TMRPA was able to track dollars across five service domains, including what was added in the previous fiscal year (FY) and what was planned for the next five years. He indicated that the red areas of the pie chart on the slide represented reinvestment, while the gray areas represented growth. He said that, depending on the domain, roughly 75 percent was reinvested in the community to maintain service levels, while growth accounted for a smaller percentage. He speculated that some believed the region was spending a lot of money on growth, which he said was partially true; however, most of the investment was to maintain existing infrastructure.

Dr. Smith read from the slide titled *Regional Plan Policy PF 1* and noted that in 2019, the TMRPA added the concept of region-wide public facilities and services standards, in addition to regional land designations. He said that often, one of the reasons agencies did not move forward with a project was the cost to build infrastructure. He explained that prior to 2019, regional planning at its decision point lacked methods and relied on local jurisdictions and concurrency management programs that said there would be sewer service. He recalled that the TMRPA enabled a master plan change to create a standard for each of the five domains to be addressed in the decision-making process. He referred to the *Scenario Planning* slide and mentioned that during the regional plan update, the TMRPA researched the concept of scenarios because he felt there were many ways that the future could change depending on market dynamics and politics. He said that analyzing potential scenarios, such as having the same number of housing units across the region but built in different ways, would help the TMRPA better understand differential impacts. He

relayed that certain impacts would occur regardless of how the region was built, and the TMRPA wished to ensure they understood those impacts in advance.

Dr. Smith referred to the *Spatial Modeling* slide and indicated that to create potential future scenarios, the underlying assumptions for what could increase growth and development needed to be identified. He noted that the colors in *Figure 2.1* on the slide represented the TMSA's suitability, which helped clarify the desirability and the ability to develop in the area. He said that the left map in *Figure 2.1* was related to infrastructure-based surfaces such as roads and pipes. He reported that the Smart Greenfield scenario was created by comparing variables across service domains, emphasizing density and the preservation of open space. He pointed out that the right map in *Figure 2.1* showed that the surface was driven by higher levels of amenities and transit-oriented development, which represented a classic infill scenario. He asserted that understanding the underlying assumptions, infrastructure, and community, as well as leveraging investments, were priorities.

Mr. Smith read from the slide titled *Understanding Our Constraints* and said there were many costs associated with investments. He asserted that while it was true that development paid for development, once the County accepted the infrastructure, it became the County's responsibility to operate, maintain, repair, and replace it. He noted that public infrastructure carried significant responsibility and that the County was responsible for existing and new developments; therefore, it was important to protect the existing level of service provided by the infrastructure, including roadways, sewer lines, stormwater, and safety. He said that the County had to verify that capacity existed when considering new development; otherwise, the County could experience service degradation, increased failure, or regulatory challenges. He relayed that the public traveled to work or school and used the infrastructure the County provided every day; therefore, there was a high expectation regarding maintenance and reinvestment. He reported that there were minimum standards for public infrastructure and said that the County spent a lot of time ensuring that new infrastructure complied with those.

Mr. Smith mentioned that the County focused on maximizing existing infrastructure and using existing roadways to full capacity. He recalled public comments about increased traffic, and he said that there would be more traffic as development and growth continued. He noted that the County understood best practices and solutions and said that capacity was available on many roadways in the area. He reiterated the importance of focusing on maximizing existing infrastructure before building new infrastructure, because public infrastructure was a long-term commitment that carried benefits and responsibilities for the community. He said that the County needed to focus on actual capacities and ensure that, when considering new development, it understood where the development was occurring so the County could leverage and utilize existing capacity.

Mr. Smith indicated that there were three identified resource ceilings. The first was physical elements such as water, sewer, roadways, and stormwater, with capacity levels that must be adhered to before new physical elements are built. He said that the second resource ceiling was associated with the County's financial ability to take ownership of new infrastructure. He recalled that Ms. Cooke discussed challenges with the current

budget related to approving more new infrastructure. He noted that the third resource ceiling was staff, because there were only so many staff members to provide support for the community. He said the County could do more with less; however, he believed it was important to respect staff as they performed their duties. He opined that sustainable growth meant not approving new infrastructure but ensuring ceilings were identified, respecting physical and financial constraints, and understanding staff time.

