

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

APRIL 28, 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 10:00 a.m. in regular session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, County Clerk Jan Galassini called roll and the Board conducted the following business:

**26-0243**      **AGENDA ITEM 3** Invocation to be given by Karen Durst, Executive Pastor of Grace Church Reno.

Karen Durst, Executive Pastor of Grace Church Reno provided the invocation.

\*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*

Chair Andriola requested that Agenda Item 7A1 be heard before Agenda Item 4A1.

\*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*

**26-0244**      **AGENDA ITEM 7A1** Presentation from University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) President Brian Sandoval on collaborative initiatives between Washoe County, and UNR. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Andriola welcomed University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) President Brian Sandoval. Mr. Sandoval conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Presentation; Photo; University at a Glance (2 slides); Aerial Photo; Where We Are Going; University Village; Nevada State Health Laboratory; University of Nevada Athletics Fieldhouse; Reno Arena at The Grand Sierra Resort; Proposed Veterans Affairs Hospital Land; Upcoming Construction Projects;

Gateway District; 600 University Way; New Life Science Building; Renown Affiliation Agreement; Collage of Veterinary Medicine; Cooperative Extension; StreetReach; Thank You!. He indicated that it was an honor and a privilege to present to the Board. He said that the UNR deans, campus and student leadership, vice presidents, several other faculty members, and athletics representatives were in attendance. He asked those in attendance to participate in a brief Wolfpack chant.

Mr. Sandoval reported that UNR was founded in 1874 and would celebrate its 152nd anniversary in October. He said that UNR was the State's original land grant university. He referred to the *Photo* slide and recalled that the previous month, two students were walking near Lawlor Events Center when they spotted two huskies darting back and forth across Virginia Street, clearly lost and in danger of being struck by a car. He noted that County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas was also in the area, out for a walk with some colleagues. He said that the individuals corraled the dogs, called Washoe County Regional Animal Services (WCRAS), and waited in the cold until help arrived to safely handle the animals. He reported that the dogs were reunited with their owners the same day and expressed gratitude for the great job performed. Chair Andriola asked the two students to come to the podium. CM Thomas believed that only pre-veterinary students would be so inclined to sit in the cold and hold onto huskies for 45 minutes while waiting for WCRAS to arrive. She thanked the students for their hard work and good deed. Mr. Sandoval believed that it was a wonderful story not only because of what happened, but also because it involved Wolf Pack huskies and had a happy ending, which he felt captured the authentic relationship between the County and UNR. He expressed appreciation toward Animal Services Officer Roland Albertson for being an amazing public servant.

Mr. Sandoval referenced the first *University at a Glance* slide and said that UNR was home to over 24,000 undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral students and offered more than 500 degree programs. He reported that UNR had approximately 3,500 faculty and staff dedicated to teaching, research, and serving the community. He said that UNR also competed at the highest level of collegiate athletics as a Division I member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Mountain West Conference (MWC). He read from the second slide titled *University at a Glance* and noted that the student body included more than 750 National Merit, Presidential, and Hispanic Scholars, which he felt reflected the caliber of students who chose Nevada. He said that UNR was the recipient of the R1 Research designation at the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, which he reported made UNR one of the top 100 research institutions in the United States (US). He acknowledged UNR Vice President of Government and Community Engagement Michael Flores and his team, who worked diligently to showcase community engagement. He pointed out that *US News & World Report* ranked UNR as the best national university in its 2026 edition, and that *Niche* ranked UNR among the top 130 public universities in America. He recalled that *Time Magazine* ranked the top 500 universities in the world, with UNR at 420. He said that Northern Nevada was ranked number eight on the Country's top college towns list. He mentioned that while he was proud of the designations, he wished to become higher ranked, which he opined would not be possible without the wonderful staff.

Mr. Sandoval referred to the *Aerial Photos* slide and believed that there was a dramatic change to the campus from 2006 to 2024. He said that the university had completed or begun construction on 25 buildings, and that within the past 6 years, approximately \$625 million had been invested in the campus. He read from the *Where We Are Going* slide and said that there were four major construction efforts, including University Village, Nevada State Health Laboratory, the athletic fieldhouse, and the basketball stadium at the Grand Sierra Resort (GSR). He referred to the *University Village* slide and noted that the University Village was launched in early 2025 and provided 34 units of subsidized housing for faculty and graduate students south of campus in north downtown Reno. He asserted that affordable housing was important to him, but knew it was a challenge for the County, which was why UNR was attempting to find more opportunities for affordable housing near the university so that graduate students, faculty, and staff could have a more affordable place to live while being able to walk to work and school. He said that UNR invested an incredible amount of time and resources into the project by providing 100-year-old homes with improved landscaping and a new community with an open environment for students and staff. He pointed out a photo of a home's previous condition on the *University Village* slide, with the second photo showing the property in improved condition.

He referred to the *Nevada State Health Laboratory* slide and reported that for more than a century, the Nevada State Public Health Laboratory was Nevada's first line of defense against public health threats, as was apparent during the COVID-19 (C19) pandemic, when the lab tested more than 507,000 samples. He said the slide showed the rendering of the new lab, which was significantly improved from the previous building. He noted that the Nevada State Public Health Laboratory was the first in North America to confirm a case of C19 reinfection, a discovery that he said changed how the world understood viral transmission. He mentioned that the new building was 55,000 square feet (sq ft) scheduled for completion in October. He urged the Board to tour the facility after its completion, as it would triple the lab's current space, house a new toxicology program, expand emergency response capabilities, enhance disease surveillance infrastructure, and expand newborn screening programs. He believed that the lab would impact every Nevadan from Boulder City to Gerlach. He recalled that Senator Catherine Cortez Masto joined UNR for a ceremonial brick laying at the site marking the major milestone.

He pointed out the slide titled *University of Nevada Athletics Fieldhouse* and noted that UNR began construction on a new 72,000 sq ft indoor athletic fieldhouse adjacent to Mackey Stadium. He recalled that the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents approved the project in June of 2025, with completion scheduled for the fall of 2026. He said that the fieldhouse would serve all 17 varsity sports. He indicated that UNR was the only US campus without an indoor facility for cold weather. He said the fieldhouse would provide 110 yards of indoor turf, which was critical for year-round training in the Northern Nevada climate and during the fire season, when smoke was prevalent. He noted that the fieldhouse would contain batting cages, conditioning space, a practice area for the Wolf Pack Marching Band, and a concert area. He said the fieldhouse would be used for more than just athletics, noting that the student body would use it for intramurals, club sports, recreation, and community events. He believed the project used

an innovative public-private partnership (P3) model and was funded without State funds. He opined that it should be publicly acknowledged that the students agreed to increase their fees to pay for the facility.

Mr. Sandoval referred to the *Reno Arena at The Grand Sierra Resort* slide and reported that while the new arena was being built at the GSR, it was not a UNR project. He said that UNR was excited about the completion of the arena, which would be the future home of the Wolf Pack men's basketball team. He indicated that the arena would be 300,000 sq ft and would feature hospitality suites and a central plaza. He asserted that students would have free transportation and access to the arena with a private entrance. He expressed appreciation for the arena and noted that UNR was grateful for the space.

Mr. Sandoval pointed out the map located on the *Proposed Veterans Affairs Hospital Land* slide and noted that UNR was actively engaged in discussions with the US Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) regarding a proposed land acquisition for a new VA hospital. He said that UNR was honored to be considered for the land acquisition and mentioned that the proposed site was at the north end of the campus. He believed that veteran healthcare needed to grow alongside the veteran population and that the university was positioned to play a meaningful role in developing the property in partnership with federal, State, and local stakeholders. He opined that having the hospital on campus would create an amazing opportunity for the School of Medicine, the Orvis School of Nursing, the School of Social Work, and the School of Public Health. He disclosed that UNR was the only site in Northern Nevada currently under consideration for the new hospital.

Mr. Sandoval read from the *Upcoming Construction Projects; Gateway District; 600 University Way; New Life Sciences Building* slides and indicated that the Gateway Project included the University Hotel along Virginia Street. He said the hotel would be privately operated and would include a conference center. He noted that the hotel would serve the university's community, visitors, and the broader Reno economy while being built without public money. He reported that the Gateway District was the university's signature expansion and noted that the hotel would include a restaurant and rooftop terrace. He said that the John Tulloch Business Building had been open for one year and was performing marvelously. He referred to the *600 University Way* slide and said that a 400-unit housing development would be built to expand housing options for faculty, staff, and graduate students. He felt that housing in Northern Nevada was a challenge; however, he asserted that UNR was committed to being part of the solution. He noted that 600 University Way was across the street from University Village and Canyon Flats. He said that construction on 600 University Way would begin in 2027.

Mr. Sandoval explained that the new Life Sciences Building was a \$137 million, 85,000 sq ft facility in the Gateway District. He said that the design was almost complete; however, a preliminary rendering was displayed on the *New Life Sciences Building* slide. He noted that the building would house 18 research labs, 4 teaching labs, a 300-seat lecture hall, and conference spaces serving the College of Science and the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources. He asserted that UNR was grateful for the \$68.5 million appropriation from the State, the largest in Nevada history for a higher

education project. He said that the Davidson Family also gifted UNR with \$30 million for the construction. He believed that the Life Sciences Building represented a genuine inflection point for the university's research capacity and for Nevada's healthcare and biotech workforce pipeline. He recalled that the freshman agricultural building was built in the late 1950s to early 1960s. He said the building was fully amortized and, while it was a great building, it was time for an update because it would not support modern heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), other equipment, or pedagogy. He noted that the elevators were so old that parts had to be located on eBay for repairs. He said that the new facility would train students in molecular and cellular biology, neuroscience, chemical ecology, and biomedical sciences.

Mr. Sandoval expressed pleasure in announcing that UNR established Nevada's first fully integrated health system through a 50-year affiliation agreement between the University of Nevada School of Medicine and Renown Health. He referred to the *Renown Affiliation Agreement* slide and said that Renown was the region's largest locally owned, not-for-profit healthcare network with more than 7,500 employees across two acute care hospitals, the Renown Children's Hospital, a rehabilitation hospital, and an insurance plan. He believed that the partnership transformed how UNR trained physicians, conducted clinical research, and delivered patient care. He said that residency training programs were opening new clinical services not previously available in the community and were increasing the medical school class size. He opined that the collaboration would make Washoe County healthier.

Mr. Sandoval read from the *College of Veterinary Medicine* slide and noted that Nevada was one of only a few states without an in-state Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) program for pre-veterinary students. He noted that pre-veterinary medicine students had to leave the State to pursue their DVM and that data indicated they would likely not return after obtaining their doctorate. He said that Nevada faced a growing shortage of veterinarians, with real consequences for agriculture, rural communities, food security, and public health. He mentioned that UNR completed a rigorous feasibility study and presented the proposal to the Board of Regents in March. He said that there were only 32 accredited veterinary schools in the US. He speculated that UNR had a unique capacity to host a veterinary school and integrate veterinary education with public health, education, agricultural science, and existing biomedical infrastructure. He said that if all went well at the Board of Regents in June, UNR would seek approval to hire a founding dean or dean for accreditation purposes. He reported that the proposed launch window targeted provisional accreditation by 2026, with the goal of enrolling the first DVM class around 2029 and the first graduating class in 2033. He said that the Board of Regents was extremely excited and positive. He hoped that UNR would receive a favorable outcome at their next meeting.

Mr. Sandoval read from the *Cooperative Extension* slide and indicated that the extension program was expanding its 4H youth development work in Washoe County with a new youth workforce development program. He said that the initiative used real-time workforce data and skills-matching software to help high school students identify and pursue careers aligned with their skills in Nevada. He noted that community instructors,

local educators, and workforce partners would implement the program together, with the goal of helping young people see a path forward in Washoe County rather than elsewhere. He expressed pride in building a close collaboration with the County and partners.

Mr. Sandoval referenced the *StreetReach* slide and stated that StreetReach was one of the most meaningful community partnerships that UNR had developed. He reported that StreetReach was a collaborative effort that brought together the School of Public Health, the Orvis School of Nursing, and key community partners to provide street-level healthcare to people experiencing homelessness. He explained that the program delivered compassionate, low-barrier care, including wound care, testing for human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), hepatitis B virus (HBV), and hepatitis C virus (HCV), while connecting individuals to community services. He said that every week, a team of Orvis Nursing faculty, a project coordinator, a phlebotomist, and a community health worker went to the streets surrounding the Cares Campus and the Village on Sage to provide follow-up care. He mentioned that partners included Northern Nevada Hopes (HOPES), the Community Health Alliance (CHA), Volunteers of America (VOA), and Washoe County Housing and Homeless Services (HHS). He announced a new partnership between the university and Washoe County to integrate StreetReach directly into County services for unsheltered residents. He said that, together, the partnership signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to increase data and referral sharing and to use space at the Cares Campus Resource Center for outreach to meet with clients and provide care in a consistent environment. He pointed out that with the approval of Agenda Item 16, the proposed transfer of the County's mobile health outreach vehicle to the university, would support shared public health activities and provide StreetReach with a new way to expand access to preventive care, medical screenings, and outreach services to underserved populations in the community. He thanked the County for its engagement and the university for its role in addressing homelessness.

