

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

DECEMBER 16, 2025

PRESENT:

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

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

ABSENT:

Alexis Hill, Chair

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

25-0878 AGENDA ITEM 3A1 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 indicated that the previous week had been difficult for the TMFPD family due to the loss of Battalion Chief Ryan Rizzuto and his wife Danielle in a fatal car accident. He requested that those in attendance partake in a moment of silence.

Chief Edwards recalled that the region's weather had been great, which allowed individuals to harden their homes and reduce fuel loads to help fire prevention efforts. He pointed out that those with an active burn permit were allowed to burn. He reported that the burn hotline number was temporarily down, but the TMFPD website and social media accounts had active burn day status updates for anyone interested. He noted that the TMFPD was partnering with Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful (KTMB) for the Christmas Tree Recycling Program. He said that Stations 32, 46, and 440 were collecting trees on January 3 and 4 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. He indicated that fire crews would chip the trees for recycling. He wished everyone a happy holiday season and a happy New Year.

Commissioner Andriola thanked everyone for their moment of silence. She asserted that the death of Battalion Chief Rizzuto and his wife was an immense tragedy. She expressed concern for their children, who were struggling without parents. She asked Chief Edwards to share the funding information that had been created for the children. Chief Edwards indicated that the Truckee Meadows Firefighters Foundation (TMFF) generously organized a fund to collect donations for the family and surviving children, with 100 percent of the proceeds going directly to the family. He explained that there was a link on the TMFPD homepage that led to the funding website. He expressed appreciation for the community's generosity and help to support the family. Commissioner Andriola thanked Chief Edwards.

25-0879 AGENDA ITEM 4 Public Comment.

Michael Marquiz displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He requested that the Board uphold the denial for Agenda Item 20. He said that there were four reasons to uphold the denial from the Board of Adjustment's (BOAs) decision based on Washoe County Code (WCC) Section 110.810.30. He stated that those reasons included the project risking the safety of church attendees and neighborhood residents, the project's failure to satisfy provisions in WCC Section 110.810.30, and his opinion that the approval set an erroneous precedent that commercial development was more important than a community's character, quality of life, and safety. He opined that the BOA's 4 to 1 denial was based on WCC Section 110.810.30, which he felt was clear and not personal. He asserted that emergency secondary access via Opal Station Drive posed a critical safety risk and that, according to Washoe County Assessor's records, North Star Ranch owned the parcel. He said the Homeowners Association (HOA) conditioned the approval on more details being provided since none were presented at the BOA hearing. He indicated that BOA member Pat Caldwell asked the applicant about the HOA's request, and the applicant stated the HOA had not communicated with homeowners regarding their requests. He noted that the HOA would not grant access to the parcel and that eminent domain would represent an unconstitutional taking, violating Nevada law. He pointed out that staff dropped the emergency secondary access requirement for Agenda Item 20, which created a single entry and exit on Rolling Ridge Road for a church with a maximum capacity of 531 people, including 400 individuals in the worship area. He expressed concern regarding emergency services attempting to gain access to the same location from which individuals exited. He stated that emergency secondary access represented a paradox for the project, and that obtaining it was not feasible, while not obtaining it would risk public safety. He urged the Board to uphold the denial of Agenda Item 20.

Terry Brooks read an original poem regarding discrimination, politics, and gender.

Nicholas St. Jon played a recorded speech regarding the difference between a democracy and a constitutional republic. He expressed disappointment that Chair Hill was not in attendance, as he believed she did not understand the difference between a democracy and a constitutional republic.

Corrine Carmignani displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She indicated that she was the president of the Northstar Ranch Landscape Maintenance Association (LMA) and referred to a document that she said should have been sent to the Board regarding the inability to allow the Sanctuary of God Church access to a common area of the property to build a roadway. She explained that the roadway was not realistic due to the 500 members who would visit the church. She believed that it was a bad decision to put the church in a small community with a dead-end road. She urged the Board to review her distributed document and uphold the denial.

Kaila Thompson speculated that many teenagers in the community relied on their own income to meet personal or family needs, such as gas, car insurance, bills, and savings for adulthood or college. She believed that it was known that individuals had to perform well academically to attend college or a low-tier university. She said that seniors in high school struggled to balance their workload between dual enrollment, honors classes, excess work hours, and their well-being, while also attempting to save money and apply for college. She opined that students should not have to sacrifice their academic success to provide for themselves and their families. She reported that Nevada and Washoe County laws enforced that minors, aged 16 or 17, work no more than 30 hours weekly, 8.5 hours a day, and during the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. She thought that the current minor labor regulations did not align with the level of performance that students needed to achieve in school to pursue higher education. She felt fortunate because she worked for a company that respected her needs. She said that she was allowed to work four hours a day on weekdays, with a 30-minute lunch every four hours on weekends. She asserted that her work hours allowed her to balance her school schedule and maintain her well-being. She urged the Board to enforce stricter laws and regulations for all companies and organizations to follow, ensuring protected school hours, mandatory breaks, reasonable weekly hour limits, and flexibility during exam periods that would allow students to succeed academically and financially.