Mr. Smith read from the *Washoe County at a Critical Infrastructure Juncture* slide and reported that construction costs had increased, affecting not only new development but also the County's CIP budgets and operations and maintenance costs. He said that the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) had decreased to 68 from 73, which he asserted was a big deal. He recalled the Lake Clarity Program in Lake Tahoe, which he believed was an important program that was organized by the County and California jurisdictions three decades ago. He said that about ten years ago, the County organized cost projections for increased maintenance costs of the infrastructure built to obtain clarity credits. He mentioned that funding projections for 40 years were almost \$1 million. He said that the operational costs from last year were around \$300,000, which aligned with projections for a 40-year period. He clarified that he informed the Board of the program because there had been increases in operating and maintenance costs that the County needed to consider.

Mr. Smith noted that the County received many calls regarding pedestrian traffic and traffic safety. He recalled that a few years ago, a traditional speed hump had cost about \$7,000, but now costs \$15,000. He read from the slide titled *The Relationship between Future Growth & Infrastructure* and said that the County was focusing on understanding regional infrastructure because it carried benefits and responsibilities to the community while also incurring high costs. He referred to the slide and noted that the left side showed the traditional building infrastructure types, typical of developer builds. He clarified that the slide was not an all-encompassing list but had common points such as stormwater, roadways, sewer, and water. He said the infrastructure was built and dedicated to the County, thereby placing responsibility for it on the County. He noted the other facilities such as jails and parks listed on the right side of the slide.

Mr. Smith referenced the *Infrastructure Considerations and Responsibility* slide and stated that the Board had previously reviewed the infrastructure scorecard. He believed the Lake Clarity Program was fantastic; however, he reiterated that it had cost a lot of money to maintain. He said the County's roadways represented an asset valued at about \$1.1 billion. He asserted that if the roadways were not maintained, the PCI would drop, creating concerns. He indicated that the categories in the infrastructure scorecard above the column titled, *Equipment Services*, were expensive to maintain, while the ones below had dedicated funding sources. He reported that the infrastructure was a continuous cost and that there was no choice but to accept and maintain it unless the Board discussed levels of service. He said there was a balance to be struck between budget availability and the level of service the County provided.

Mr. Smith read from the slide titled *The Rising Costs of “Forever”* and explained that roadways and sewer systems differed from other infrastructure because they were constrained by other considerations. He recalled that at the last BCC meeting, the North Spanish Springs Flood Detention Facility was discussed. He felt that the facility was a great example of how the community reached out to the County, which then created a program and plan and built infrastructure to reduce the impact of repetitive flooding in Spanish Springs. He said the County was bonded for the flood infrastructure; however, the County did not anticipate the 2008 Great Recession. He noted that when the bond debt repayment structure was built, it was based on connection fees, which new developments were not paying; therefore, the County had to reevaluate the repayment structure and request a rate increase. He said that since the County had gone through the process of paying off the debt, the County could lower the rates from the high levels they had been increased to.

Mr. Smith referred to the slide titled *The Reality of Growth – “Funding for the Future”* and indicated that the County needed to be cognizant of previous experiences and examples. He relayed that the County had received an increase in phone calls from individuals stating that there were fewer rural areas in the region. He said that many individuals lived in areas where roadside ditches were the standard of practice at the time of the development, without sidewalks or lighting. He noted that individuals also asked about stormwater infrastructure and inquired when the County would lay pipe in certain areas, as homeowners wanted to reclaim water in front of their homes. He explained that the calls related to a lack of sidewalks were due to busy roadways or people wanting to walk in their neighborhoods without being on the roadway. He recalled that he visited a site on Fawn Lane, where the previously listed concerns were discussed; however, the County did not have funding for new infrastructure in existing development. He said that the more infrastructure that was built, the more it required sustainable funding sources to continue to meet community expectations. He mentioned that development fees were available for new and expanded capacity, but not for ownership, operations, maintenance, repairs, or replacements.