Mr. Sandoval reiterated that the UNR was Nevada's original land-grant institution, founded in 1874, and that they took their mission very seriously. He took pride in UNR and believed it was central to serving the community. He thanked the Board and expressed appreciation for their time. He also thanked the university's partners, believing that a great university needed a great community. He said that he delved into the strength of the UNR and County collaboration and opined that it was a force multiplier that would benefit each constituent. He noted that UNR was growing in enrollment, research, physical presence, and community impact, which he called a *silver thread* that connected everyone.

Vice Chair Garcia indicated that the *silver thread* Mr. Sandoval referred to was the silver hair she had from being on campus for as long as she had. She said that she was reminded of how much promise, opportunity, and hope the youth had when she stepped on campus. She reported that UNR was 152 years old, that she shared UNR's birthday, and that she was also born in Elko. She thought the presentation highlighted how the university improved the lives of Nevadans every day, from rural to urban areas. She noted that the Collegiate Academy was impactful and a bright spot for the university, bringing college-level education to high schools.

Mr. Sandoval indicated that the university offered high school students the opportunity to take college-level classes on the high school campus. He recalled that the program began three years ago in Clark County and that UNR was invited by the superintendent of the Clark County School District (CCSD) to run a pilot program in two high schools, one of which was a Title I, high-risk high school. He indicated that the pilot started with approximately 300 students and, three years later, grew to 8,000 students in 30 high schools throughout the State. He reported that Nevada used to be 51st in the Nation for college attainment. He believed that one way to address the low ranking was to bring high-quality educational opportunities to students on their own campus. He said that, in working with school districts, principals, and faculty across the State, UNR was able to offer courses and train more capable faculty to teach them. He mentioned that when he visited the school, he told those students they were part of the Wolf Pack. He said there was an increase in the number of students taking college classes, and that it was remarkable that Title I high schools and high-risk students had access to these courses. He urged students to attend UNR, Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC), Western Nevada College (WNC), the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), or any other higher education institution in Nevada, as these institutions could change lives. He said he could recall many stories of students who did not think they were college material, but who had attended and graduated. He explained that the courses cost \$100; however, many counties offered scholarships. He said that when a high school student took college-level classes, they could enter college as a sophomore and potentially graduate sooner. He indicated that the Board could join UNR in a visit to the high schools to witness the life-changing impact it had on the community.

Commissioner Clark thanked Mr. Sandoval for the presentation. He found it enlightening and interesting to see the students' personal growth. He said there were millions of dollars in construction and a lot of square footage added to the campus. He felt that UNR enriched everyone in the County and added value to the region due to a return on investment. He opined that the UNR team performed a fabulous job. Mr. Sandoval indicated that the team worked hard and that, while he was biased, he believed the secret to UNR's success was the staff's commitment to the university's mission. Commissioner Clark believed the community could benefit from Mr. Sandoval's leadership.

Chair Andriola thanked the UNR staff for making a difference and improving people's lives. She recalled administering scholarships for 10 years, with one criterion that the individual attend a college in Nevada. She said she was an alumna of UNR and urged others to attend UNR. She noted that having an accredited veterinary school was important. She thanked Mr. Sandoval for providing generations of people with the opportunity to attend the university. She expressed gratitude for UNR's partnership with the County. She said that there would be interns from UNR at the County's future behavioral health center to assist traumatized children. She mentioned that UNR was globally recognized and hoped its ranking would continue to rise to number one. She reiterated her thanks to Mr. Sandoval and the staff for their attendance.

**10:40 a.m.**    **The Board recessed for a photo.**

**10:45 a.m.**    **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

**26-0245**    **AGENDA ITEM 4A1** General Update from Truckee Meadows Fire & Rescue, Chief Richard J. Edwards may be available to provide the Board of County Commissioners a verbal report on fuel management and emergency planning, and any other updates as requested monthly to the board, to update to the community related to fire activities. TMFD. (All Commission Districts.)

Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Fire Chief Richard Edwards highlighted the TMFPD's partnership with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and the Living with Fire (LWF) Program, which had been instrumental throughout the County in helping homeowners manage fire risk in their communities through home hardening and fuel mitigation. He expressed appreciation for the partnership and noted that significant work was underway in the community to make it more resilient.

Chief Edwards displayed documents, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. He explained that the TMFPD had been working closely with Code Enforcement, the Wildfire Prevention Division, and the Fire Prevention Bureau to address questions and concerns regarding weeds and vegetation management throughout the community. He shared that it was the growth period for vegetation and weeds, and the recent moisture had contributed to that growth. He advised that collaboratively, a one-page sheet was developed to provide the community with information on how property owners could address various issues, share information with neighbors, and harden their entire subdivisions or neighborhoods. He pointed out that the document helped define noxious weeds, invasive species, and hazardous fuels, as well as the prevalent code. He stated that most enforcement for vegetation plans came from the International Wildland-Urban Interface Code (IWUIC). He explained that the IWUIC applied only to new homes and homes within new additions or building permits issued in high-risk areas, which required a defensible space plan to finalize the permit. He emphasized the importance of educating the community to the fact that the TMFPD might not always have the authority to accomplish what the public was asking, due to certain codes. He mentioned that the TMFPD was available to community members seeking recommendations or additional information. He noted that the TMFPD would send a defensible space inspector to provide information and inspect a specific parcel, offering additional guidance on how to protect property from wildfire risk. He mentioned that the document that he displayed would also be posted to the TMFPD website. He explained that the TMFPD's biggest concern was ensuring that each home would survive a wildfire and added that the document provided steps to harden homes and reduce the fuel around them.

Chief Edwards shared that the open burn season would end on April 30, 2026, and would remain closed until the fall, when it would reopen for several months to allow vegetation burning on parcels greater than one acre. He stated that the final spring Green Waste Collection would be on May 2, 2026, at 11525 Red Rock Road, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., and on Sunday, May 3, 2026, at 885 East Lake Boulevard, from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. He explained that only natural vegetation would be accepted, and no

household garbage would be collected. He said that if anything was brought in garbage bags, the green waste would need to be removed from the bags prior to disposal. He mentioned that the Green Waste Program would return in the fall. He shared that there would be a wildfire preparedness and homeowner education workshop on April 30, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. at the South Valleys Library in partnership with Fire Adapted Nevada (FAN), LWF, the emergency management team, and regional fire partners. He said the meeting would focus on wildfire resilience, home hardening, vegetation management, emergency notifications, and evacuation planning. He encouraged community members to attend due to the potential for wildfires in the coming months. He emphasized the importance of communicating wildfire prevention information to the community in advance, should they be impacted by wildfire.

Chief Edwards shared that the TMFPD personnel had begun their annual wildfire training and preparations for the wildfire season. She stated that the public should not be alarmed if they saw firefighters performing progressive hose lays, practicing shelter deployments, and refreshing strategies and tactics for wildfire operations. He noted that a multi-agency exercise with regional partners would take place in May.

Chief Edwards invited the public to attend the next TMFPD meeting on May 5, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., to learn more about the Fire District.

Vice Chair Garcia mentioned that only a few days remained to participate in the Regional Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Survey. She asked how many surveys had been completed and how many people had visited the website.

Chief Edwards said that he was not certain of the numbers but shared that anyone wishing to provide feedback for the regionalization study needed to do so by April 30, 2026. He described the process of logging in and completing the survey as quick and easy. He pointed out that if more than one person in a household attempted to complete the survey on the same device, only one response would be recorded, and he suggested using multiple devices.

Chair Andriola thanked Commissioner Herman for requesting that Chief Edwards be added as a standing agenda item and expressed her appreciation for the TMFPD's hard work.

**26-0246**     **AGENDA ITEM 5** Public Comment.

Jameson Chow expressed concern that Washoe County was considered unfriendly to pedestrians and failed to support pedestrian infrastructure. He suggested that Washoe County's layout heavily promoted car dependency, and the number of injuries and fatalities in Washoe County had been on the rise and did not appear to be slowing down. He mentioned that there were over 2,000 pedestrian injuries and 16 reported fatalities in Washoe County in 2025, and he felt that the number of injuries and fatalities would continue to increase if the issue was ignored. He alleged that Washoe County was considered car-dependent, with most daily activities and services accessible only by car.

He thought that could cause serious issues with how streets were designed, and believed walking was likely an afterthought. He felt that putting sidewalks and bike lanes directly next to traffic was dangerous and added that some areas of the community lacked sidewalks. He noted that, according to the National Library of Medicine, pedestrians were three times more likely to be in an accident without sidewalks than with them. He believed that it was highly probable that pedestrians and bikers would get hit while commuting, and added that being hit by a car could result in serious injuries and sometimes death. He thought that the reason commuters were forced into such a bad system was the current zoning laws. He said that after World War II, the United States (US) began turning thousands of acres of land into suburbs, which he said were required by single-family zoning laws. He explained that suburban areas had minimum lot and setback requirements to accommodate many similar houses with large driveways and long roads. He alleged that single-family zoning laws would result in a lack of space for pedestrian areas and, in some cases, even sidewalks, which made it incredibly difficult for people to commute in Washoe County without a car. He stated that an estimated 90 percent of Washoe County residents commute, primarily by car. He speculated that most people in Washoe County did not get enough exercise or spend as much time outside. He believed that those issues were not unique to Washoe County but spanned across the US. He surmised that the issue could be easily solved and shared an example of people in other countries, such as the Netherlands, who could walk freely to their local jobs and markets. He suggested building homes closer to job sites and markets, and creating pedestrian-friendly areas, including sidewalks and bike lanes far from cars. He emphasized the need to promote pedestrian-only areas, especially in downtown Reno and near new developments, to create a safer, more accessible County.

Tristan McMinn shared that in 2024, over 300,000 dogs were euthanized in the US alone, which he felt disgusted by. He said that before the blame was placed on the shelters, he suggested considering why there were so many dogs that needed to be euthanized. He mentioned that in 2024, over 8 million dogs were taken in by shelters, and added that dog overpopulation was a major problem in the US. He explained backyard breeding as the irresponsible breeding and selling of puppies, often in poor conditions. He opined that puppy mills and backyard breeding created overpopulation. He thought greedy, uneducated, and reckless breeders never considered the well-being of the dogs they bred. He asserted that dogs bred improperly or unsafely were at risk for health problems, including respiratory issues and other diseases. He noted a second issue with backyard breeding was coat health and pointed out that dogs bred improperly were likely to have matted, hard-to-brush fur that could affect how much they shed. He said that temperament could be affected by backyard breeding, though owners also influenced a dog's behavior. He opined that a poorly bred dog could be properly trained by its owner and still have temperament issues. He shared a personal story about his family purchasing their dog, Violet, from a backyard breeder. He explained that his family was uneducated about backyard breeding, and although they attempted to train Violet, she was very territorial. He pointed out that Violet was a German Shepherd and was naturally territorial, but she had taken territoriality to an extreme. He thought that unethical breeders had bred dogs in poor conditions and lacked health records for adult dogs and their puppies. He recommended finding a breeder who could answer valid questions and added that most registered breeders

with the American Kennel Club (AKC) were likely reliable. He believed that if people were not made aware of issues with illegal breeding, the number of innocent dogs being euthanized would continue to increase. He commented that pets deserved better.

Brooklyn Rummel shared her concern about the tragic events occurring in Lebanon. She mentioned that people were focused on the war in Israel and had forgotten about what was happening in Lebanon. She said that since March 2, over 2,500 people had died because of the Israeli attacks, and over 7,000 had been wounded. She advised that President Donald Trump had promised a two-week ceasefire, yet shortly after, Israel unleashed a deadly 100 strikes in just ten minutes, which killed 300 people and injured over 1,000. She felt that those statistics showed how much destruction could occur in such a short time. She noted that what was happening was unacceptable and that there needed to be a greater focus on Lebanon. She emphasized the importance of spreading awareness and noted that nothing would change if no one addressed the issue. She pointed out the alleged corruption and thought that more needed to be done. She speculated that Israel was actively destroying everything in Lebanon and added that it was not only military targets being destroyed, but also schools, homes, and much more. She reported that the Israeli government had ordered its soldiers to shoot unarmed civilians in the south of Lebanon, even though there was an active ceasefire. She asserted that the Israeli Government made a claim that there were to be no civilians beyond the demarcation line. She mentioned that 55 villages had been erased, but the fact that tens of thousands of civilians still lived in those villages was disregarded. She opined that Lebanon was being erased from maps by the Israeli bombardment, physically and digitally. She believed that south of Lebanon had been destroyed, and homes were being burned to the ground. She alleged that Israel had paid people for every building that was destroyed. She indicated that not only the south but also the north had experienced bombardment. She explained that the majority of the north were Christian areas where people wanted to build families and had nothing to do with the war, but were being pushed out of their homes. She noted that Syrian villages had been left alone. She suggested that similar destruction had occurred in Gaza to the Palestinians and forced the omission of longstanding villages in the West Bank. She emphasized the importance of sharing information for awareness and added that nothing would change if the problem were not dealt with.