Penny Brock displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She believed that the County and the State had a crisis of confidence regarding elections. She said that further documentation came from *United 4 Freedom*, which created a scorecard for each state. She thought that the State of Nevada's scorecard was bleak. She referred to the *Nevada 2024 General Election Validity Scorecard* and said that Nevada had a 7.5 percent error rate in voter rolls and a 24.3 percent error rate in counting the votes of eligible voters. She pointed out that section 3 of the *Nevada 2024 General Election Validity Scorecard* indicated that the difference of votes counted compared to the number of voters who cast a vote was 17,813, and that the total excess ballots counted in error according to the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) of 2002 for the 2024 General Election was 361,476. She indicated that the United States (US) Department of Justice (DOJ) sued the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS) for failing to comply with federal election laws. She explained that the DOJ began the investigation in June and that the SOS refused to cooperate with the investigation, making Nevada one of 18 states that failed to comply. She reported that three counties in the Nation were sued and that Washoe County was one of seven swing counties. She wondered if the County

would be investigated. She urged the Board to research the accusations regarding voting concerns. She stated that President Donald Trump had a pending executive order that would require paper ballots, hand-counting, election-day voting, and the elimination of electronic voting machines to restore voter confidence.

Janet Butcher displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She read from the document regarding her concerns related to the purchase of voting equipment, the relocation of the Registrar of Voters (ROVs) Office, and what she felt was the disenfranchisement of voters. She thanked Vice Chair Herman for not approving the election without a thorough review. She thought that the ROV relocation proposal was suspicious and did not include all the future fees associated with the decision.

Sean Hill expressed gratitude for the opportunity to be considered for reappointment to the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (WCOSRPC). He thanked the Board for allowing him to serve on the WCOSRPC because he felt it was an honor. He expressed a deep respect for the role the WCOSRPC played in stewarding the places that defined Washoe County while protecting the natural, historical, and cultural resources to ensure the community had access to meaningful recreation and open spaces. He reported that he had lived in Washoe County for nearly two decades. He said that parks and open spaces were essential to him, both personally and professionally. He noted that as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Sierra Nevada Journeys, he spent 16 years working to ensure young people, particularly those from underserved communities, had access to nature and outdoor learning. He explained that he witnessed how well-managed open spaces supported health, education, and a lifelong sense of stewardship. He recalled that during his WCOSRPC term, he worked to bring a balance of a thoughtful and collaborative approach by listening carefully, asking questions, and considering both near- and long-term impacts. He stated that he valued the professionalism of his fellow commissioners and staff and had endeavored to contribute positively to the quality of dialogue and decision-making. He believed that the work of the WCOSRPC was becoming increasingly important as the County grew and the demand for recreation increased. He said that development, climate, and equitable access increased the pressure of navigating challenges thoughtfully while protecting resources for future generations. He expressed excitement about supporting the transition to a special parks district. He explained that if he were reappointed, he would be honored to continue serving and contributing his experience in nonprofit leadership, education, and community collaboration. He thanked the Board for their consideration and their service.

Jill O'Leary stated that she was a 63-year-old victim of fraud perpetrated against the court through the filing of a fraudulent lien and writ of execution. She noted that the unlawful recordings in the Second Judicial District Court (SJDC) and the Washoe County Recorder's Office (WCRO) were both staffed and housed in facilities funded by Washoe County tax dollars, directly violating statutory duties and threatening the property rights of all Washoe County residents. She reported that her complaints had gone unanswered since October and that she had requested oversight into the WCRO's improper policy, which allowed the use of a notice of legibility attached to fully readable documents. She stated that the notice only existed under Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) when a clerk

requested it for documents that could not be reproduced. She believed that a clerk requesting a readable document constituted an unlawful recording practice by the WCRO. She opined that the acceptance and enforcement of a fraudulent lien violated the Fifth Amendment, which, she said, guaranteed that no person shall be deprived of property without due process of the law. She reported that her motion to the court to expunge was stricken because two letters from the WCRO claimed the lien was filed correctly. She recalled receiving a writ of execution from the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), which she stated was hand-endorsed by the clerk and backdated to November 4. She assumed that her time to reply to the writ of execution had expired and noted that it did not appear in the court case summary or docket as being filed, served, or noticed. She asserted that the Board's oversight directly harmed property owners. She said that Washoe 311 contacted her and told her they required an email address, even though she indicated that she wished for responses by mail. She mentioned that Washoe 311 emailed her instructions to contact the SJDC for metadata log requests. She speculated that the residents deserved better accountability from the Board. She stated that on December 2, 2025, the SJDC signed another order that she felt further restricted her right to due process. She believed that the Board's failure to exercise its oversight enabled criminal actions within facilities paid for by County tax dollars. She asserted that ministerial duties were essential for lawful governance and that violations eroded public trust. She said that the Supremacy Clause made federal law and constitutional protection paramount and that State laws could not override federal protections. She asserted that she was sure that Board oversight ensured compliance with statutes and protected property rights, and that any violation would undermine the rule of law. She explained that the experience had led her to support Republican representation at the County level.

Trista Gomez expressed concerns regarding property rights, property uses, and traffic. She noted that she was interested in Jill O'Leary's case. She wondered why agenda items were pulled out of order and felt that it seemed suspicious and odd. She thought that the County could be transparent, straightforward, and address people in the way they wanted to be addressed. She believed that being more transparent could solve many problems. She stated that she disagreed with taking agenda items out of order and opined that there were numerous inconsistencies in the details regarding the agenda items. She recalled that she had heard rumors regarding pocket deeds and that people were trying to decipher agenda items because they were unclear. She said that there was a lot of information to go through, and it could be overwhelming. She speculated that the distrust was warranted and wondered if the confusion had been created intentionally due to political dynamics. She felt that there were too many people involved, which created mixed feelings and concerns among individuals. She asserted that it was the Board's job to be transparent. She recalled a previous meeting where an individual had stated that when someone spoke loudly, some people could not hear what they were saying, which she said resonated with her because of her experiences with BCC meetings. She wished the Board a merry Christmas and hoped they had a wonderful time with their families.