Mr. Smith recalled attending a legislative subcommittee meeting years earlier with Nevada Division of State Lands (NDSL) Administrator Charlie Donohue, during which a discussion about dedicating significant funds to the County for the Lake Clarity Program was welcomed. He said that he presented to the subcommittee regarding the need to identify funding for infrastructure construction and maintenance. He asserted that the discussion was difficult because there was an expectation that local government would maintain the infrastructure. He mentioned that funding for building capital was sometimes available, but the County faced a significant challenge in maintaining its existing capital assets. He read from the *Future Growth & Infrastructure* slide and reiterated that the County was struggling to define what it meant to approve new development and to identify ways to pay for ongoing infrastructure commitments, as the County was exceeding some available resource ceilings. He pointed out that the County needed new approaches to sustainability, existing infrastructure, and decision-making regarding new development. He asserted that development was not a bad thing, but it could be done more effectively by focusing on infill redevelopment, existing sewer lines,

roadways, and infrastructure with existing capacity. He hoped that the discussion and presentation were helpful.

ACM Solaro indicated that the goal of the presentation was to determine whether the Board had heard anything that surprised them, as it was important to receive input. He noted that the next presentation would focus on crafting potential solutions; however, he wanted to hear the Board's thoughts on service levels. He believed that infrastructure and its services were necessary across the community, and there were areas that could have adjustments.

Commissioner Clark referenced the slide titled *Washoe County at a Critical Infrastructure Juncture* and saluted Mr. Smith and ACM Solaro for meeting with him and the residents of Fawn Lane. He recalled that about 35 to 40 individuals were on the roadside for a two-hour discussion. He said the residents lived on a quiet country lane, some of whom had lived there for 67 years. He explained that there was a massive billion-dollar project at the end of the residents' road, with trucks and traffic deteriorating the street while speeding, and dust inconvenienced residents. He found it interesting to hear the residents' perspectives and noted that the roads were County-owned, making it the County's responsibility to maintain them. He said that it was intriguing that speed bumps were now called speed cushions. He reiterated that it was nice to have Mr. Smith there to discuss residents' concerns and thanked him for his good work. He opined that the public appreciated Mr. Smith listening to them. He asserted that the Board needed to keep the residents in mind and consider how situations could have a tremendous impact.

Commissioner Hill expressed appreciation for the presentation because she believed it was important for the community to understand that sustainability was lacking. She said that while growth technically paid for growth, growth only paid for certain sustainability. She said that if an individual was only paying \$2,000 a year in property taxes, while someone else was paying \$15,000 a year, who was supplementing whom. She believed there was a perception that the County was addicted to growth; however, she felt that, in some ways, the region could not survive without it. She acknowledged that growth also caused long-term problems. She said the County owned and maintained growth forever but asked what would fund the County's ability to do so. She recalled that the presentation relayed that more rural areas expected a higher level of service because they had come from another community or because there was more traffic on those roads. She said she was grateful for the presentation's outline, which would help the community better understand the County's struggle to maintain service levels.

Commissioner Herman believed that there was a loss of balance. She said she did not know whether the imbalance was due to a tax issue or excessive development, but she asserted that the balance needed to be regulated so the County could afford services. She explained that when someone was budgeting for their family, they needed to plan a certain way, much like the County. She opined that the County could not afford ten housing units or subdivisions if it had not prepared for them, such as when a family had ten children and did not plan for them. She felt that some of the County's tax structures were too generous and that the County should not make developers richer.

Vice Chair Garcia said that it was interesting to see that the TMRPA monitored domains. She mentioned that, as policymakers, the Board should understand that there were two other factors to consider: fire and law enforcement, making seven domains that the County should monitor and manage. She asserted that the Board was the steward of the taxpayer dollar, and growth was impacting the region. She questioned the different models regarding scenario planning and asked who performed the infill survey and if it was still relevant.

Dr. Smith indicated that the information in the presentation was outdated and had been organized during the TMRPA's 2019 regional plan update. He recalled that several thousand people responded to an open-to-the-public online survey. He said that several vignettes after Chapter 2 of the regional plan presented statistics on 16 metrics for each scenario. He explained that to achieve the infill scenario, 50,000 units over a 20-year period, with smaller units in a different mix of housing types, were needed. He noted that land consumption, housing mix, and housing price variability impacted the infill scenario. He said that the TMRPA was researching a more sustainable option to keep up with the County's approved maintenance to maintain the metrics.