Tammy Holt-Still displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She mentioned that she had contacted Washoe County recently regarding Agenda Item 12. She felt that the item should not be heard, based on information in Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 278.315 regarding special exceptions and special use permits (SUP). She suggested that the contract for Agenda Item 12 included special exceptions and SUPs, and that the public needed to be notified of them before the hearing. She alleged that the contract mentioned the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and added that RTC was part of regional planning. She suggested that regional planning had not been shown the contract or agreed upon it as required by NRS 278.02556. She implied that the base flood elevation (BFE) had been revised and believed the examples showed that Washoe County had violated many laws, which she thought were problematic. She said that in 2008, a referendum was held by the people, but the NRS had convoluted the issue due to interference from the legal system. She stated that Washoe County was meant to

serve its residents, not special stakeholders, and said that the Board should represent the constituents who voted them into office. She suggested that it had not been the case for a very long time. She explained that changes were needed, which was why she was running for Washoe County Commissioner, District 5. She thought the NRSs were being used against citizens rather than for them, and that they benefited special interest groups. She suggested that Washoe County needed to change its practices and focus on citizens rather than prioritizing special contracts.

Terry Brooks read an original poem about discrimination against people with hearing impairments.

Emma Doty thanked the Board for hosting UNR Day. She shared that she was a student at UNR and looked forward to her upcoming graduation with a degree in Chemistry. She mentioned that when she looked back at her time at UNR, she was most proud of her achievements while serving as a Senator of the Associated Students of UNR (ASUN) from 2023 to 2025, which gave her the great privilege of making changes on campus. She shared that she focused on basic needs issues, primarily food insecurity, and developed a special committee on food insecurity. She explained one particular initiative that she could not complete in her time at UNR was opening an on-campus grocery store that could be subsidized by UNR and would create student jobs. She explained that the store could use local produce from the Desert Farming Initiative to address the problem that students often lacked access to healthy food, such as fresh produce. She said that UNR President Brian Sandoval had previously spoken about other basic needs, and she hoped that the Board was excited about the partnership with StreetReach. She noted that a Civic Engagement Survey was conducted every other year, with the most recent in 2026, and that the data would be available after the semester. She stated that the 2024 survey showed that in the six months leading up to it, 45 percent of students had some degree of food insecurity, 37 percent had struggled to pay for housing, and 4 percent had been homeless at some point during that period. She mentioned that during her time serving as senator, she saw students who suffered from the same cost-of-living crisis as the community had faced. She felt that students' voices were not being considered during discussions about those issues. She said she hoped the UNR Day at Washoe County could change that. She requested that the Board work with the ASUN and join the UNR students in fighting the scourge of poverty in the community.

Charlie Yingling said that he was proud to serve as the Dean of the Orvis School of Nursing at UNR. He expressed his profound appreciation for the transfer of the mobile health outreach command post vehicle to the Orvis School of Nursing and for the trust that the Board was placing in UNR as stewards of that resource. He mentioned that less than a year ago, Jane Fox asked what it would look like if UNR took an active role in improving the health and well-being of Washoe County's unhoused residents. He replied that within months, StreetReach was initiated, and since that time, StreetReach had touched the lives of hundreds of unhoused residents through nurse-led wound care, testing for blood-borne viruses, and direct linkage to ongoing care. He explained that the work was led by Dr. Molly Kokenge, Dr. Theresa Watts, Professor Jasen Brooks, Natalie Davidson, Jasdeep Buttar, Cary Ballard, and Ms. Fox, and was making a difference where the need

was the greatest. He mentioned that shortly after, another question emerged from his nursing colleagues, Dr. Sheryl Bennett, Professor Amy Millsaps, Professor Kim Buell, and Dr. Shannon Richard, to determine what it would look like if StreetReach partnered with Washoe County School District (WCSD) nurses to expand access to health screenings for children, including enhanced vision and hearing testing. He shared that, as a result of those conversations, School Health Champions were introduced and would soon begin delivering care in partnership with the WCSD. He noted that the team explored how a teaching health center could better serve residents in communities like Incline Village, where geographic barriers, insurance challenges, and workforce shortages overlapped. He said that, together with Community Health Alliance, the StreetReach team was pursuing funding to support the vision of expanding care in Incline Village. He commented that while nothing was yet finalized, the groundwork was being laid. He thought it was important to ask questions, then build practical, nurse-led solutions alongside community partners. He mentioned that the transfer of the mobile health outreach command post vehicle helped fulfill that idea, not just for the current projects underway, but also for future questions that had not yet been asked. He felt that the mobile health outreach command post vehicle enabled care to be brought directly to people, whether outside the Cares Campus, at a school, or in a rural or unincorporated community. He added that the mobile unit allowed his team to respond nimbly as needs shifted, and it would position Washoe County to say yes when opportunity and urgency met. He thanked the Community Reinvestment Program and Grants and Community Program Analyst Alyson Castro, whose partnership and persistence helped the StreetReach team accomplish the transfer of the mobile unit. He mentioned that when two government institutions wanted to achieve something, people like Ms. Castro and Jennifer Bonk from UNR found a way to accomplish their goal. He shared that UNR and the Orvis School of Nursing saw the mobile health outreach command post vehicle not as a vehicle but as a community asset. He said that his team was committed to using it immediately, locally, and in partnership with Washoe County to advance health, dignity, and access for the people who were collectively served. He thanked Washoe County for its leadership and its confidence. He expressed his excitement for future collaborations.

Cynthia Perine shared her concerns regarding the ballot drop box at the Cares Campus. She said she hoped the Cares Campus would provide a refuge of succor and help people who needed assistance. She explained that she recently visited the Cares Campus and went inside. She noted that there were security measures before entering, but the foyer where the drop box would be placed was rather cramped because an extensive security apparatus was in place, similar to going through airport security. She added that there was a walk-in scanner and a scanner for personal belongings. She said she was also concerned that the busy security staff would find having the ballot drop-boxes a distraction, as they were trying to maintain campus security and accommodate public traffic coming in and out. She suggested that the Cares Campus frequently had interruptions from law enforcement. She believed public safety was extremely important, especially during a time of national and local safety concerns. She mentioned that, given the situation, she felt a ballot drop box at the Cares Campus was not a good idea. She remarked that at a recent Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting, there was a lot of discussion about following the law, and she believed that the existence of polling places and drop boxes was a question of legality, which she would not argue with. She felt that what was being

questioned was the specific placement of the drop boxes. She opined that the placement was within the Registrar of Voters' (ROV) discretion. She emphasized the importance of the Washoe County Commissioners seriously considering the reasonableness and wisdom of placing a ballot drop box at the Cares Campus.

Beverly Schnobrich, a Washoe County resident, expressed her appreciation for Ms. Perine's comments. She said that she opposed having a ballot drop box at the Cares Campus.

Penny Brock displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She mentioned that an unsafe, unfenced Cares Campus would be a location for a ballot drop box. She believed that ballot drop boxes should be at polling locations and said that the Cares Campus was not a polling location but was a drop box location. She mentioned that in downtown Reno, there were seven polling locations, plus the drop box location. She added that there were 22 early voting locations, and yet the downtown corridor had seven. She felt that those polling locations were unfair and discriminated against the other voters in the County, which she found concerning. She suggested that more voters were located in South Reno, Northwest Reno, North Reno, Spanish Springs, and Sparks. She shared that she lived in Southeast Reno, District 2, and added that there were no early voting locations, yet there were thousands of registered voters. She mentioned that in Southwest Reno, the polling location was on Mount Rose Highway, which she believed was unacceptable. She explained that the ROV had shown a heat map, which she described as ridiculous, because having seven of the 22 polling locations in the downtown corridor was not rational. She alleged that Washoe County voters were being discriminated against, that it was a major voting issue, and that voters should be provided with sufficient polling locations. She shared a concern that the drop box at the Cares Campus would be used to stuff the ballot box, because she alleged that the Democrats wanted to secure the Commissioner District 2 seat and the Governor's seat. She believed there should be a dedicated camera at the Cares Campus drop box, so anyone could monitor it online 24 hours a day. She suggested that the Cares Campus lacked security and noted a significant difference between a security camera in the room and one specifically dedicated to the drop box.

\* \* \* \* \*

Chair Andriola stated they would move to Item 6, but County Manager (CM) Thomas suggested they had Item 7B1 with Milt Stewart of Nevadaworks, who was there to speak with the Board. CM Thomas stated that she knew they had taken President Sandoval out of order, so she suggested inviting Mr. Stewart to present. Chair Andriola asked CM Thomas if she would then like to move to the Commissioners and County Manager's announcements after Mr. Stewart's presentation. CM Thomas replied in the affirmative, and Chair Andriola confirmed her approval.

\* \* \* \* \*

**26-0247**      **AGENDA ITEM 7B1** Milt Stewart-CEO Nevadaworks will be discussing overview of their services and grants they have received. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas thanked Commissioner Herman for the recommendation to have Mr. Stewart present to the Board.

Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Nevadaworks Milt Stewart conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Nevadaworks; Nevadaworks' Mission; We are here to help.; Serving Northern & Central Nevada; Our Approach; The Hub of Northern Nevada's Workforce Development Ecosystem; Creation of a World-Class Talent Pipeline; In-Person and Virtual Support for; EmployNV Business/Career Hub Locations; Job and Career Seeker Resources; The Career Hub is a place where; The Resource Center; Employer Resources (9 slides); Nevadaworks' Strategic Approach; Good Jobs Northern Nevada (2 slides); Battery Workforce Initiative; Disconnected Youth; Nevada Tech Hub; High Sierra Area Health Education Center; Up Next Nevada Workforce; Quality Jobs, Equity, Strategy and Training; Project Clean Energy Jobs Academy; Apprenticeship Building America Grant; How to Work With Us; Questions?.

Mr. Stewart introduced himself and thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. He stated that his organization brought together job seekers and employers. He noted their mission was to provide the best workforce solutions, fulfilling the needs of both employers and job seekers, who he clarified were their two primary sets of customers.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *We are here to help* and explained that for job seekers, they looked to help increase stability, with self-sustaining family wages, and then put them on career pathways so that they could be successful. He went on to explain that for employers, the objective was to provide them with a skilled workforce that met their talent needs, so that they could have a competitive edge in the marketplace and be successful.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Serving Northern & Central Nevada* and noted that the areas in green were the areas served by Nevadaworks. He listed counties they did not serve, such as Lincoln, Nye, Esmeralda, and Clark, which he said were served by a sister organization called Workforce Connections, operating in Southern Nevada and doing similar work. He noted that Nevadaworks was created through a cooperative agreement of the 13 counties they served, and their work was being done on behalf of the county commissions. He noted that, effectively, the Commissioners were his bosses. He stated that Nevadaworks was the administrative and fiscal entity for those 13 counties.

Mr. Stewart explained that their primary funding was federal funding from the United States (US) Department of Labor (DOL) through the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), which was distributed to each State via a formula and then to each local Board. He clarified that Nevadaworks was the entity that received that federal funding on behalf of those 13 counties.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Our Approach* and stated their approach to workforce development was to implement a system that met employer needs and improved retention, employment, and overall earnings for workers in northern Nevada. He added that they integrated those workforce development programs with the private sector, so that their work was not being done in a vacuum but through public and private partnerships (P3). He explained that their goal was to strengthen local economies by creating a talent pipeline, and that one of the things they had become very good at was aligning resources and leveraging funding, which he said he would demonstrate later.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *The Hub of Northern Nevada's Workforce Development Ecosystem* and declared that Nevadaworks was a hub connecting employers, career seekers, and skills training. He noted that University of Nevada, Reno (UNR)'s President Brian Sandoval had mentioned the cooperative extension, and added that Nevadaworks had held a conversation with that team to try to incorporate that concept into the larger workforce development ecosystem.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Creation of a World-Class Talent Pipeline* and reiterated that their objective was to establish that world-class talent pipeline. He stated that based on the federal legislation and grants received, they targeted populations with barriers to employment or those who, with some support, could be in the labor market or upskilling. He noted that the career development they provided included occupational skills training, work-based learning, employability skills, case management, and more. He explained that they currently had five industry sector partnerships, which aligned them with high growth, in-demand industries. He added that while they supported all industry sectors, they targeted those that were highest growth and most in-demand.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *In-Person and Virtual Support for* and stated that the Nevada Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation (DETR), Nevada Department of Education (DOE), the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Nevada Department of Human Services (DHS), and many others were partners in the EmployNV hub system. He added that Nevada's role as a local board was to convene those American job center hubs, and that requirement was part of the WIOA. So, he noted, it was a responsibility of the local board to make sure that all of the organizations were partnering together and aligning from a resource and strategy perspective.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *EmployNV Business/Career Hub Locations* and explained that Nevadaworks' physical locations were listed, including Carson City, Elko, Ely, Fallon, and Fernley where, he noted, they just completed the ribbon-cutting on a new facility the week prior. He finished the list with Reno, Sparks, and Winnemucca.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Job and Career Seeker Resources and The Career Hub is a place where* and stated that in Reno, the EmployNV hub was at the retail mall, which was near the Atlantis Casino Resort Spa. At that employment hub location, he specified that they provided employment services and upskilling opportunities, where individuals with barriers to employment could be served. He stated they could find