Clyde Cordova indicated that he was a long-term resident of Golden Valley and that the Sanctuary of God Church proposal would create public health, safety, and welfare concerns because the roads were built for rural traffic and could not uphold

suburban loads. He stated that the necessary improvements regarding utilities, drainage, and roadways were inadequate. He recalled that the Sanctuary of God Church was previously denied by the BOA, which he felt was proof that they should not be permitted to build. He noted that five acres was not suitable for high-occupancy assembly use and that granting the permit would be detrimental to the public, adjacent properties, and the character of the surrounding area. He reported that the Washoe County Master Plan's general rural (gr) designation required rural areas, such as Golden Valley, to retain their rural character, which included agriculture, grazing, conservation, and large-lot residents. He felt that a large assembly occupancy was not compatible with the designated zoning. He believed that a special use permit (SUP) was intended to be exceptional and that an exception was only granted when every requirement finding was fully supported. He opined that there could not be unresolved negatives when the effects directly impacted the community. He stated that there was substantial evidence to suggest that compatibility had not been demonstrated, and that the findings could not be made because the applicant had failed to meet the requirements under WCC Section 110.810.30. He urged the Board to deny the SUP, and he respectfully requested that they uphold the denial.

* * * * *

The Board convened in a joint session of the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC).

* * * * *

25-0880

AGENDA ITEM 5 Recommendation to adopt a resolution re-adopting Washoe County and the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District's current permit and service fee schedule for fire-related matters. The permit and service fee schedule was previously contained in Washoe County Code Chapter 60 in Exhibit B; however, the County and the District no longer wish the fee schedule to be included as part of the Washoe County Code, but rather, adopted by resolution as authorized by WCC 60.100.060; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Truckee Meadows Fire. (All Commission Districts).

Vice Chair Herman indicated that the meeting would be jointly convened as the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and the Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC) for Agenda Items 5 and 6. She noted that Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Fire Chief Richard Edwards would facilitate the two items.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

25-0881 **AGENDA ITEM 6** Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 60 (Fire Prevention and Protection) to update the adopted editions of the International Fire Code (“IFC”) and International Wildland-Urban Interface Code (“IWUIC”) from the 2018 editions to the 2024 editions, with modifications to make them applicable to conditions within Washoe County; and to remove the adopted permit and service fee schedule from the Washoe County Code and provide for its adoption by resolution; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Truckee Meadows Fire. (All Commission Districts).

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1750, Bill No. 1942.

On the call for public comment, Trista Gomez inquired whether Agenda Item 6 would impact or add regulations for businesses and residences seeking to build or remodel.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Chair Hill absent, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1750, Bill No. 1942, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

25-0882 **AGENDA ITEM 7** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas announced that textile artist Holly Gardner was attending to make a special presentation to the Board regarding the completed Washoe County panel for the Capitol Christmas Tree. She reported that Ms. Gardner was commissioned to create the Washoe County panel for the Capitol Christmas Tree skirt. She noted that Ms. Gardner only had a few weeks to design and build two identical panels that depicted the beauty of Washoe County. She expressed that it was an honor to have one of the panels on display at the Washoe County Administrative Complex. She mentioned that Ms. Gardner was a native Nevadan, a graduate of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), and an active member of the Sierra Arts Foundation (SAF), where Community Reinvestment Manager Gabrielle Enfield had encountered Ms. Gardner’s work. She said that Ms. Gardner’s father, Bud Putnam, remodeled the Washoe County Administrative Complex.

Ms. Gardner noted that it was an honor to design and create the panels and said she felt blessed to be able to represent the County, as her father had remodeled the complex. She explained that she wanted to create the panels with the heart and soul of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, the regional mountains, the State bird, and the State animal as inspiration. She noted that she was able to see the complete Capitol Christmas Tree skirt, which she thought was lovely. She said that she felt blessed that her work would hang in the building that her father remodeled.

10:46 a.m. The Board recessed for a photo.

10:49 a.m. The Board reconvened with Chair Hill absent.

Commissioner Andriola recognized Ms. Gardner and recalled that she had created a video regarding the components that inspired her for the panel. She pointed out that she and Vice Chair Herman served on the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) Board, and she felt that some accolades were due to NACO for initiating the creation of the tree skirt. She hoped that the County could broadcast Ms. Gardner's video because she believed that Ms. Gardner did a great job discussing the connections of each component and the representation of the great place the community called home. She thanked Ms. Gardner for her work.

CM Thomas reported that the special use permit (SUP) for Iverson Ranch, case WSUP 25-0018, was announced and noticed for the current meeting; however, the Planning Commission's (PCs) actions related to the project were recently appealed. She explained that the hazardous materials SUP was rescheduled to coincide with the appeal hearing on January 13, 2026. She pointed out that there was an item on the current Agenda related to Iverson Ranch, which was separate from the hazardous materials SUP. She reported that updated notices had been sent out in compliance with the Washoe County Code (WCC).

Commissioner Clark asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large for clarification regarding Jill O'Leary's earlier comments. He recalled that Jill O'Leary attended multiple recent meetings, and he wished to hear the status of her concerns for the record.