Dr. Smith indicated that he appreciated the comment regarding infill and said he had researched data regarding infill and redevelopment that could help the County save tax dollars. He noted that if the region experienced more infill, capitalizing on existing infrastructure and possibly saving 5 to 10 percent would create a huge benefit for rate structures and for potential costs that impacted them. He said that the region had committed not to raise sewer rates for ten years. He reported that there were small considerations regarding infill and leveraging existing infrastructure, while ensuring that capacities within a sewer pipe, waterline, or roadway were meaningfully maximized.

Dr. Smith speculated that if the region invested and maintained infrastructure, how it could be maximized was important. He said that a precursor to the four scenario plans was the previously mentioned housing study. He mentioned that the TMRPA worked with ECONorthwest, a firm based in Oregon, to address the fiscal issues Commissioner Herman had raised, specifically focusing on maintenance and capital investment. He said the research concluded that reallocating 25 percent of expected growth to the McCarran Boulevard area could save approximately \$780 million over 20 years. He clarified that the research was performed in 2016; therefore, the savings would be higher. He said that the TMRPA attempted to hone how much funding was reflected in the facilities developers built and dedicated in the TMRPA dashboard.

Chair Andriola expressed appreciation for the TMRPA dashboard, which included the five domains. She praised the work done to organize the dashboard and thanked Dr. Smith for his efforts. She noted that the region faced a systemic challenge regarding how funding in the State worked, which fell outside the scope of what the Commissioners could do. She recalled that Mr. Smith had discussed using existing capacity first, which she thought was a point of concern for some individuals, because they believed that while the capacity needed to be used, there would not be enough of it. She explained that while the region might be close to capacity, legally, there was a balance on how the

region could approve projects, given capacity, because the Board could not deny a project based on circumstances. She opined that Dr. Smith highlighted the systemic challenge of balance and that the Board could only work within the confines of what was available. She reiterated her thanks for the presentation. She felt that it was important for people to understand the regional connections between all jurisdictions.

Director of Community Services Eric Crump, Planning and Building Division Director Kelly Mullin, and County Assessor Chris Sarman conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Prioritized Development Areas; Development Discussion Flow; What Are Prioritized Development Areas; Why Use Prioritized Development Areas; Prioritized Development Areas – Criteria Considerations; Possible Incentives; Land Use Incentives; Development Fee Incentives; Tax Incentives; Other Tools/Incentives; Potential Mechanisms; Benefits of Using Incentives in Prioritized Areas; Expanding the Tax Base; Existing Incentives and Considerations; Washoe County Incentives; Increasing Property Values; Benefits of Strategic Growth; Development Discussion Topic.

Chair Andriola acknowledged that it was Public Works Week.

Mr. Crump said he appreciated the opportunity to present to the Board and noted that Washoe County and some regional partners had been making significant progress in housing. He acknowledged the concerns raised by previous speakers and mentioned that solutions could be considered. He shared that although it was not a new concept, one option to consider was prioritized development areas. He indicated that previous discussions included the TMSA and various tiers of development, which he felt were the basis of identifying prioritized development areas. He suggested that Washoe County could be more granular than what was presented in the regional approach within the regional plan for the unincorporated areas of Washoe County. He stated that Washoe County could offer incentives to encourage growth or development in specific areas.

Mr. Crump reviewed the slide titled *What Are Prioritized Development Areas* and said that the concept of prioritized development areas was a fiscal discipline tool that the County could utilize to influence some of the costs of infrastructure. He shared that both Mr. Smith and Dr. Smith had mentioned earlier that the future of rising costs was real and was related not only to repairing and maintaining but also to replacing expensive infrastructure. He indicated that rising costs increased the farther specific areas were from existing services and infrastructure, and that certain communities were expensive for the County to serve due to their geography. He thought that one solution could be to develop a system that would incentivize development in areas where infrastructure and services already existed or were planned. He stated that close proximity would reduce the number of miles, storm drains, sewer lines, lift stations, and other services required to maintain the infrastructure. He pointed out that it would ultimately lead to better service delivery and a better quality of life.