co-located partners in that building, or via a virtual referral system. He explained that if someone walked in the door of the hub, rather than hand them a business card and tell them to go somewhere across town, they could make a referral virtually. He added that the referral would be trackable, so that if they sent a referral they could check in on it, with automatic triggers and alerts that would inform the person who made the referral if the jobseeker met with the potential employer or not. He stated this was a pilot project they had implemented that year, and they had made hundreds of referrals through it already, with a turnaround rate of over 95 percent. He clarified that this meant that of the referrals that were made, 95 percent of them had been received and acted upon by the recipient organizations.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *The Resource Center* and explained that it was a picture of the current hub in Reno, which contained computers with internet access, wi-fi, and business-style infrastructure for individuals so that they could job search, write resumes, or even fill out applications right in the hub. He mentioned there was no cost for those services, and that users could walk in to the hub, check in, and use those services.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Employer Resources (Slide 1)* and *Employer Resources (Slide 2)* and reiterated that they offered employer resources, a full array of business solutions, and, sharing the slide titled *Employer Resources (Slide 3)*, recruiting and prescreening of candidates from the largest database in the State. He specified that the largest database was EmployNV.gov, a virtual system where individuals and businesses could post resumes and jobs, and find labor market information. He felt the hub locations were physical manifestations of the virtual system, so that they served both those who wanted to do things virtually, but also those who needed a human touch and to speak with a real person. This, he explained, was the idea behind the hub.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Employer Resources (Slide 4)* and stated that it showed a hiring event and job fair at the Reno Town Mall. He shared the slides titled *Employer Resources (Slide 5)* and *Employer Resources (Slide 6)* and explained that they provided labor market information, training, and upskilling for staff. He clarified that by upskilling, he was talking about businesses with employees they wanted to upskill, ideally to receive a promotion or wage increase. He stated that the EmployNV hub system could provide support for this, such as paying for training or books.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Employer Resources (Slide 7)* and noted the Reno Town Mall computer lab had 30 terminals and, sharing the slides titled *Employer Resources (Slide 8)* and *Employer Resources (Slide 9)*, that interview rooms were also available, all at no cost. He clarified that no cost meant they were public investments through the federal government, or through the State and other partners, which meant that everyone was paying for it through taxes, but that there was no cost to the end user. He noted that they served businesses of all sizes, adding that everyone knew the major players, but that there were smaller businesses that did not have the infrastructure the hubs could provide. He added that those smaller businesses could come in and use the conference rooms, training rooms, and interview rooms at no cost. He explained that the hub had calendars to schedule use of those services.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Nevadaworks' Strategic Approach* and noted their high-level strategic approach was, from a governance perspective, that they had two bodies, the first being of local elected officials. He stated that Commissioner Herman was the Washoe County representative on their legal consortium. He added that they had one representative from each County, for a total of 13 members. He stated that the second body was an advisory council, which was required to be a minimum of 50 or 51 percent business. He noted that the local elected officials (LEOs) had the fiscal responsibility for anything related to fiscal budgets. He stated the advisory council was created through businesses and included economic development, such as the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN). He noted that in Washoe County, they had President Jeffrey Alexander from Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) and other community colleges to advise the LEOs. He explained that they met together for board meetings, and from those meetings the board—consisting of the LEOs and business members—created their strategic approach, not staff.

**11:32 a.m. Commissioner Herman left the meeting.**

Mr. Stewart felt it was important to point out that their strategic approach was not made in a vacuum, but by input through the Commissioners and businesses. He explained that it also included identifying regional workforce needs based on collaboration, convening stakeholders to ensure alignment, sourcing funding streams, with additional streams beyond the WIOA funding, and investing those streams in innovative solutions. He noted they were always improving and used human-centered design.

Mr. Stewart explained that this job was essentially a second-career, and that for over 20 years he co-owned a small business with multiple retail locations, and so customer service was part of his mindset. He felt this made it impossible for him not to think about how to make the experience at the hubs work for the individuals and businesses, with human-centered and business-centered design at the forefront to deliver a white-glove or concierge service. He observed it did not cost them any additional money to provide good service.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Good Jobs Northern Nevada (Slide 1)*, noting that he would discuss a few of the grants that Nevadaworks received. He stated that the WIOA provided three funding streams, and totaled approximately \$6 million per year, plus or minus for their territory. He noted it covered 13 counties, and 70,000 square miles (sq mi). He stated it was one of the largest workforce development boards in the US with about 75,000 people. He voiced that \$6 million did not seem like enough money to cover that. He added that if they wanted to provide the high level of services he described, they had to turn to partners and additional funding streams. He explained that three years ago, Nevadaworks applied for US Department of Commerce American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding through the Good Jobs Challenge, of which Nevada was a recipient. He stated they targeted four sectors, in collaboration and consultation with the Governor's Office of Economic Development. He noted that one thing they were able to do was 650 job placements, which was the goal. He explained that by leveraging funding with additional grants and the WIOA, they were currently at over 900 job placements. He added

that their stretch goal was 1,100 individuals, as they were successful in obtaining additional funding, which they could leverage. He stated they received an 18-month no-cost extension to continue their work and help individuals in the community. He mentioned that they were able to create industry-sector partnerships, convening employers and workforce stakeholders, but that the key was that the employers, businesses, and industries were driving the conversation. He explained that it was not someone saying they were from the government to help, so much as asking people what they needed. Then, he added, they would take what they learned and tell others what they had heard and how they could help.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Good Jobs Northern Nevada (Slide 2)* and noted that for the Good Job Challenge awards, there had been 509 applicants across the US that resulted in 32 awards, and that Nevadaworks had been one of the 32 award recipients, which equated to almost \$15 million to help distressed communities, rural communities, and tribes. He explained there were 22 tribes in the Nevadaworks territory, and they had a tribal liaison that had developed meaningful and trusted relationships with the tribes so that Nevadaworks could help serve them and reduce any barriers to employment they might have.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Battery Workforce Initiative* and stated that he would cover the information quickly. He explained that it was a grant they had received from the DETR, which allowed them to support the lithium lifecycle industry sector partnership. He said it was aligned directly with the UNR Tech Hub Award, which they received from the Department of Commerce (DOC). He stated they were working closely with lithium lifecycle employers.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Disconnected Youth* and reiterated that it was a DETR-funded grant. He stated that they were in conversations about extending the grant or getting additional money, and that the key takeaway was that they were targeting 16 to 24-year-olds in a five-county area of western Nevada who were not in secondary or post-secondary education, and typically not employed. He stated they were in the process of reimagining their youth delivery service model. He added that they had recently received their latest numbers, and there were 7,200 disconnected youth, which he felt meant that there were 7,200 individuals that needed their assistance, and 7,200 individuals who could be in the labor market or in secondary or post-secondary education. He stated that the Disconnected Youth Program was ongoing.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Nevada Tech Hub* and stated that the UNR tech hub was around the lithium lifecycle and that Nevadaworks had received approximately \$3 million to be part of the UNR tech hub, specifically for workforce development, and more specifically around engagement. He stated that they were bringing UNR into the ecosystem and the ecosystem into UNR, so they could share best practices and ensure their efforts aligned and did not duplicate services.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *High Sierra Area Health Education Center* and explained that a High Sierra Area Health Education Center (AHEC) was a health care grant they had received from DETR that was currently targeted in Reno, Sparks,

and Washoe County, with the intent to spread that across the rural areas. He stated they reached out to the school system, provided information, and identified pathways as early as fifth grade to connect students with career paths they could pursue.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Up Next Nevada Workforce* and stated that it was a partnership between DETR, Nevadaworks, and the Nevada Alliance of Boys and Girls Clubs. He noted that they had a homegrown approach to early childhood education and childcare. He explained that the grant helped foster that, along with the model they used, which was that their members became mentors to help younger members.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Quality Jobs, Equity, Strategy and Training* and mentioned it was another area targeted for WIOA funding. He stated that they were still seeing impacts of COVID-19 (C19) on many people, and that either their jobs were eliminated or they were not able to return to the same jobs. He explained that they had targeted funding to help those individuals cross-train, retrain, or receive additional skills to get back into the labor market.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Project Clean Energy Jobs Academy* and stated that it was from the US DOL and that it helped align their Tech Hub grant, their Industry Sector partnership grant. He added that it was focused around lithium ion battery production.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide titled *Apprenticeship Building America Grant* and explained that Nevadaworks received a four-year, \$4 million grant to establish employer-driven apprenticeship and a pre-apprenticeship readiness program. He stated that they currently had medical, electrical, and general trades available. He stated that they worked with the building trades and were working with multiple different entities. He noted that Nevadaworks had four programs in front of the State Apprenticeship Council in the coming month, where they would be the intermediary. He explained that the concept behind it was the larger organizations and the trades had a more mature model around apprenticeships, but that he knew there were smaller businesses that believed there were too many bureaucratic procedures or did not believe that apprenticeship was a model they could use. He added that by Nevadaworks becoming that intermediary, they could do the arduous work for them. He reiterated that they had four occupations in front of the State Apprenticeship Council, so they could provide the curriculum and the model, adapt it for an employer, and handle the paperwork for them. He felt he was oversimplifying, but reiterated that the apprenticeship building grant was a \$4 million grant over four years with the intent to serve 400 people, and that they were close to a year and three quarters in and had already served 700 people, and that number would likely be at 1,000 by the end of the year. He noted they had not identified a stretch goal yet, because they were hoping they could go even further.

Mr. Stewart shared the slide *How to Work With Us* and summarized that what he had described so far was the work that Nevadaworks did on behalf of the Commissioners, through partnerships, and through the EmployNV hubs. He explained that they continued to apply for additional funding and solicit additional resources to better

serve their communities. He stated that for those familiar with the Reno Town Mall location, the career hub was currently upstairs and the business hub was downstairs. He added that downstairs, across the hall from the existing business hub, there was about 20,000 sq ft, which was a former Burlington Coat Factory space that became the Made in Nevada store. He stated that store moved to another location in the Reno Town Mall. He explained that they were moving the business hub to that location downstairs and would be adding a youth hub. He added that there would be around 4,000 sq ft of space with two air walls, which was shared space that community partners could use for conference rooms, and that they would be providing 30 laptops for individuals or companies to do training. He stated they would have three different sets of that. He shared that they did not intend to have two projects going on at the same time. He stated it became that way because the space at the mall became available. He added that they had been in negotiation with and working on a project in the Oddie district. He mentioned that the former Lowe's building on Oddie Boulevard was going to become an EmployNV hub, and that the Sparks hub that was currently on Pyramid Way would be moving to the downstairs of that hub, and it would be a business hub, career hub, and resource center downstairs with a set of stairs that connected to an upstairs mezzanine. He specified that the space was approximately 5,000 sq ft and would be the youth hub. He stated that they were taking a multi-generational approach, and that the stairs inside would allow them to intermingle, allowing the youth to have their own space but also expose them to a larger ecosystem in the annex. He noted that this space would be similar to the shared space currently at the Reno Town Mall, but amplified. He added that the new building would have access twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. He stated that while the Reno Town Mall location required coordination with the mall owner and security, the new space would allow partners to have their own access codes to use the equipment as they needed.

Vice Chair Garcia stated she got excited about the modernization of the referral system. She felt it was critical in the current era. She felt the remodel at the Reno Town Mall and the relocation of the hub from Pyramid to Oddie Boulevard were also exciting. She noted Mr. Stewart spoke about funding sources and how they diversified funding over the years with State and other dollars. She mentioned she read online that the Trump Administration and Congress were currently considering changes to the WIOA. She asked Mr. Stewart which local programs or populations he was keeping an eye on.

Mr. Stewart stated that the concept Vice Chair Garcia was referring to, which was in the budget that year, had also been proposed last year as well, but that the WIOA funding ended up being flat, which he felt was better than a reduction. He noted that if the current administration were to reduce the current budget per the proposal, it would reduce funding by over 30 percent. He stated that while he did not know what the exact outcomes would be, going off the 30 percent figure would equate to approximately \$2 million less at the local level for Nevadaworks. He stated that, to specifically address Vice Chair Garcia's question, because they had worked to diversify their funding, they could still focus on the individuals with barriers to employment. As for which populations they were looking at, he admitted they were looking at all of them and explained that workforce development was important to everyone, and that anyone that went through the system was served and received a job. He added that not only did this help the employer,

but since many people were on safety net programs and were not paying taxes, Nevadaworks got them into the marketplace so that they were paying taxes. Referring back to the potential funding loss, he stated that his approach was to not worry about it until it happened because they could not control what would happen with any administration. He noted that the current administration acted differently than past administrations, and so, until they knew what the actual funding would be, they could not know exactly what they would do about it. He added that it would not change how they approached things. He stated the good news was that for an organization like Nevadaworks, DETR understood the landscape. He added that they had shared more of the State funding over the past few years with the local boards, including Nevadaworks. He noted they were having a conversation for the upcoming legislative session on how the State might continue to support the local boards. He stated that it was the easiest pivot for them, and that DETR were great partners, and he appreciated that they wanted to invest resources in the local communities.