CDDA Large indicated that on December 9, 2025, Jill O'Leary provided documents to the Board requesting specific documentation related to a civil and probate case, including orders, and metadata related to the orders and judgment in those cases. He reported that her requests were submitted to Washoe 311, as all public records requests (PRR) were. He recalled that he worked in conjunction with Washoe 311 to coordinate with Jill O'Leary, attempting to obtain her email address for communication and to provide the documentation she had requested. He noted that Jill O'Leary also requested follow-up from the District Attorney's Office (DA), which he sent yesterday via mail due to a lack of an email address provided. He reported that the Second Judicial District Court (SJDC) was a department of the State of Nevada, which he believed the Board was aware of. He indicated that, because the SJDC was under the purview of the State of Nevada, the County did not have custodial control over the SJDC's public records; therefore, any PRRs were sent directly to the SJDC for processing.

Commissioner Clark thanked CDDA Large and noted that he wanted the information on the record so that the public was aware of the County's role in the situation. He announced that a Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) meeting was scheduled for February 9, 2026, and that it was his understanding that the meeting would

be broadcast on YouTube, similar to the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meetings.

Commissioner Andriola noted that Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Fire Chief Richard Edwards organized a holiday celebration, which involved a decorated fire engine that traveled through several districts to collect toys. She said that the toys would be donated to various organizations, and that day was the last day to donate unwrapped toys or make monetary donations through the TMFPD website. She expressed her appreciation to the TMFPD staff who spent seven hours decorating the fire engine, which she felt brought a great deal of joy to the community. She announced that a Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) meeting would take place on December 17, 2025, at Red Hawk Golf and Resort. She noted that the meeting was to discuss the study results based on the Northeast Connector in her district. She explained that, although she did not serve on the RTC board, she felt it was essential for interested parties to be aware of the meeting. She wished everyone a merry Christmas.

Commissioner Garcia wished everyone a merry Christmas and a happy New Year. She noted that the holidays could be tough for many families and reminded the public that the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline was available for anyone in crisis. She explained that many hoped for a good holiday season; however, it could be challenging for those who had lost loved ones or suffered from traumatic experiences. She mentioned that she was the liaison for the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (WCOSRPC) and that she had utilized her District 3 funds over the previous year to donate picnic tables and a park bench to the newly opened River Bend Trailhead in Verdi. She said that she had reached out to the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) to obtain permission for a mural to be painted on a wall at the trailhead that was frequently vandalized with graffiti. She indicated that the mural unveiling would take place the following day at River Bend Park and welcomed her fellow Commissioners to attend. She reported that the muralist's name was Autumn Harry, an emergent community leader who she believed did incredible work. She said that Ms. Harry organized Truckee River cleanups through her nonprofit and was making a difference in the community by beautifying various neighborhoods. She thought that the mural was a testament to who Ms. Harry was, her background, and her culture. She opined that River Bend Park offered an interesting landscape, transitioning from desert to alpine with a variety of wildlife. She said that Ms. Harry was completing the finishing touches on the mural and that during the mural reveal, attendees could walk the newly paved path, which would provide access for river rafters and kayakers. She encouraged anyone interested to attend the mural reveal.

Vice Chair Herman thanked her fellow Commissioners for their announcements and indicated that the Board had provided great information.

25-0883 **AGENDA ITEM 8A1** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the Washoe County Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR), auditor's report, and report on internal control for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2025 as presented; approve the re-appropriation of [\$117,880,477.50] for the fiscal year 2026 budget, consisting of [\$68,481,627.22] for purchase

order encumbrances committed in fiscal year 2025 and [\$49,398,850.28] for spending of restricted contributions and fees; and, authorize the Comptroller to proceed with distribution of the ACFR for public record, as required by law. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)

Comptroller Cathy Hill indicated that the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) would be presented differently than in previous years because it did not include the single audit of compliance for federal awards due to the federal government's delay in compliance deadlines and auditor direction. She reported that she would present more information to the Board on another date when the federal government's guidelines for auditors were known. She recalled that the Finance Department presented to the Board throughout the year, and that the fiscal year (FY) had ended with approximately \$2.5 million added to the fund balance, which was the net figure excluding unrealized gains. She thanked Eide Bailly and County staff for their efforts in organizing Agenda Item 8A1. She expressed appreciation toward the following Eide Bailly employees for their teamwork in providing the County with a timely and thorough audit procedure: Audit Partner Teri Gage, Senior Audit Manager Laura Nelson, Audit Associate Jacob Evans, Audit Manager Kenneth Bayless, and Senior Audit Associate Tyler Yamamoto. She additionally thanked the Washoe County staff, which included Accounting Manager Robert Andrews, Senior Accountant Asta Dominguez, Senior Accountant Susan O'Haro, Accountant Joyce Garrett, Accountant II Na Na Huang, Senior Accountant Rebecca Mosher, Accountant II Michelle Glodt-Mikoliczyk, Senior Accountant Cris Shimkovsky, Administrative Assistant II Victoria Stebbins, and their support staff.

Ms. Nelson noted that page 2 of the *Annual Comprehensive Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2025*, contained the independent auditors' report. She said that Eide Bailly was able to issue an unmodified opinion for 2025, also known as a clean opinion, which provided reasonable assurance that the financial statements were free from material misstatement. She stated that the implementation of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement Number 101 introduced consistency in how compensated absences were reported for certain government agencies. She explained that Washoe County was already in compliance with GASB Statement Number 101 regarding the reporting of compensated absences and had received a break from some GASB pronouncements.