Mr. Crump reviewed the slide titled *Prioritized Development Areas – Criteria Considerations* and said it represented a partial list of considerations for

identifying potential prioritized development areas. He indicated that staff could develop a system that would weigh considerations based on factors such as community benefit, service cost, return on investment, and infrastructure capacity, allowing the County to make more data-driven decisions about where development should occur.

Ms. Mullin acknowledged that challenges had been shared regarding infrastructure and that changes were needed to ensure it was sustainable in the long term. She mentioned that she would share how the County could encourage and focus development in prioritized areas. She stated that the staff was not strictly focused on encouraging new growth but also on prioritizing where that growth occurred, which she felt was an important distinction. She clarified that the presentation would share a list of potential incentive options and added that some might sound mild, others extreme, or not feasible. She explained that the intent of the presentation was to show the range of possibilities to spark thought and further discussion about the idea of incentives. She stated that the presentation would not thoroughly examine each option, would not require the Board to select an option, but would ask which option the Board had the strongest thoughts on. She shared that if the Board wished to move forward with investigating prioritized development areas, staff would conduct additional research on the selected options. She explained that staff would then present the findings of that research and provide recommendations on how to proceed.

Ms. Mullin reviewed the slide titled *Possible Incentives* and said it showed the four major categories of incentives. She reviewed the slide titled *Land Use Incentives* and explained that some slides would include icons, and clarified that the orange light bulb icon meant it was an idea the County already knew how to do, and the green thought cloud indicated an idea that required more research if the idea was going to be pursued to determine its feasibility, along with the legal and financial implications. She mentioned that the options on the slide would likely be familiar to the Board, as some of the incentives had been considered previously or used in housing packages over the last couple of years. She noted that reducing or eliminating public hearings was an option that would save developers time and added that time was valuable. She suggested that the incentives would offer density bonuses, similar to what was currently being done in some housing packages, which she felt was a strong option. She stated that each parcel had its own zoning, with a maximum number of units allowed. She provided an example of a developer who developed 7 units per acre, but with a density bonus, they could possibly develop 10 or 15 units per acre. She thought the example allowed additional units, which could help make a project financially feasible that otherwise would not be. She indicated that parking could take up a lot of space and land, which could be costly, and suggested possibly eliminating or reducing minimum parking requirements. She mentioned the cost of developing and the infrastructure benefits of building closer in and at higher densities. She suggested offering incentives for higher-density development and noted that prioritized application processing was one way to achieve that. She indicated that another incentive could be increased flexibility in certain infrastructure-specific development standards.

Ms. Mullin reviewed the slide titled *Development Fee Incentives* and said that development fees were applied to every project, including building permit fees,

regional road impact fees, sewer connection fees, and park construction taxes. She mentioned that one option could be to reduce or waive those fees in prioritized areas. She noted that, instead of waiving fees up front, there could be a performance-based incentive to refund or partially refund fees after a condition had been met, after the project was completed, or after certain components of the project were completed. She stated that the last two bullet points on the slide would create tiered fees, so that fees were lower for developing at higher densities or in priority areas than for developing outside priority areas or at lower densities. She thought that example might feel a little more extreme, but felt it would equate to subsidizing other users or fee payers who were helping subsidize development in the prioritized areas.

Ms. Mullin reviewed the slide titled *Tax Incentives* and said that most of the tax incentives would fall under tax increment financing (TIF) in prioritized areas. She thought most individuals were likely aware that one of the most important features of using a TIF was the ability to collect incremental p-tax, which could help fund various infrastructure projects. She suggested incentivizing development focus in those areas by creating TIFs, offering p-tax reductions or rebates just for developing in those areas, offsetting infrastructure investment dollars in those areas, or matching infrastructure investment dollars at a certain rate.