Commissioner Hill stated it was a great presentation and that she had two questions. She asked what the biggest barriers to employment were that the Board could understand and address. She then asked what other states were doing that Mr. Stewart wished he had the resources to do.

Mr. Stewart responded that the National Association of Workforce Boards—which was the industry association for local workforce development boards, of which there were approximately 550 across the US—had, for the first time in their history, held their national convention in Las Vegas. He stated this was intentional because of the work that was being done in Nevada. He felt that the two local boards in Nevada were some of the most innovative local boards across the US. He stated that both Jaime Cruz at Workforce Connections and he were members of the National Association Board and also the US Conference of Mayors Workforce Development Committee, of which Mayor Hillary Schieve was also a past president. He explained that they were part of a group of 50 high-performing boards across the US, constantly sharing best practices. Regarding the question of what he wished they could do more of, he noted that funding drove what they were able to do, and in the current landscape with the uncertainty around federal funding, he stated they were very grateful for the State stepping up and providing funding so they could continue to do the work they were doing. He asked for Commissioner Hill to repeat the other part of her question.

Commissioner Hill reiterated her question about barriers they were facing.

Mr. Stewart stated that it depended on where they were in the spectrum. He stated they leveraged the work that the school districts did because they were good at what they did. He explained that the populations they dealt with were difficult for the local board to make meaningful inroads with, so they relied on the school districts while providing support from their end of the spectrum, such as training for seniors in high school or high school dropouts. He clarified that other general barriers they saw included transportation, noting that rising gas prices forced some people to make hard choices between employment and staying home to take care of children. He added that childcare expenses were another

significant barrier, and that some families had to make hard decisions on being a single or dual-income family based on childcare costs. He added that when the math did not work out for some families, that affected everyone. He explained that it affected employers because the labor market would shrink, and it affected the tax base because instead of having dual-income families, there would be more single-income families. He reiterated that they were strengthening the hub system to support those types of individuals in person. He stated that one of the projects happening at the State level was to reimagine the EmployNV.gov virtual system to make it more user-friendly and bring in more partners. He added that from a workforce development perspective, it was a no-wrong-door approach in that it did not matter where one entered the system, if they were not the organization that could help, they were going to get the individual connected with the right source. He gave the example of housing and said that even though they did not provide housing assistance, they would make a referral or ensure that even if someone was unhoused, they would try to get them to a place where they could be ready for training or employment. He stated it was more than simply workforce development bringing the different organizations into the ecosystem. He noted they had hired a consultant to reimagine their youth delivery service model and had held conversations in Washoe County with over 40 organizations to learn more about what was happening in the County and to invite other organizations into the ecosystem. He gave the example of Eddy House as being good at what they did, with a workforce development aspect, and described weaving that into the larger system. And therefore, if a homeless youth walked into any door, they knew to refer them to Eddy House, and then they would also be provided with all the workforce development resources at their disposal, or how to help them scale up without having to do it all themselves. He reiterated that this was the idea behind it.

Chair Andriola thanked him for the very in-depth overview of what Nevadaworks did. She recalled when they were still at 560 Mill Street and stated she was on the Board at that time. She thanked him for his work and for continuing to be the lead on workforce development and the Workforce Investment Board, and for partnering and leveraging resources.

**26-0248**      **AGENDA ITEM 6** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas said she was reminded that during the months of May and November, residents of unincorporated Washoe County could place up to six bags, boxes, or bundles per service day at the curb without a Waste Management sticker. She explained that it was a free service under the franchise agreement and added that the public could call Washoe 311 with questions. She mentioned that she was uncertain about the contracts for the Cities of Reno and Sparks but wanted to remind the Board and the community of that service. Chair Andriola hoped that the information could be shared Countywide.

Commissioner Clark requested a report and a future agenda item regarding limiting development extensions. He said that developers had, at times, requested multiple extensions and clarified that he was not scrutinizing Agenda Item 12 but believed a future discussion was needed on the issue. He mentioned that there was a housing shortage and

that subdivisions often sought to continue extending their developments to address it. He stated that it would be ideal to have those proposed developments completed and on the tax rolls to supplement the County's ability to generate income and deliver goods and services to citizens. He thought that a few extensions were reasonable, but having an agenda item to allow for discussion was important. He said that communicating to the development community that endless extensions would not be approved was important. Chair Andriola suggested discussing the topic at a future workshop when housing was on the agenda.

Commissioner Clark agreed to discuss housing when it was appropriate. He questioned the allotted time for presentations and speakers who made public comments at the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meetings. He wondered whether time limits for public commenters could be extended if presentations were allowed more time. CM Thomas confirmed that the presentation time limit was 10 minutes and said that speakers were reminded of that limit before arriving. She noted that a timer would be used for future presentations. Commissioner Clark said that although presentations often shared valuable information, he suggested they should be brief and to the point.

Commissioner Hill explained that there had been significant regional discussion about data centers and noted that the Board had previously considered them when setting priorities for staff developing new Code. She stated that Washoe County lacked sufficient staffing to pursue ordinance changes and acknowledged that data center code development was a lower priority. She suggested that a regional team could develop recommendations for local governments to consider. She asked CM Thomas to share any relevant information with the Board. She expressed concern that, if an entity were to request data center development, the Board might not be fully prepared to regulate such use. She stated that it would be helpful to better understand, on a regional basis, how to align Code so that developers had clear expectations while ensuring appropriate regulations were in place when proposals were brought forward.

CM Thomas said that, in anticipation of the data center topic and to improve communication, an article on data centers, policy, and regional partner efforts was shared during the recent Board brief. She read a document stating that there had been early discussions on a coordinated approach to data center development, reflecting industry interest across Northern Nevada. She mentioned that the document acknowledged that the Cities of Reno and Sparks had recently met with other regional organizations to discuss the potential for a unified policy that did not address resource use, land use, and compatibility, and long-term community impact. She shared that the Cities of Reno and Sparks had expressed interest in moving quickly. She acknowledged that Commissioner Hill had stated that data centers had been prioritized and said that Reno mentioned they would begin the process, along with regional planning. She explained that Reno had expressed a willingness to lead the development of the draft ordinance, and Washoe County would coordinate joint public workshops and maintain alignment with County priorities. She mentioned that the article she shared referenced the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN), which had recently weighed in on the region's economic competitiveness and the need to address infrastructure and resource considerations, and added that the Desert

Research Institute (DRI) created an interactive story map. She confirmed that data centers were under discussion and referred the Board to the Board brief for additional information. Commissioner Hill commented that she wanted to ensure the community was aware that the Board was participating in those discussions and that staff were involved in drafting the guidelines. She hoped that further discussion would occur at upcoming workshops and that information would be shared with constituents.

Chair Andriola mentioned that, while serving as Chair of the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) Governing Board, one of the priorities had been data centers. She said an update on research findings and the proposed regional timeline had been provided so jurisdictions could review the ordinance for consistency. She recommended that a representative from the TMRPA attend a BCC meeting to provide an update. She emphasized the importance of jurisdictions sharing information to ensure a common understanding of the discussions. She suggested that there had been numerous conversations, workshops, and discussions over the past year, including at the national level, and added that Washoe County staff were participating in those efforts.

Vice Chair Garcia acknowledged that, as the third speaker, she would not address data centers but gave her approval for the topic. She shared that the fourth community cleanup was recently held in unincorporated Washoe County. She thanked Sustainability Manager Brian Beffort, Media and Communications Program Manager Candee Ramos, and Benefits Specialist Christine Kirkland for their hard work. She indicated that there was an overwhelming need for cleanup efforts in some unincorporated communities. She expressed appreciation for volunteers from Hug High School, noting their positive attitudes, and for the partners at Hero Environmental Services, who collected a tremendous amount of electronic waste (e-waste). She mentioned that a line formed well before 9:00 a.m., which prompted the check-in station to open earlier than expected to prevent traffic from reaching Sun Valley Boulevard. She explained that the cleanup event was a success, with many tires and e-waste collected. She noted a decline in illegal tire dumping in her district, which she considered a positive trend. She stated that cleanup events were critical in unincorporated areas. She thanked CM Thomas, the Commissioners, volunteers, and staff for their support of clean-up efforts.

Chair Andriola shared that an upcoming Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful (KTMB) community cleanup event was scheduled. She noted that interested individuals could visit KTMB's website for additional information. She said that she had previously participated and would participate again. She expressed surprise at the amount of trash left behind in various areas and encouraged everyone to consider volunteering. She added that the event would begin at 8:00 a.m. and lunch would be provided for volunteers throughout the community.

### **DONATIONS**

**26-0249**      **8A1** Recommendation to accept a gift card donation value of [\$53.39] from a community member to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Community Engagement Office, to be used for food purchases retroactive to March 10,

2026. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0250** **8A2** Recommendation to (1) retroactively approve an agreement between Washoe County Sheriff's Office Citizen Corps Program (CCP) and Hot August Nights, Inc. providing event volunteer services from August 6 - 9, 2025 and (2) accept the resulting donation of [\$3,326.69], for the purchase of operating supplies to benefit volunteers of the Citizen Corps Program (CCP); and, if approved, authorize Finance to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Items 8A1 and 8A2 be accepted.

**CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 9A1 THROUGH 9F1**

- 26-0251** **9A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of March 10, 2026, and March 17, 2026, and the workshop of January 27, 2026. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0252** **9A2** Acknowledge the communications and reports received by the Clerk on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, including the following categories: Communications, Monthly Statements/Reports, and Annual Statements/Reports. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0253** **9B1** Recommendation to 1) approve roll change requests, pursuant to NRS 361.765 and/or NRS 361.768, for errors discovered on the 2022/2023, 2023/2024, 2024/2025 and 2025/2026 secured and unsecured tax rolls 2) authorize Chair to execute the changes described in Exhibits A and B and 3) direct the Washoe County Treasurer to correct the error(s). [cumulative amount of decrease to all taxing entities \$87,154.21]. Assessor. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0254** **9C1** Recommendation to approve Amendment #2 to the Agreement for Services between Washoe County and Verus Associates Nevada, LLC for onsite discovery, programming, design, and construction engineering support related to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Detention and Courts Security Control System Upgrade Project, [in the amount of \$219,480.00]. The scope of services includes onsite discovery and programming to support more effective design and technical document development, as well as construction oversight to facilitate successful project delivery. These efforts will support a future construction project that meets necessary safety requirements for ingress/egress and facility control systems at the 911 Parr

Boulevard Detention Facility. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

- 26-0255** **9C2** Recommendation to accept grant funding [\$15,628.09 with no County match] for Fiscal Year 2026 from the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, received under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (SRS Act) for the benefit of public schools and roads within Washoe County and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0256** **9C3** Recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to provide a non-binding recommendation to the Nevada State Engineer as identified in Nevada Revised Statute 533.363, for the State of Nevada's possible approval of Application numbers 94812 for Permission to Change Point of Diversion and Place of Use of the Public Waters of the State of Nevada, and Applications 94406 and 94407 for permission to appropriate the Public Waters of the State of California and use the water in the State of Nevada. Application 94812, submitted by Truckee Meadows Water Authority, proposes to change the point of diversion and place of use of 81.51 acre-feet of water rights in the Truckee Canyon Hydrographic Basin (via the Truckee River) to a point of diversion and place of use within Washoe County and Storey County for municipal use. The water right was previously diverted from the Truckee Canyon Hydrographic Basin and placed to use within Washoe County. Community Services. Applications 94406 and 94407, submitted by Sierra Pacific Industries, propose to divert 5,600 acre-feet of water rights via underground sources within Lassen County, California, and place the water to use in Dry Valley Hydrographic Basin within Washoe County for irrigation use. Community Services. (Commission District 4.)
- 26-0257** **9D1** Recommendation to accept an FY26 Federal Title IV-B 1 sub-grant award from the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) in the amount of [\$62,004.00; \$20,668.00 county match], including the possible purchase and/or use of prepaid cards/gift cards for participant incentives, retroactive from July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026 to improve outcomes for children and families involved with Washoe County Human Services Agency; authorize the Director of Finance & Administration of the Human Services Agency to execute the grant and related documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0258** **9D2** Recommendation to accept a grant from The Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine (UNRMED) in the amount of [\$8,000.00; no

county match] retroactive from March 1, 2026 through June 30, 2026 to support street medicine to individuals experiencing homelessness through the Nevada Cares Campus; authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the grant and related documents; and direct the Finance office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

**26-0259** **9E1** Recommendation in accordance with NRS 244.1505, to approve FY26 Community Support grant award to:

1. Gerlach General Improvement District (GGID) in the amount of [\$20,000] to support the restoration of the Historic Water Tower, and Gerlach parks, and Resolution 26-26 for the same.
2. Tahoe Prosperity Center in the amount of [\$9,000] to support Tahoe Inc. Roundtable events and the 2026 Business Walks economic conditions survey and outreach; approve Resolution 26-27 for the same; and
3. Incline Village Crystal Bay Business Association in the amount of [\$10,000]; to support the Incline Village Main Street program; approve Resolution R26-28 for the same and direct Finance to make the budget appropriation disbursements. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

**26-0260** **9E2** Washoe County Federal Legislative Activity report for the first quarter of calendar year 2026, created in accordance with Washoe County Federal Legislative Principles and Lobbying Practices for the 119th United States Congress. This item provides a summary of federal legislative activities of county staff, contract lobbyists, and elected officials during the first quarter of 2026, including but not limited to contacts with the members and staff of Nevada's congressional delegation on matters such as Washoe County's Federal Fiscal Year 2027 Congressionally Directed Spending/Community Project Funding requests, the shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security, requests for support for legislative measures, testimony submitted for the record for the Truckee Meadows Public Lands Management Act, attendance at the 2027 National Association of Counties Legislative Conference, and various letters of support submitted to congressional committees and federal agencies. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

**26-0261** **9F1** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$70,736.32; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY26 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) Notice of Subaward, retroactive to October 1, 2025, through September 30, 2026, for the Population Health Division (PHD) to support Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

Vice Chair Garcia disclosed that, for Agenda Item 9D2 regarding the \$8,000 grant to UNRMED, she was an employee of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), but was not affiliated with the funding in the Agenda Item and had no pecuniary interest in the matter. She stated she wanted to put that on record.