Ms. Nelson pointed out that there were two levels of findings, including significant deficiencies and material weaknesses. She reported that the first finding, 2025-001, pertained to subscription-based information technology (IT) arrangements. She recalled the previous year's report and noted a finding related to the implementation of GASB Statement Number 96 and the establishment of software contracts. She mentioned that most of the previous year's findings had been corrected in the current year and that the ending balances had also been corrected. She asserted that there was a misstatement in the current year's activity of principal payments, which was part of rectifying the finding and resulted in 2025-001. She expressed confidence that the following year the findings would no longer be of concern.

Ms. Nelson explained that the second finding was 2025-002, which was considered a material weakness over federal grant revenue. She noted that when the federal award expenditures were added, a receivable should have been recognized, which would have applied part of the matching principle. She stated the receivable was missed, resulting in a material misstatement of \$2.2 million in the fund; however, the error was corrected and accurately recorded in the financial statements. She thanked Ms. Hill, Mr. Andrews, and the entire accounting staff. She said that it took a partnership to get through an audit and believed that the County's team was always pleasant and took their jobs seriously. She thanked the Board for their time and looked forward to presenting the single audit once it was issued.

Commissioner Andriola indicated that there were many changes to GASB Statement Number 101 and appreciated that staff, such as Ms. Hill, made the auditing process easier. She noted that anyone who had audit experience knew there was always something to be found. She reported that the County had a large budget with many complexities. She thanked Ms. Hill for being a great leader. She encouraged everyone to meet Ms. Hill because she thought Ms. Hill had a great sense of humor and was intelligent. She thanked Eide Bailly's team and extended her wishes to everyone for a happy New Year.

On the call for public comment, Trista Gomez was not present when called to speak.

Penny Brock explained that she was confused because she recalled \$2.5 million missing from the budget. She said that the FY ended in a deficit and thought that taxpayers deserved clarification. She recalled that Trista Gomez stated that voters and taxpayers had hired or elected Commissioners and staff, and they required transparency. She asked what FY 2024 and 2025's ending budget totals were.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Chair Hill absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8A1 be acknowledged, approved, and authorized.

25-0884 **AGENDA ITEM 8B1** Presentation and Update on FY 26 First Quarter Status Report for the Washoe County Regional Detention Facility to include security of the jail, conditions of confinement, staffing and medical care of inmates housed at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Detention Operations Captain John Stewart conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Jail Status Report; Medical Information; NaphCare Medical Data (two slides); ADP; Average Length of Stay; Total Bookings; FY 25/26 1st Quarter Jail Data; Inmate Assistance Program.

Captain Stewart advised that the primary purpose of the quarterly status

reports presented by the WCSO to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) was to share information about changes and communicate any areas where the WCSO needed improvement. He displayed his *Medical Information* slide and described his purpose in explaining the statistics. He theorized that figures within reports were often presented quickly and overlooked, but he wanted to provide more context to enable Commissioners to better understand the data. He explained that the slide showed medical refusals, which occurred when a WCSO partner agency brought in an arrestee who was deemed not to be a good fit for WCSO custody at the time and needed to obtain medical treatment before the WCSO was willing to accept them. Captain Stewart stated that the evaluation was conducted by a third-party provider, NaphCare, with whom the County contracted to limit the County's liability. He shared that there were 32 refusals in the first quarter (Q1) of fiscal year (FY) 2026. He said the established procedure limited County liability and taxpayer obligation to pay for medical treatment of individuals in WCSO custody. He stated that ER referrals represented instances when an individual in custody had an event that was deemed to require a higher level of care provided at a hospital.

Captain Stewart showed the first of his *NaphCare Medical Data* slides and shared that it represented screenings performed by medical staff. He summarized the data as typical for the average numbers seen from quarter to quarter. He displayed the second of his *NaphCare Medical Data* slides and commented that he found it interesting because it reported the number of medications the jail population took daily, including mental health medications. He remarked that the number was significant. He stated that the jail population that morning was approximately 1,180 inmates. He observed that because an average of 834 inmates took medication daily, it created a large task for medical staff and WCSO employees in general. He noted that the slide also contained data for the Medication-Assisted Treatment (MAT) program, which assisted people with substance abuse issues. He reviewed his *ADP* slide and informed that it showed the Average Daily Population (ADP), which ranged from 1,195 to 1,230 during Q1, for an average of 1,211. He disclosed that the jail often saw an increase in the ADP during the summer months and a decrease in the fall. He showed his *Average Length of Stay* slide, which represented the average length of stay for inmates. He noted that Q1 of FY 2025 was 15.71 days per inmate, and Q1 of FY 2026 was 16.21 days. He explained that the number varied due to a multitude of factors, including the number of available Deputy District Attorneys (DDAs), caseload, and the courts' other responsibilities. He pointed out that the average length of stay varied by less than one day over the past year, which he did not consider concerning. More variation would warrant further investigation.

Captain Stewart reviewed his *FY 25-16 1st Quarter Jail Data* and stated that it provided information on battery incidents involving inmates. He reported that in Q1 of 2025, there were 15 such instances; a decrease from 17 in the prior quarter. He explained that the inmate versus staff figure represented instances in which a staff member got into an altercation with an inmate. He informed that the County facility was a direct-supervision jail, which meant that WCSO deputies were present among the inmates when they were out on tier time, a period spent outside their cells. He communicated that direct supervision was one of the reasons WCSO staff were able to intercede before fights happened. He mentioned that it seemed odd that the number had increased, but he noted that more fights

were averted during Q1, which decreased the likelihood of inmate injury and possible expense to taxpayers if inmates had to be taken to a hospital for medical care. He showed his *Inmate Assistance Program* slide and described ways the WCSO assisted inmates within their custody, and how those interventions resulted in fewer days spent at the jail.