Ms. Mullin reviewed the slide titled *Other Tools/Incentives* and said another potential incentive could be to use the County's bonding power. She indicated that it was currently being done with the County's allocation of private activity bonds for affordable housing. She explained that the County recently adopted a policy related to Special Improvement Districts (SIDs). She noted that in designated priority areas, the policy could provide full support for the formation of Special Assessment Districts (SADs) and SIDs as tools to help developers finance the infrastructure improvements necessary to bring development projects online. She shared that a more extreme option was to introduce scarcity for development outside prioritized areas or for undesirable uses, which was not something currently being done in Washoe County. She explained how development in Lake Tahoe was handled through the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and noted that the TRPA used the concept of allocations and annual development. She mentioned that development had been allocated and that only a limited number were available. She said it was a concept that controlled the amount of development and the rate at which it could occur in each particular area. She mentioned that while the idea might sound a bit extreme, there might come a time when something like that would be necessary, but by introducing scarcity in a similar way. She said it could limit the number of units annually in a particular area, and if it was outside a prioritized area, or within one, there would be no limit. She explained that another potential option would be to provide a higher level of assistance to developers in prioritized areas. She stated that there was currently a business facilitator who helped developers navigate general development processes within Washoe County. She shared that the next step would be to hire a financial expert with experience in infrastructure financing to identify and leverage available funding sources, including grants, loans, and State and federal incentives, and to assist developers in navigating opportunities.

Ms. Mullin reviewed the slide titled *Potential Mechanisms* and said one potential option was simply selecting incentives to offer for development, and offering them to anyone who wanted to do residential development within the prioritized areas. She suggested establishing a scorecard that would reward developments with desirable characteristics, such as affordable housing and balanced mixed-use components, by making them eligible for greater incentives. She noted that there could be a limit to the incentives offered only to highly desirable uses within the prioritized areas and said that what was considered desirable might vary depending on the area. She acknowledged that some Commissioners had made similar comments, saying the initiative could not be carried out solely by the County and would require partnering with other agencies, which could be powerful. She explained that if other agencies also benefited from development in certain areas, Washoe County could partner with those agencies to see if they could offer any incentives, creating a packaged approach to make it more feasible to develop in those areas. She restated that some of the options presented might seem mild, while others might seem extreme, but added that the intent was to spark discussion.

Mr. Sarman thanked the attendees for reviewing all the information that was presented for future discussions. He pointed out that there was a lot of information on the concepts and variables related to development, growth, current and future costs, and how the County could do more with less, which he referred to as *smart growth*.

Mr. Sarman reviewed the slide titled *Benefits of Using Incentives in Prioritized Areas* and said the structural deficit was a simple yet complex equation. He noted that there had been extensive discussion about costs, infrastructure maintenance, future infrastructure, and incentives. He suggested that there was a strategic, cost-effective approach and that the County could guide development for the greater good of the community. He stated that he wanted to bring awareness to what the funding might look like and the potential revenues. He mentioned one way to increase funding was by legislation or local governments increasing taxes. He wondered whether there was a way to expand the tax base, increase property values, and ultimately improve the quality of life.

Mr. Sarman reviewed the slide titled *Existing Incentives & Considerations* and said that the State had incentives that were not necessarily tied to prioritized area growth, but included economic and tax cap abatements, affordable housing initiatives, which the Assessor's Office dealt with each day, and developer discounts. He explained that some of those already existed to incentivize economic growth. He explained that local incentives were being offered within the redevelopment district. He thought that for Washoe County's incentives, a key thing would be that any future tax growth had to be tied to exceeding the incentive. He added that the incentive would need to outweigh the future service costs discussed and that there would be no overlap with the partnering agencies. He noted that to weigh that benefit appropriately, the various multipliers in place needed to be reviewed. He explained the importance of understanding the drivers of property values as they related to prioritizing growth in certain areas.

Mr. Sarman reviewed the slide titled *Increasing Property Values* and said that property values were significantly influenced by land use. He noted that both the uses

permitted on a property and the quality of development within the subject parcel or area would play key roles in determining value. He indicated that, in general, a higher and better use of the property tended to support higher assessed values and, over time, would result in additional funding. He explained that the relationship between market value, actual use, and authorized use was important in determining taxable and assessed values. He noted that when the land or improvements were being put to their highest and best use, the assessed values would be higher. He mentioned that when zoning allowed, whether it was a single-family home or a multi-family unit, there would be higher use of the property, leading to higher values and revenues. He shared that the quality of the development and whether the land was residential or commercial would affect the quality and result in higher assessed values.