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

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 9A1 through 9F1 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 9A1 through 9F1 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**BLOCK VOTE – 10, 13, 14, 15, 16**

**26-0262** **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to approve the purchase of one (1) new Elgin RoadWizard sweeper from Owen Equipment, 1085 Horizon Drive Fairfield, CA 94533 [\$484,165.00], utilizing Sourcewell (a public agency created by the Minnesota legislature) contract #062425-ELG, pursuant to the joinder provision of NRS 332.195. This sweeper replaces like-kind sweeper number 7744, which reached the end of its useful life, and will be used by Community Services Department Roads and Stormwater to maintain service levels in roadway safety, stormwater maintenance, and air quality regulatory compliance. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be approved.

**26-0263** **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to approve Clark/Sullivan Constructors, Inc., doing business as Clark Sullivan Construction, as the Construction-Manager-At-Risk (CMAR) for the Washoe County Register of Voters (ROV) Tenant Improvement Project, located at 6550 Longley Lane, Suite 145, Reno, Nevada. Clark Sullivan Construction is recommended for selection as the project CMAR as identified in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 338.169 following the required competitive processes. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 13 be approved.

**26-0264** **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to acknowledge a [\$860,000] net zero cross-functional budget appropriation transfer from the Public Works function to the Judicial function within the Capital Improvements Fund as allowed per NRS 354.5989005(5)(b); net fiscal impact [\$-0-]. Acknowledgement of this cross-functional appropriation transfer will transfer expenditure authority from Major Maintenance Replacement (IO 20457) to Downtown Courts North Tower Boiler Failure (PW920376) . Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be acknowledged.

**26-0265** **AGENDA ITEM 15** Recommendation to accept the 2025-2026 Extended Foster Care (EFC) state funds as an Award Amendment in the amount of \$1,202,073 retroactive to July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026 to invest in the staffing and direct care payments for the EFC program for young adults aged 18-21, including the possible purchase and/or use of prepaid cards/gift cards for participant incentives; authorize the Director of Finance & Administration of the Human Services Agency to retroactively execute agreement documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 15 be accepted, authorized, and directed.

**26-0266** **AGENDA ITEM 16** Recommendation, in accordance with SLFRF Final Rule FAQ 17.16 and 2 CFR §200.313 to approve a subrecipient agreement between Washoe County and the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) for the transfer and continued use of a mobile health outreach/command post vehicle (VIN: 1F66F5KN9N0A12432) originally purchased in 2022 with American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF) for Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH). Due to operational constraints, NNPH has had limited ability to utilize the asset. This agreement will transfer the vehicle to UNR to ensure it remains in active use for its original intended public health purpose.

And, approve associated resolution and authorize the County Manager to sign necessary award documents, for the transfer of [VIN: 1F66F5KN9N0A12432] to the University of Nevada, Reno, a government entity. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Vice Chair Garcia reiterated her earlier disclosure regarding UNR from Agenda Item 9D2.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be approved and authorized.

**26-0267**      **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation by the Community Services Department to 1) adopt Resolution R26-23 directing staff to initiate the introduction and schedule a first reading of an Ordinance repealing and replacing Ordinance No. 1552, to decrease stormwater management fees effective July 1, 2026, from \$9.31 to \$2.00 per residential parcel or equivalent residential unit (ERU) for non-residential parcels, and other matters properly relating thereto; and 2) direct staff to initiate design of the North Spanish Springs Floodplain Detention Facility Phase 2 project utilizing available Program funds to further reduce flood and stormwater impacts this area of North Spanish Springs. Community Services. (Commission Districts 4 & 5.)

On the call for public comment, Tammy Holt-Still stated she had spoken to residents in Spanish Springs and that they were very concerned that the Commissioners were reducing stormwater management fees. She explained that the residents were worried that, should flooding happen later, and those same residents had issues, then there would not be appropriate funding because the Commissioners had recently approved a development behind the school that would not have to pay the current stormwater management fees. Instead, she expressed, they would be paying the newly-approved reduced fees. She stated she had spoken with residents with the General Improvement District (GID), and they were very concerned. She declared that they felt they would be put in a worse position because of the changes, and that by being in a low-income housing area, the residents would have a difficult time affording what they needed to pay to the GID. She felt that then having the GID be responsible for anything else as well, due to the reduced fees being paid into the system, was appalling. She stated the Board was not looking at their citizens as a whole, and were instead looking at special interests. She declared that developers were not the only stakeholders, that taxpayers were also stakeholders. She stated the Commissioners were responsible for every individual who put

money into the public coffers, and they needed to uphold that. She felt the people that she had spoken with from Sparks did not like the idea of the reduction.

Chair Andriola asked if any of the Commissioners had questions for Dwayne Smith, Director of Engineering & Capital Projects for the Community Services Department (CSD). She asked Mr. Smith whether he wanted to share any information with the Board, specifically a brief summary of the matter and an explanation for the \$2 reduction, along with the commitment the County had made to return the money.

Mr. Smith introduced himself and stated that he appreciated the opportunity for the Board to hear the item. He noted that the item followed the commitment that the staff had made to the Board. He explained that when they raised the fees to \$9.31, they knew that there would be a time when the bonds, the reason for the original fee raise, would be paid in full. He noted that the final bond payment would be in June. Due to that, he explained, they were in a position to reduce the user fees. He clarified that the fees were user rate fees and were not a tax. He added that the fees were used to accomplish the required ongoing operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement of the facilities. He mentioned that, as included in the Staff Report, there was significant information regarding their current fund balances, operational costs, and how they planned on moving forward through the approach.

Mr. Smith stated that the second piece, which he felt was important, was that they recognized that the program really did bring significant benefit and value to the unincorporated residents within Spanish Springs, and that their commitment was to carry this forward. He added that the second part of the request was to direct them to initiate phase two of the capital design, using the available fund balance to bring additional benefits to the community through additional flood management approaches. He felt that paying off the bonds marked a milestone, representing that the County was following through on its commitment, and that they had appropriately managed the fund to allow Washoe County to reduce the fees for residents down to \$2 a month. He noted that, as they did with all of their utility approaches, they kept a very close eye on fund balances and worked closely with the Comptroller and Budget Manager to ensure they were in conformance with the Washoe County policy requirements. He added that he made sure they were in full conformance with Washoe County fiscal policy.

Vice Chair Garcia asked for clarification on a comment made during public comment regarding the GIDs being impacted by Sun Valley.

Mr. Smith stated he was not familiar with any GIDs in the unincorporated areas of North Spanish Springs.

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

26-0268

**AGENDA ITEM 12** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 approving a development agreement between Washoe County and Lansing-Arcus, LLC, for Prado Ranch North, a residential subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM18-002). The purpose of the development agreement is to extend the deadline for recording the next final map from September 9, 2026, to September 9, 2030. The project is located adjacent to Lemmon Valley Drive, north of Nectar Street and adjacent to Chickadee Drive and Sand Pit Road. The project encompasses a total of approximately ±246.6 acres, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 490 with 7 lots recorded and 483 lots remaining to be recorded. The parcels are located within the North Valleys Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 5. (APNs: 540-051-01, 080-721-03, 080-721-04, & 080-721-05). And, if approved, schedule a public hearing, second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for May 26, 2026, and authorization for the Chair to execute the Development Agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1947.

On the call for public comment, Tammy Holt-Still displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She expressed concerns about the Base Flood Elevation (BFE) because she believed the BFE approved in Lemmon Valley was presented by a staff member who was not a hydrologist. She recalled that Lemmon Valley flooded in 2017, not due to Swan Lake, but rather, to an issue with the amount of effluent discharged to the lake by an unlicensed, unpermitted sewer plant in the area. She referred to her *Permit Type: Groundwater Discharge* document and opined that it was the last permit available from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP). She reported that the BFE level for Swan Lake was over 4,700 feet (ft) and almost at 4,900 ft. She said that the developer wanted to build in a floodplain where a State of Emergency had been declared. She speculated that problems were caused by approving Agenda Item 12 because it would flood the existing residents. She asserted that the drainage was the same as it had been and felt that the developer would take the floodplain away from existing residents. She indicated that the County should be following Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 206.310. She said that the region was a closed basin that did not drain. She felt that the Board had not addressed her concerns since 2017.

Danny Cleous indicated that he normally did not provide public comment because he did not like his civil rights being revoked by certain Board members. He believed that the development project should never have been approved. He recalled that there was a hydrology report that the Board did not want to read; however, he used it to successfully sue the City of Reno. He said that a report was released after the 2017 flood, stating that high-density buildings should not be built in the area because they would cause flooding. He relayed that the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) website noted that to stay reasonably safe from flooding, a community must review all permit applications to determine whether the proposed building sites would be reasonably safe

from flooding. He said that the review of permit applications was also one of the minimum qualifications for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). He mentioned that when developers wished to move dirt to a location that had previously flooded, FEMA and its engineers needed to inspect it, which he felt had never been done. He speculated that the developer needed to redo their process because they could not account for what would drain or where the water would be directed, even though it had been previously approved. He recalled that Engineering and Capital Projects Division Director Dwayne Smith said, in 2018, that silt could not be built on. He urged the Board to deny Agenda Item 12.

Chair Andriola asked Planner Julee Olander to come to the podium for potential questions. She requested that Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large share the legal clarifications regarding the various Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) referenced. CDDA Large indicated that, before the Board, was an introduction and first reading of an ordinance approving a development agreement. He said that Agenda Item 12 allowed the Board to read an ordinance extending the Prado Ranch subdivision's time to comply with the final map. He noted that if the ordinance were introduced, a public hearing would be scheduled for the second reading and possible adoption. He said that the introduction and first reading of the ordinance did not require any notice beyond what was required by the Open Meeting Law (OML). He pointed out that the second reading, as reflected in the Staff Report, would be scheduled for a future meeting in accordance with NRS 244.100 and Washoe County Development Code (WCDC) 110.814.24, which included publication in a newspaper of general circulation mailed to all property owners within 300 feet (ft) of the development. He asserted that the notice for Agenda Item 12 was vetted by legal to ensure proper notice was applied.

Bill No. 1947 was introduced by Vice Chair Garcia, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**26-0269** **AGENDA ITEM 17** Public Hearing: Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA26-0001 (Mustang RZA). Consideration of Planning Commission's recommendation to adopt an amendment to the Truckee Canyon Regulatory Zone map to change the zoning on one (1) parcel (APN: 084-060-13) totaling ±624 acres from 27% Parks and Recreation & 73% General Rural to 100% General Rural. And if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect. The applicant is Q&D Construction and the property owner is Lockwood Investment Co LTD. The property is located at 12005 Interstate 80 East. The Board of County Commissioners may adopt the proposed amendment, may modify the proposed amendment and refer the matter back to the Planning Commission for its report in accordance with NRS 278.220(4), or may deny the proposed amendment after the public hearing. In making its determination regarding the regulatory zone amendment, the Board shall either affirm, modify, or reject the findings of fact included in the Planning Commission's recommendation. Community Services. (Commission District 4)

Chair Andriola opened the public hearing. She noted there was a presentation by Courtney Weiche, Senior Planner with Washoe County Community Services Department (CSD) Planning & Development.

Ms. Weiche conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WRZA26-0001 (Mustang RZA); Request; Location; RZA Request; Evaluation; Neighborhood Meetings & Public Comment; Planning Commission Recommendation; Thank you.