Captain Stewart restated his intention to explain the statistics rather than simply handing them over and providing a quick overview. He related that a production company recently visited the County jail and created a video segment about it. He shared that the company had disclosed visiting numerous jails, both within and beyond the Country, and the Washoe County jail stood out as one of the cleanest with the most professional staff. He added that the production company remarked on the food at the County jail and indicated that it was the best they had seen in any jail they visited around the world. Captain Stewart attributed those successes to WCSO staff, including the executive staff and Sheriff Darin Balaam, for facility management and operations. Additionally, federal agencies regularly visited the jail for audits, and Captain Stewart reported that similar feedback was received from those agencies. He highlighted a recent audit that included 2,200 points of inspection, with only two points found to require attention. He noted that both identified issues were corrected within a day. Captain Stewart summarized that the WCSO staff were performing well and the facility was operating smoothly. He commented that he wanted to reserve time for the Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team but was happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Captain Stewart. She noted that she also wanted to reserve time for the update from the HOPE Team. She recalled that Captain Stewart mentioned that the Q1 ADP was 1,211. She asked about the jail's full capacity.

Captain Stewart responded that the full capacity was approximately 1,350 if every bed was filled, but he stipulated that the jail often housed inmates with mental health issues. In those circumstances, even if the cell had two beds, only one could be used. He said there was also a forensic program for the Mental Health Unit, which reduced the number of beds available. He related that great work was being done in the Mental Health Unit, but due to the mental capacity of some inmates, the number of available beds was restricted. He discerned that 1,300 was a realistic maximum capacity considering the population at the jail.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Captain Stewart and echoed his observations about the positive outcomes seen from the jail-based MAT program. She spoke about the impact of a jail tour she took and the dedication that she observed in WCSO staff, who clearly all wanted to make a difference. She expressed appreciation for the information about cost savings outlined on the *Inmate Assistance Program* slide. She supposed that Captain Stewart could not specifically predict outcomes, but she saw the estimated savings of \$911,250 as a testament to the importance of releasing individuals at the right time with adequate tools and resources to ensure that they did not return to jail. She supported that goal and extended her appreciation to Sheriff Balaam, Undersheriff Corey Solferino, and Captain Stewart.

Commissioner Garcia asked Captain Stewart what the average daily cost for each inmate was.

Captain Stewart responded that the contract between the County and the United States (US) Marshals Service was renegotiated a couple of years prior, at which time the daily rate per inmate increased from \$109 to \$160.

Commissioner Clark thanked Captain Stewart for his report and his work. He commented that Captain Stewart was doing a great job with the jail. Commissioner Clark recalled taking numerous tours of the facility, remarking on the high quality of the food, the cleanliness of the facility, and the professionalism of the WCSO staff, both in the jail and in the community. He observed that WCSO deputies consistently demonstrated respect for the public, which was a welcome sight. He theorized that the creativity and skill of the chef at the jail had a positive impact on the morale of individuals in WCSO custody.

Vice Chair Herman wished everyone a Merry Christmas. She said the Commissioners were proud of the work of the WCSO, and she thanked them for doing such a wonderful job

WCSO Sergeant Sonia Butler introduced her colleague, Deputy Sheriff Kourtney Lusby, and together they conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Camping Ordinance (50.400): Enforcement, Impact, and Balance; Ordinance Overview; The Controversy-Voices on Both Sides; Enforcement in Action-Stats Snapshot; The Three Times the Ordinance Has Been Charged; Why the Ordinance Is Necessary-Real Benefits; Conclusion-A Balanced Path Forward; Thank you.

Sergeant Butler advised that she and Ms. Lusby would, as promised, provide a follow-up on the public camping ordinance approved by the BCC on March 26, 2024, made effective on June 5, 2024, and incorporated into Washoe County Code (WCC) in Section 50.400. She said that in the next five minutes, Commissioners would see exactly how the ordinance had been used, the results it produced, and why it functioned as a balanced, humane tool, not as a hammer. She showed her *Ordinance Overview* slide and explained that WCC Section 50.400 prohibited camping on County-owned property or in public places in the unincorporated County, including within 1,000 feet of the Truckee River. She described that, for the purposes of the ordinance, camping was defined as sleeping or preparing to sleep, storing belongings for more than 48 hours, using a tent as a shelter, or using a vehicle as a living accommodation. She noted that there were clear exemptions for medical emergencies, disabilities, and permitted events. She informed that a person could only be charged if they first received a verbal warning from a deputy or if the area was posted with *No Camping* signs every 500 feet or less. She stated that the penalty was a misdemeanor, but that was almost never the outcome.

Sergeant Butler presented a slide entitled *The Controversy-Voices on Both Sides* and described that the ordinance was highly debated. She recounted that supporters contended that the ordinance was needed to keep public spaces safe, clean, and accessible

while giving deputies ways to connect people with services. Conversely, critics worried that it would criminalize homelessness and punish people who did not have anywhere to go. She reported that the BCC passed the ordinance with a 3 to 2 vote on March 26, 2024, after hours of public comment. She added that shortly after, the decision of the Supreme Court in *City of Grants Pass v. Johnson* confirmed that cities and counties could enforce regulations even when shelter beds were limited. She stated that the WCSO heard every voice and promised to use the ordinance responsibly.