Mr. Sarman reviewed the slide titled *Benefits of Strategic Growth* and said that the concept could be implemented through redevelopment and revitalization efforts. He emphasized the importance of those because they could materially shift value by improving quality and making certain supplies more attractive, thereby increasing demand and driving stronger market performance. He noted that perceived risk was used for developers and investors, and that it would boost investors' confidence. He suggested that public perception needed to be considered, as the public wanted to see a return on the investment. He emphasized the importance of focusing on growth in areas where infrastructure already existed or could be maintained or expanded efficiently, thereby creating sustainable growth, strengthening the County's financial position, and improving quality of life. He stated that values needed to be reviewed when prioritizing different areas.

Mr. Crump recognized that little detailed information was provided about the incentives mentioned. He mentioned that the discussion about incentives focused more on how the Board felt about the suggestions and whether the Board wanted to pursue prioritized development areas.

Vice Chair Garcia asked the senior members in attendance whether incentives were a new concept to Washoe County. Ms. Mullin said that using true incentives on the planning and development side was relatively new to the County. She noted that incentives had been offered recently in the housing efforts over the last few years, and that the density bonuses currently going through the process were the first real incentives. She explained that staff had gone through the effort of streamlining processes, making things easier, and reducing the number of public hearings. She noted that those efforts were ongoing and there were always more opportunities, but true incentives and bonuses were new to Washoe County.

Vice Chair Garcia felt there were many lessons to be learned from other jurisdictions to ensure quality of life was maintained. She emphasized the importance of efficiency, which she believed meant collaborating with all stakeholders first, since the Board were not a subject-matter experts. She suggested that Washoe County be the regional leader and convene the groups to conduct a litmus test of the direction the County should take. She mentioned that, although she valued her colleagues' opinions, she did not feel it

was appropriate for the Board to discuss the options until they had spoken with the subject matter experts.

Commissioner Hill suggested offering another development fee disincentive based on the regional plan work that Dr. Smith had done. She wondered how development fees could be increased when developments were far from infrastructure, and added that they could be used to control development. She felt that development was dependent on who owned the land and when they had the capital to develop. She indicated that the timing of considering incentives and making changes was perfect, as growth had slowed. She supported Vice Chair Garcia's comments to convene stakeholders and development partners to hear their thoughts. She said that she supported higher development fees for lower density and noted that was being considered in Lake Tahoe, which she felt was a big issue. She suggested disincentivizing billionaire developers from purchasing multiple parcels to create a single large compound and mentioned possibly charging a fee. She acknowledged prior Commissioner comments that families likely had fewer children and did not require homes with as much square footage. She thought it was important to use available data to increase fees when development was away from infrastructure and acknowledged that developers would need to pay for it. She mentioned that she supported limiting incentives to highly desirable uses. She said the focus should be on attainable housing and balanced, mixed-use development for p-tax incentives, because there was currently not enough p-tax revenue to cover the costs. She mentioned that if there were going to be incentives, they needed to be given for the desired developments. She noted that there were not enough home credits each year for everyone who wanted them. She hoped that the County could incentivize more of the needed items and added that workforce housing was for higher-area median income, and that the County could not depend on receiving State and federal funding. She shared that she had worked in the Lake Tahoe area to create incentives to address the missing housing piece and believed it could also be done in the Truckee Meadows area because the County controlled the tax incentives for Washoe County, even in Tahoe. She said she looked forward to hearing more about the options presented to the Board. She shared her appreciation for the many departments that came together to find a solution for the sustainability and growth issue in the region. She thanked the presenters for their leadership in bringing the information to the Board and for ensuring the Board had the information needed to make the best decisions.

Commissioner Clark asked Mr. Sarman for his thoughts regarding the slowdown in growth and development in the County.

Mr. Sarman confirmed that development had slowed but explained that the duties in the Assessor's Office had not decreased. He mentioned that values had continued to increase through the valuations, and there were still many permits to be worked. He indicated that the creation of subdivision maps out of the Assessor's Office had slowed down, but there were still many subdivisions that had not yet been built out. He clarified that there had not been a dramatic slowdown but rather a stabilization.