Ms. Weiche shared the slide *WRZA26-0001 (Mustang RZA)* and introduced herself and the item before the Board. She shared the slide titled *Request* and stated that the specific request was to amend the Truckee Canyon Regulatory Zone map to change the zoning on a 624-acre parcel from 27 percent Parks and Recreation and 73 percent General Rural to 100 percent General Rural.

Ms. Weiche shared the slide titled *Location* and explained that the subject parcel was located at 12005 Interstate-80 (I-80) East in the Truckee Canyon Planning Area and was located on the north side of I-80 near exit 23, which was Mustang Road.

Ms. Weiche shared the slide *RZA Request* and noted that the existing Parks and Recreation zoning, which was shown on her slide in green, accommodated previous off-road racing events, which were defined as outdoor entertainment and were an allowed use in the Parks and Recreation regulatory zone. She stated that the applicant noted that the site was no longer being used for recreational purposes, and that they wished to return the property to its previous zoning to better align with the existing uses on the site and surrounding properties. She clarified that it was to return to General Rural.

Ms. Weiche shared the *Evaluation* slide and stated that the proposed General Rural zoning was consistent with the surrounding General Rural zoning on the parcel and adjacent parcels. She explained that expanded aggregate pit operations or any other future development would comply with requirements if the applicant chose to do so. Ms. Weiche stated there would be no changes to existing access, traffic, or circulation of the site. She noted that applicable agencies reviewed the application, and that their comments were included in the Staff Report. She said no comments of concern were received.

Ms. Weiche shared the slide titled *Neighborhood Meetings & Public Comment* and noted that a neighborhood meeting was held virtually on December 9, 2025. She stated there were no members of the public who attended, and that staff had received no comments or calls.

Ms. Weiche shared the slide titled *Planning Commission Recommendation* and stated that the Planning Commission held a public hearing in March, made all the required findings, and unanimously recommended approval of the request. She stated that a possible motion could be found on page 12 of the Staff Report.

Ms. Weiche shared the slide titled *Thank you* and announced the end of her presentation and that she was available for questions. She added that the applicant also had a presentation and was available to answer questions.

Melissa Smith with Wood Rogers, Inc. conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: APN 084-060-13 Regulatory Zone Amendment; Project Area; Master Plan and Zoning; Background; Current Request; Proposed Zoning; What are the next steps?; Questions.

She stated she was before the Board to represent the applicant, Q&D Construction. She noted that she had a presentation prepared and was willing to present it, but that it duplicated much of what Ms. Weiche had just presented. She noted that Ms. Weiche had done a good job presenting the project. She stated she would skip ahead to one slide that highlighted the benefits of the zone change. She shared the slide titled *Current Request* and explained that it returned the site to its original intended zoning, eliminated split zoning across the site, aligned the site with current users, and would facilitate future expansion of those uses. She explained that the matter was a cleanup of zoning. She added that others were available for questions, including a representative for the applicant, Q&D Construction.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Herman absent, it was moved to (1) adopt Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA26-0001, which amends the Truckee Canyon Regulatory Zone Map, on one (1) parcel (APN: 084-060-13) totaling ±624 acres from 27% Parks and Recreation & 73% General Rural to 100% General Rural; and (2) authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained in Attachment A to this staff report to that effect. In making this motion, the Board is affirming the Planning Commission's findings of fact required for the regulatory zone amendment as required by Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15(d), as outlined in the Staff Report.

Chair Andriola closed the public hearing.

**26-0270** **AGENDA ITEM 18** Public Hearing: Appeal of Washoe County Board of Adjustment's approval of Case Number WPVAR25-0011 (515 Rhodes Wall Height Variance) by appellant Jim Grimes which brings into conformance an existing ninety-five (95') foot long wall with a height of fifteen feet, eight inches (15' 8"). The variance applicants are Curtis and Judy Coulter. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

Chair Andriola opened the public hearing.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Andriola explained that, given concerns raised during the previous public hearing on Agenda Item 17 and in the interest of consistency, the Board would provide the appellant and the applicant with ten minutes each to provide their presentations. She stated that, after the staff presentation, the appellant would be invited to present next, followed by the applicant.

Planner Jolene Bertetto conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WPVAR25-0011; Request; Parcel Background; Site Plan; 515 Rhodes Wall; View from neighboring property; Key Required Finding; Findings; Recommendation; Thank You.

Ms. Bertetto introduced herself and noted that her presentation detailed the appeal to the 515 Rhodes Road wall height variance. She displayed the slide titled *Request*, explaining that the request for Agenda Item 18 was for an appeal of the Board of Adjustment's (BOA) approval of a variance to increase the maximum allowed height for a wall from 6 feet to 15 feet 8 inches. She stated that varying the standard would bring the existing wall near the applicant's eastern property line into compliance. She showed the *Parcel Background* slide and noted that the subject parcel with the existing wall in question was located at 515 Rhodes Road, was approximately five acres in size, was in the low-density suburban (LDS) regulatory zone, and was part of the South Valleys Planning Area (SVPA). She displayed the slide titled *Site Plan*, explaining that it included a map showing where the wall was located within a yellow circle. She stated that the wall was near the subject parcel's eastern property line.

Ms. Bertetto showed the *515 Rhodes Wall* slide. She noted that the image on the slide depicted the wall, which was 15 feet 8 inches high and 95 feet long. She reported that, according to the applicant, the wall was constructed eight years prior and mounted with various birdhouses. She explained that the diagram showed the wall's height relative to that of an average pedestrian, as well as how the birdhouses were mounted along its side. She displayed the *View from neighboring property* slide, noting that the image was a view of the wall from the neighboring property to the east. She reported that the birdhouses depicted previously were mounted on the opposite side of the wall. She stated that a noteworthy aspect of the image was the presence of a separate fence along the property line, which was independent of the applicant's wall.

Ms. Bertetto displayed the slide titled *Key Required Finding*. She reported that, when evaluating the application for the requested variance, staff did not find that there was exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape to the parcel, nor exceptional topographic conditions, or other extraordinary and exceptional situations or conditions of the piece of property. She stated that the BOA had found that there was a special circumstance, which was the removal of a mature tree and the creation of habitat for wildlife, and had subsequently approved the variance in a 5 to 0 vote. She showed the *Findings* slide, noting that the list detailed the full findings that would need to be made in order to approve a variance. She displayed the *Recommendations* slide, noting that the recommendation was for the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) to review the record and decide whether to affirm the BOA's decision and approve the variance, which would

include the conditions of approval in Attachment H of the Staff Report, or reverse the BOA's decision and deny the variance. She noted that the representative for the appellant was present at the BCC meeting with a presentation, as well as a representative for the original variance applicants.

Chair Andriola invited the appellant to present, noting that they would set the timer for ten minutes. She requested that the appellant introduce themselves.

Attorney Nathan Aman of the law firm Vilorio, Oliphant, Oster and Aman conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: *Untitled Photographs* (6 slides).

Mr. Aman introduced himself and explained that he was representing the appellant, Jim Grimes. He stated that there was some history to discuss about the appeal. He noted that he and the appellant had not attended the initial BOA meeting on the matter, as Mr. Grimes had not been aware of it until approximately two days beforehand, while he was not in the United States (US). He explained that there had been very little participation by those in support of the appeal at the previous BOA hearing. He displayed the first *Untitled Photographs* slide, stated that he was a litigator, and apologized for not having the most comprehensive PowerPoint presentation. He opined that the photographs included in the presentation would be enough to support his argument. He explained that he had appeared in courts throughout Nevada and that, in his work, he had not often given PowerPoint presentations.

Mr. Aman reiterated his intent to discuss the appeal's history and noted that he and Commissioner Clark had become involved in the matter at approximately the same time. He recalled that in July of 2025, a letter raising various issues from the attorney of the applicants, the Coulters, had been sent to 14 different offices and individuals within Washoe County, including the District Attorney's (DA) Office. He explained that the letter described allegations regarding the appellant's property, which Mr. Grimes was developing adjacent to the subject property. He explained that the allegations stated there were 12,000 cubic yards of dirt placed on the property, but no calculations had been done to support that claim. He reported that, when the appellant calculated the volume of dirt that would be associated with such a claim, it would represent a 32-foot-high hill with 70-degree slopes in order to fit on the appellant's one-acre property. He explained that the letter included other allegations about violations of septic system codes, but no septic system had even been designed for the appellant's property.

Mr. Aman stated that the applicant intentionally sought to create every obstacle to the development of the appellant's property, with such efforts resulting in multiple delays. He said that there were currently other variance issues associated with the applicant's property. He stated that upon resuming work on the development of his property following the delays, the appellant had discovered that a permit was required to build a fence over six feet tall. He explained that, after the development issues and delays he had described, the appellant began to question whether a 16-foot-tall, 100-foot-long fence on the applicant's property, located directly beside another fence, was a violation.

Mr. Aman described his understanding of the law and acknowledged that he had the burden of persuasion to convince the Board to reconsider the BOA's decision. He explained that both the law and the details in Ms. Bertetto's presentation needed to be followed by the Board. He noted that consideration of the special circumstances was required by law and that all four findings needed to be made per Washoe County Development Code (WCDC) Section 110.804.25. He stated that the findings from WCDC Article 804 Subsection A for special circumstances and Subsection C for no special privileges, as provided in the Staff Report, had not been found. He explained that he would continue reviewing his presentation and acknowledged that each Commissioner had received both his and the applicant's presentations.

Mr. Aman noted that the applicant's presentation would show the Board a 16-foot-tall fence. He stated that he found the use of the term *wildlife preservation* in the applicant's argument curious, as it was not defined anywhere in the WCDC. He reported that the BOA could not determine whether the wall in question was considered a fence, as it was located directly beside another property's fence, or whether it was technically a structure due to its size and proximity to the neighboring fence. He stated that, if the wall was technically a structure, it encroached on the property line, and if it was a fence, it was nearly three times the required height outlined in the WCDC. He questioned the applicant's reasoning for requiring the construction of the wall to preserve new trees, given that another tree on the property had fallen and needed to be cut down. He explained that the report in the original application asserted that the wall was on the east side of the subject property, and there was a claim that it was necessary to protect a newly planted arboretum. He asserted that residents of the region were aware that the winds in that area traveled from the west to the east, though the applicant's presentation showed that all of the trees were located to the west of the wall, meaning that the wall could not protect the trees.

Mr. Aman stated that describing the wall as a wildlife preservation wall was a curious decision, as, in his experience attending courts throughout the State, there was a requirement for unique scientific issues that some expert in the relevant field would be present to support the claim that the 16-foot-tall, 100-foot-wide wall helped migratory birds. He noted that, while he personally loved birds, there was no scientific proof, such as a biology report, to support the idea that the wall had such a purpose. He reported that the birdhouses had been mounted on the wall in February 2026. He expressed appreciation for the history associated with the age of the trees on the subject property, but noted that there was no scientific evidence that the wall was related to wildlife or bird protection. He stated that he had various books on birds and engaged in birdwatching with his niece, but despite his involvement in those hobbies, he could not see how the applicant's claims complied with them. He explained that the BOA never addressed the elements or developed a rationale to support its decision on special circumstances or a lack of special privileges.

Mr. Aman speculated that the applicant's argument would be that Mr. Grimes was just an aggrieved person who could not even see the wall from his property. He clarified that the property the applicants were referring to in that argument was not the same property that was at issue, as there was another property owned by the appellant directly beside the applicant's subject property. He reported that, during the ongoing

dispute, the applicants had constructed a light pole with a camera on top of it, which was pointed directly at the appellant's property, and that he suspected would be the cause of a future lawsuit related to an invasion of privacy. He stated that the appellant had to consider options to protect himself from the camera facing one side of his property, such as possibly building a 16- or 30-foot-tall fence, but he asked where the issue would end and whether tall fences would be built all around the Washoe Valley area. He explained that he had acted as legal representation for fencing companies and suspected that those businesses would love the opportunity to charge \$100,000 to construct large fences.

Mr. Aman requested that the Commissioners review the BOA's decision. He recalled that some of the comments made during the BOA hearing to justify the variance had included the idea that the wall was interesting and that the BOA suspected that it was constructed in good faith. He asserted that the reality was that the letters from the applicant's legal representation, which Commissioner Clark was copied on, had been submitted and were on record, and had contained demands that Mr. Grimes remove the dirt, return his entire property to native conditions, and not build on it. He opined that the wall was only constructed for privacy after a large tree on the subject property fell. He acknowledged that the applicants had discussed the matter with their neighbors, but he noted that they had also persuaded the neighbors to oppose the appellant's construction efforts on his properties in the area. He opined that no one wanted more neighbors or new construction, but such a desire did not justify the applicant's variance, as concrete proof was required that there were no special circumstances. He explained that the wall would create a special circumstance that he was certain Mr. Grimes would not be granted if he were to apply for a variance as well. He reiterated that the Staff Report had made it very clear that there were no special circumstances associated with the subject property, which detailed that the variance would create special privileges for the lot. He emphasized his belief that the Staff Report should be adhered to.