Ms. Lusby reviewed the *Enforcement in Action-Stats Snapshot* slide. She reported that, since June 5, 2024, only three people were formally charged. She mentioned that HOPE Team members often returned to the same individuals to build trust with them and offer help, which she described as progressive, restrained enforcement. She outlined their model as education first, assistance second, and citation only as an absolute last resort. She showed her *The Three Times the Ordinance Has Been Charged* slide and restated that there were only three charges in 18 months. She detailed the circumstances of each charge. In the first incident, which occurred in January 2025, she described that two individuals were setting up camp on the courthouse grounds. Resources were offered to the individuals, but they declined. Ms. Lusby said that one person fled, jumped into the Truckee River, and was later found with drug paraphernalia and warrants. Resultingly, the camping charge was secondary to charges of possession and resisting arrest. She reported that on July 21, 2025, on North Hills Boulevard, an individual ignored multiple posted 48-hour notices. Ms. Lusby disclosed that the HOPE Team had already cleaned up three previous encampments left by the same person, and multiple nearby businesses had repeatedly reported large amounts of trash and debris. Services were offered many times over the prior year, but they were refused. Ms. Lusby said that a citation was issued and the individual was referred to Community Court for court-ordered resources. She noted that in each case, charges came only after repeated warnings, repeated offers of help, and, in most instances, additional criminal behavior.

Ms. Lusby showed her *Why the Ordinance Is Necessary-Real Benefits* slide and described that the Ordinance provided two essential tools: 48-hour notices so abandoned, unoccupied sites could be cleaned safely, and legal authority to make contact, which enabled the HOPE Team to start real conversations with people. She revealed that the results were measurable. She explained that 4,529 contacts resulted in 262 people being placed in stable housing, 116 in transitional housing, and numerous family reunifications. She reasoned that the removal of debris from encampments protected public health, the environment, local businesses, and the Truckee River. She posited that the ordinance did not criminalize homelessness; rather, it represented responsible stewardship that restored public spaces and helped people find housing.

Sergeant Butler showed her *Conclusion-A Balanced Path Forward* slide and summarized that the low number of charges combined with thousands of warnings and hundreds of people housed demonstrated that the ordinance was being used exactly as the Commission asked, with restraint, compassion, and results. She said the WCSO remained committed to ongoing oversight and listening to every perspective. She offered to answer any questions.

Vice Chair Herman remarked on the difficulty of the job done by the HOPE Team.

Sergeant Butler responded that the work was rewarding.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Sergeant Butler and Ms. Lusby for their presentation, which she knew many members of the public watched and listened to. She admired how the information shared was both comprehensive and brief. She thanked Ms. Lusby for her help in coordinating ride-alongs for the Commissioners. She reported that in those experiences, she observed the extraordinary level of communication, calm professionalism, and compassionate demeanor of WCSO deputies. She added that those characteristics in deputies could be seen both in the detention facility and out on the streets, which she attributed to deputies starting their time with the WCSO by working in the detention facility. She reasoned that when WCSO staff did not have access to weapons as a tool for enforcement, they were forced to use critical thinking, strong communication skills, and de-escalation techniques. She believed those skills were crucial as deputies progressed through their careers and interacted with people in the community from diverse backgrounds. She commended Sheriff Balaam and all WCSO leadership for maintaining a high level of professionalism, which began with training and continued throughout each person's career. She asked if the recent cessation of Community Court had made the jobs of WCSO staff more difficult.

Sergeant Butler responded that, due to the structure of the court system, the WCSO HOPE Team was unable to specifically cite individuals to Community Court. She commented that the HOPE Team staffed a table at an associated resource center every Wednesday, where they were available to work with anyone in the community to connect them with case managers, get involved, and take steps toward permanent, stable housing. She stated that the only difference for the HOPE Team since Community Court was discontinued was that they no longer staffed a table on Wednesdays at that resource center.

Commissioner Andriola remarked that doing a ride-along with Sergeant Butler and other members of the HOPE Team was a pleasure. She recounted that she had been on several ride-alongs and looked forward to more. She viewed it as first-hand experience of the work the HOPE Team engaged in, and she echoed the observation made by Commissioner Garcia about how aspects of the work resembled social work. She thought it was essential to emphasize the support provided by case managers and a team that focused on relationship-building. She mentioned that even the uniforms the HOPE Team members wore looked different from other WCSO staff, and she applauded Sheriff Balaam for his leadership in attending to those details. She asked Sergeant Butler to share the percentage of success in the tenancy support program, and she queried how that resource helped people become independent, productive, and successful in the long term without relying on taxpayer dollars.

Sergeant Butler responded that the HOPE Team was developed in partnership with the Washoe County Human Services Agency (HSA), which she viewed as a major reason for its success. She advised that two case managers with the HOPE Team

worked for HSA, and she recounted that in the early stages of program development, the tenancy support component was established. She described tenancy support as ongoing care. She explained that when someone was housed, a case manager would continually check in on them to ensure they were transitioning well and knew how to pay their bills and manage other aspects of their lives. She pointed out that independent housing was often a big culture shift for people. She established that the tenancy support program originally provided newly-homed individuals with vouchers and a tenancy support specialist. Since that time, the tenancy support program was able to keep individuals housed with a 92 percent success rate.

Commissioner Andriola mentioned a one-page summary document that Sergeant Butler had prepared, and she suggested that if Sergeant Butler felt so inclined, it would be great to share that document with the Commissioners. She thanked Sergeant Butler for her regular updates and the status reports that the Commissioners received. She believed that the reports reinforced the program's success.