Commissioner Clark asked Mr. Sarman for his thoughts on current interest rates compared with those from several years ago, given market stability and movement, growth, and development. He wondered whether the rising interest rates had hampered the fast-paced housing market, given the doubling of interest rates over the last several years.

Mr. Sarman suggested that many homeowners had secured one of the low-interest rates from several years ago. He shared a statistic that 70 percent of people typically moved every five years. He stated that this was no longer the case and felt that no one wanted to give up their low interest rate by purchasing a new home. He wondered what someone could afford and what the monthly payment was. He indicated that the higher interest rates had hindered purchasing power, as well as the increased cost of the home. He acknowledged that some of the Commissioners had stated that what used to be an acceptable, modest home was 1,600 to 1,800 square feet (sq ft) with a single-car garage. He mentioned that newer homes were being built much larger and with more amenities. He thought that the increased cost of those larger homes was unaffordable for most home buyers. He suggested offering incentives to build more affordable homes and added that 1,600 sq ft homes were difficult to find.

Commissioner Clark said there were neighborhoods in town with subdivisions built approximately 40 years ago, featuring 1,200 sq ft homes. He opined that the housing market lacked entry-level homes. He suggested that, traditionally, homeowners purchased an entry-level home, built equity, and then purchased a larger home, but he believed this was no longer the case. He compared his prior comment to buying a high-end vehicle with many accessories and features rather than buying one solely for transportation. He asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large about penalizing individuals who purchased land to create a compound and whether the Board had the authority to do so. He questioned whether that would open the County up to lawsuits if higher fees were charged to certain individuals.

CDDA Large explained that the Board had significant discretion regarding the fees charged for development. He noted that, whether a line would be legally crossed, the specific ordinances and regulations to be put in place would need to be reviewed prior to making a legal determination. He said there were many hypotheticals until something was put in writing. He mentioned that careful consideration was needed to ensure certain incentives were not being used as punishment. He stated that if someone had property rights, it was more difficult to change them than to obtain them. He confirmed that the Board had significant discretion in making those determinations.

Commissioner Clark questioned CDDA Large whether, if one developer was offered an incentive but another was not, that would expose the County to legal consequences, since all developers were not being treated equally. CDDA Large said the scenario could expose the County to an equal protection or due process challenge and added that the determination would be based on the ordinances.

Chair Andriola stated that the discussion demonstrated the County's brilliant team. She acknowledged the staff for realizing the inevitable budget constraints and how the systemic model of government funding could not be changed. She appreciated that the

suggestions were high-level, which she felt provided an opportunity for a broad group of stakeholders to discuss further. She agreed with a prior comment by Dr. Smith, who said developers developed what they were comfortable with, which was likely the case for any product type. She believed that there were efficiencies and economies of scale. She noted that, with brilliant minds involved, great research would be conducted and best practices would emerge. She thanked Mr. Sarman for always thinking of ways the County could do things better to meet the demand. She shared her concern about regulations that interfered with market forces. She said that she supported a tiered connection and acknowledged that a standardized approach was not always appropriate. She mentioned that she had attended several meetings where someone stated that having TIFs would solve all of the issues. She expressed her appreciation to the staff for the SADs and SIDs initiatives, which she was proud to have led, and added that the stakeholders involved recognized the opportunity. She recommended to the staff that they move forward with incentives quickly because there were upcoming projects that had already been approved by the Board. She noted that the Commissioners were kind enough to support her suggestion to increase notifications, which was on the development list. She mentioned that streamlining and reviewing what could be done administratively, especially regarding legalities and the framework, would save time. She felt there was a balance between the value of time and the staff, and said she was eager to see what the future would hold with the new opportunities. She thanked Mr. Sarman for his creativity. She believed that Washoe County had the best staff. She indicated that 6.1 full-time equivalents (FTEs) in the Assessor's Office were serving 22 percent more than they used to.

No public comment or action was taken on this item.

26-0316 **AGENDA ITEM 7** Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

* * * * * * * * * *

2:00 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

CLARA ANDRIOLA, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

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

Minutes Prepared by:
Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk
Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk
Elizabeth Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk
Andrew Garnand, Deputy County Clerk

Pending Board Approval