Mr. Aman stated that when all of the details he had provided were applied to the applicant's argument, it would not hold up to scrutiny. He explained that a 16-foot fence should not be allowed. He explained that Mr. Grimes was an aggrieved party as a future neighbor of the applicants and wanted them held to the same standards he was expected to follow. He reported that the appellant had applied for a fence permit and was told that there was a 6-foot height limitation, while the applicants had built their wall eight years prior without considering whether BOA approval was required. He stated that, based on the WCDC, he did not believe the variance should be allowed and that the applicants should be held to the same legal standards as the appellant.

Chair Andriola thanked Mr. Aman and called on the applicant to provide their presentation.

Garrett Gordon, Partner of Womble Bond Dickinson conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Opposition to Appeal of Wildlife Preservation Wall Variance; Background (2 slides); Special Circumstances; Arboretum; Wildlife; Wildlife Preservation Wall; Variance Hearing (3 slides); Overview/Requested Action; Threshold Issue (3 slides); Untitled Picture; Standard

of Review; Public Welfare; Variance Authority and Governing Law; Special Circumstances: Extraordinary Site Conditions; No Special Privilege Granted; Substantial Evidence Supports BOA Decision; Conclusion and Requested Action.

Mr. Gordon greeted the Board and noted that he was representing the applicants, the Coulters. He stated that he and the applicants opposed the appeal under deliberation by the Board and asked that the BCC uphold the BOA's unanimous decision. He displayed the first slide titled *Background* and explained that the applicants had received a code enforcement violation for the wall on the subject property. He noted that the violation alleged that the structure was either a fence or a wall that exceeded six feet in height. He emphasized that there was a distinction between whether the structure in question was considered a wall or a fence, which he believed was a fence, noting that he would provide the definition momentarily. He explained that the wall had been on the subject property for eight years without bothering anybody. He noted that the variance application was filed by the applicants prior to going before the BOA, which unanimously approved it. He explained that the members of the BOA were very intelligent and each had a unique personality, making unanimous decisions among them very rare. He reported that Mr. Grimes has appealed the BOA's decision and asserted that the appeal lacked standing and the arguments necessary to support it, as the appellant could not even see the wall from his property.

Mr. Gordon showed the second slide titled *Background*. He explained that the subject property was previously home to one of the largest trees in Nevada, which was certified by the State of Nevada as a Fremont Cottonwood, standing 105 feet tall with a circumference of 42 feet. He noted that the image on the slide showed the tree's size relative to a person standing beside it. He explained that the tree's size and the subject property's location along a migratory bird path meant the tree was home to substantial wildlife. He displayed the *Special Circumstances* slide and reported that the applicants were forced to remove the exceptionally large tree after it began to split, along with unspecified events in the area. He elaborated that, because the tree was of exceptional size and ecological significance, its removal created a special circumstance, which was why the BOA found that approving the variance would not create a precedent. He emphasized that there were no other 700-year-old trees with a circumference of 42 feet in the neighborhood or in Washoe County, making the loss of that tree a special circumstance.

Mr. Gordon displayed the *Arboretum* slide, explaining that, following the loss of that tree, rather than ignoring the situation, the applicants undertook efforts at their own cost to create an arboretum to replace the lost habitat and protect the wildlife that had inhabited the tree. He reported that the applicants had created the arboretum by planting a substantial number of new trees, resulting in a significant increase in the migratory bird population. He introduced the slide titled *Wildlife* by explaining that classes from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) visited the subject property to observe wildlife. He referred to the list on the slide, noting that some wildlife on the property included great horned owls, falcons, hawks, finches, woodpeckers, doves, and others. He noted that the arboretum had become a nesting area that was bustling with wildlife activity.

Mr. Gordon showed the slide titled *Wildlife Preservation Wall*. He noted that the applicants built the preservation wall to protect and cultivate the local wildlife by shielding the maturing arboretum against high winds and other environmental hazards that could harm the birds. He noted that the wall-mounted birdhouses were visible in the picture on the slide. He contested that the birdhouses had been on the wall for years, despite earlier comments from Mr. Aman indicating they were added only in February of 2026. He explained that pictures of the birdhouses were submitted when the applicants filed for the variance in December 2025. He noted that the birdhouses had been there for years, with the height at which they were mounted being an important aspect of the wall, as after consulting experts, the applicants learned that finches preferred to nest at least eight feet above the ground to ensure safety from predators like cats, raccoons, and coyotes. He reiterated that the wall was built to such a height and that the birdhouses were mounted where they were placed with those factors in mind.

Mr. Gordon displayed the first slide titled *Variance Hearing*. He reported that the BOA had unanimously approved the variance request. He noted that the BOA had questioned the authority of code enforcement to cite the wall on the subject property as a violation because there was no definition for what constituted a wall in the WCDC, and despite Mr. Aman's comments describing the structure as a fence, it did not fit that definition because it was not enclosing any space or separating parcels of land. He noted that the preservation wall on the subject property did not meet the definition of a structure either, as structures were defined as walled and roofed buildings. He reported that the BOA, in addition to making every finding necessary to approve the variance, suspected that there was likely no authority for the County to cite the preservation wall as a code enforcement violation, as the WCDC had no definition for a wall, and it was also determined that it was not a fence or a structure.

Mr. Gordon referred to the second slide titled *Variance Hearing* and explained that the BOA conducted a comprehensive review during the variance hearing. He displayed the third slide titled *Variance Hearing*, noting the red dots shown in the slide's image. He stated that the red rectangular outline on the right side of the aerial image depicted the location of the preservation wall, with the red dots indicating the residences of homeowners who had submitted letters approving and consenting to its construction. He noted that on the right side of the rectangle that indicated the wall's location, the two largest red dots represented the residences of homeowners whose properties the preservation wall was directly behind. He reported that those residents had provided written consent on the record, asserting their belief that the preservation wall was fabulous. He stated that throughout the neighborhood, eight residents had expressed appreciation for what the applicants had done.

Mr. Gordon displayed the *Overview/Requested Action* slide. He explained that he and the applicants were requesting that the BCC deny the appeal request. He showed the first slide titled *Threshold Issue* and opined that the Board did not even need to consider the substantive question, as the BCC first needed to determine whether the appellant had standing in the appeal and what that meant in respect to the WCDC. He explained that in order for the appeal to have standing, it would mean that the variance caused injury to

personal or property rights, and was not merely applicable to a party who was dissatisfied with the BOA's decision. He opined that, based on the presentations, the Board had not heard of any injury to personal or property rights arising from the variance approval. He stated that there was no argument put on record that the appellant had lost value in their land or had suffered a personal injury of any monetary value. He reiterated his statement that the appeal was the result of a party that was dissatisfied with the BOA's decision and argued that there was a lack of injury and no standing to oppose the merits of the BOA's ruling.

Mr. Gordon displayed the second *Threshold Issue* slide, noting that the image showed the wildlife preservation wall on the right side and the appellant's property outlined in red on the left side of the image. He showed the third *Threshold Issue* slide, noting that it included pictures showing that the appellants could not see the preservation wall from their property. He suspected he might have difficulty defending the applicant's case if the property owners directly behind the preservation wall had been the ones to appeal, due to possible dissatisfaction with the preservation wall's size, potential loss of sunlight on their property, or inability to use their yard. He reiterated that such opinions from those property owners had not been expressed, and that the applicants had instead received consent from all residents who could see the wall from their property. He displayed the *Untitled Picture* slide and reported that the BOA found that all of the findings outlined in the Staff Report could be made, given the size of the removed tree. He noted that the BOA had not taken the appellant's argument into consideration, as the image on the slide depicted the view of the subject property from the public road that was located between the applicant's and appellant's properties. He noted that the treeline and the applicant's home on the subject property entirely obscured the preservation wall from view.

Mr. Gordon introduced the slide titled *Standard of Review*. He explained that the appellant did not have the right to request that the BCC overturn the ruling made by the BOA simply because they were dissatisfied with the BOA's decision. He explained that the presumption was on the appellant to make an argument that the BOA's decision was unreasonable or unlawful, and he opined that neither of those conditions was true. He displayed the *Public Welfare* slide and asserted that the preservation wall had been a great addition to the local area based on the Land Use Regulation Authority code, community support for the variance, environmental protection benefits, and advancements to public welfare. He explained that some individuals had reported visiting the area around the property and seeing a large pond with ducks, herds of deer, and abundant wildlife. He opined that the preservation wall had been a great addition to the area for eight years without receiving any complaints.

Mr. Gordon showed the *Conclusion and Requested Action* slide. He acknowledged that he was approaching the time limit and intended to conclude his presentation. He expressed a desire to reiterate that there was no standing to appeal the approval. He opined that he did not think he needed to review the merit of the variance, which he stated he would happily answer any questions about, as the appellant had suffered no injury. He reiterated that the appellant could not see the preservation wall from their property and had not put on record any personal or property rights affected by it. He

asserted that the appellant's representation had told a story about other interactions between the appellant and the applicants, but the matter currently being determined concerned the variance. He stated that the BOA unanimously approved the variance application, and he opined that the appellant and his representative were merely dissatisfied with that decision. He stated that there was nothing on record that would be sufficient to overturn the BOA's ruling.

Commissioner Hill noted that she had no questions, and she recalled that the BCC had previously heard items related to variances. She requested that staff make a note for the future to revisit whether changes to the WCDC were needed for matters similar to the current hearing. She reminded the Board of a previous variance request that had come before the BCC to reduce a setback for a property in Incline Village due to extenuating circumstances with an impacted parcel, which affected that entire neighborhood. She opined that the Board would always be in a better position to address such concerns if Commissioners learned from such requests and considered whether they needed to change the WCDC to institute requirements for extenuating circumstances similar to those in the current hearing.

Chair Andriola echoed Commissioner Hill's statements. She explained that she had watched the BOA hearing for the variance application and recalled that a member of the BOA had questioned the application of a provision in Article 438 of the WCDC allowing a director's modification, which staff and Secretary Trevor Lloyd had clearly stated did not apply during that hearing. She opined that deliberating the appeal had created opportunities for the BCC to consider methods for addressing variances and the requirements associated with them in the future, and she stated that she would anticipate revisiting that as an item at an upcoming BCC meeting.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Chair Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that the appeal be denied and the decision of the Board of Adjustment to approve Case Number WPVAR25-0011 (515 Rhodes Wall Height Variance) subject to the conditions of approval in Attachment H, be upheld. The approval is based on the Board's ability to make all the findings required by WCC Section 110.804.25, Findings.

Chair Andriola closed the public hearing.

**1:00 p.m.**      **Commissioner Hill left the meeting.**

**26-0271**      **AGENDA ITEM 19** Public Comment.

On the call for public comment, Jon Killoran stated that he was a 46-year Reno and Washoe County resident, and was also a candidate for Washoe County Commission District 2. He explained that he was before the Board and would state a qualifier, and that if he was incorrect in what he was about to say, he would accept the correction. He noted that he had just listened to the public hearing, Agenda Item 18. He stated that he did not hear a disclosure during the entire meeting from the District 2

Commissioner, identifying that one of the principles in the public hearing was his single largest campaign contributor. Mr. Killoran added that, for a candidate looking to be reelected, and who placed his platform on honesty, integrity, transparency, and ethics, Mr. Killoran could not think of a more basic function within the Board than the simple disclosure of that situation in that meeting. He stated that earlier, a different Commissioner noted a disclosure of relationships over two of the items on the Agenda. He stated that these were not words to be used lightly as political campaign rhetoric. He stated that the words meant something to people, and that, as he spoke with other citizens, they wanted people in positions on commissions and other jurisdictional bodies that manifested those very attributes. He reiterated that it could not simply be campaign rhetoric, but it had to be practiced. He added that it was not the responsibility of the applicant or appellant to disclose, though he noted that during the presentations, he heard Commissioner Clark's name brought up as having been apprised of those situations. He stated that the matter was in the district in which both he and Commissioner Clark lived. He reiterated that he felt it was neither the applicant nor the appellant's responsibility to disclose, but rather Commissioner Clark's. He stated that it was a violation of the highest kind. He added that he believed in ethics, transparency, and honesty.

**26-0272**      **AGENDA ITEM 20** Announcements/Reports.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large stated that he wanted to clarify statements that were made during public comments and throughout the day that had legal ramifications. He stated that first, from earlier in the morning, regarding ballot dropboxes and locations and whether there was an inaccuracy regarding where they could be put at the Cares Campus, he noted that Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 293.269921, Subsection 3 allowed the County Clerk to establish a ballot drop box at any other location in the County where mail ballots could be delivered by hand, and collected during the period for early voting and on Election Day. He clarified that it did not need to be at a polling place, and so the earlier comment was inaccurate. He stated that NRS 281A.420, Subsection 2, Subsection A did not require a Commissioner to disclose campaign contributions during an item.

\*      \*      \*      \*      \*      \*      \*      \*      \*

**1:04 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:*  
*Andrew Garnand, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Elizabeth Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk*

Pending Board Approval