Undersheriff Solferino, on behalf of Sheriff Balaam and the men and women of the WCSO, thanked the BCC for the opportunity to provide an update on the implementation of the camping ordinance. He recalled that two years prior, the BCC took a chance on the WCSO despite the proposed ordinance being a political flashpoint. He recalled being directed by former BCC Chair Vaughn Hartung to convene community stakeholders, including those in the faith-based community, to reach an agreement. Undersheriff Solferino stated that, although community stakeholders were unable to agree with the WCSO on everything, he and Sheriff Balaam assured the BCC that the WCSO would not misuse the ordinance and would not violate the public's trust. He believed that was exactly what Sergeant Butler and her team had accomplished. He asserted that it was not possible for the WCSO to simply fix the problem by indiscriminately arresting people. He compared the work being done by the HOPE Team to the success stories Captain Stewart shared in his jail report. He summarized that the WCSO regularly witnessed success stories. He related that they got to see drastic improvements in people who entered WCSO custody at their absolute worst and defined as chronically ill. He noted the data shared by Captain Stewart, which indicated that an overwhelmingly large percentage of the jail population took medications. He disclosed that three-quarters of inmates were defined as chronically ill when they were taken into custody. He stipulated that the jail was not a hospital, but they had contracted with a reputable medical provider who often made the difficult decision to release people back into the community to access the healthcare they needed until they could reenter the jail. Subsequently, stabilization was evident when individuals took their medication and could thrive. He noted that WCSO Lieutenant Jason Phillips was in attendance at the meeting and had accomplished noteworthy progress with the jail-based MAT program. Undersheriff Solferino related that individuals from other jurisdictions across the County visited the County jail to learn about the approach being used, which he viewed as a credit to the BCC, County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas, and Sheriff Balaam. He expressed his pride in the team and acknowledged the difficulty of the work. He disclosed that debates took place about whether the response to unhoused individuals should come from the WCSO, a social worker, or a combination, and he theorized that people were primarily concerned with receiving a response when they called

the police, and subsequently wanted a conversation to take place, not necessarily for a person to leave in handcuffs.

Commissioner Andriola commented that the entire community benefited from the approach taken by the WCSO. She remarked that \$160 per day was a significant expense, and it was essential to acknowledge that jail was not an appropriate placement in many cases. She asked what resources the WCSO needed and what investment the BCC could provide for the ongoing work of the WCSO. She thought there was an opportunity to strengthen the camping ordinance, particularly regarding individuals who refused services. She wanted to reserve the opportunity for CM Thomas to work with WCSO and legal counsel on that topic. She specified that she was not pursuing the potential for increased penalties, but she thought there might be opportunities to address the issue of service refusal directly.

Commissioner Clark thanked Sergeant Butler and Ms. Lusby for their report. He said it was very informative and contained good information. He noted that he had not been on a ride-along and wanted to see if he could schedule one. Sergeant Butler responded that she would love to take him on a ride-along.

Commissioner Garcia acknowledged that Agenda Item 8B1 was specifically about the detention facility, but she noted that the presentation also included information about the HOPE Team. She mentioned that a short but comprehensive video about the jail-based mental-health unit was available on YouTube, which she recommended people take the time to watch. She thanked Undersheriff Solferino for his leadership with that program, which she identified as an incredible opportunity to help individuals in WCSO custody while County staff had their full attention. She appreciated that the County could help people get access to appropriate medications, services, and support while they were in custody. She shared that the County recently received \$7.5 million from the special legislative session, specifically for the jail-based mental health unit. She thanked the partners at the State level and observed that the funding would allow the region to continue to provide what she viewed as an incredible resource. She asked Undersheriff Solferino to provide an estimate of the number of federal agencies that worked with the detention facility in any given year.

Undersheriff Solferino responded that he would get a comprehensive list and send it to Commissioner Garcia through CM Thomas. He reported that the WCSO partnered with numerous federal entities, including the US Marshals Service.

Commissioner Garcia explained that she posed the question to highlight the number of guests in the detention facility. She noted that people in the area had recently shown a particular interest in the activities of the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). She expressed that 2025 brought a lot of change, including increased ICE activity in communities. She recalled that in the spring of 2025, some targeted ICE arrests occurred throughout the community, and people were transported to the County facility to be detained. She wanted to take the opportunity during Agenda Item 8B1 to help quash any misinformation that could be circulating. She disclosed that she received phone

calls from people in a state of panic about raids. She added that many local news agencies reported the uptick in arrests in May 2025. She asked Undersheriff Solferino if there were any organized, large-scale raids in Washoe County since that time.

Undersheriff Solferino responded that Commissioner Garcia's question had to be posed to federal enforcement rather than the WCSO. He explained that when raids were orchestrated, the WCSO was independent of any of those operations. He described that the County jail was an ICE detention facility because the WCSO was a federal institution. He knew that the arrangement had been in place since at least 1988, but he said he would need to review records to discern what facility-use agreement was in place prior to the WCSO operating from the facility at 911 Parr Boulevard. He disclosed that the status of the County jail as a federal institution entailed several parameters, including the recently renegotiated daily rate for inmates. He established that the daily rate reflected baseline-level services, such as power for the building and providing inmates with food and clothing. He pointed out that it did not include medication or the jail-based mental health program, and that costs increased dramatically when those programs were taken into account. He revealed that the actual daily cost per inmate for the level of services provided in the County could be anywhere from \$500 to \$800. The County only received \$160 to cover the expenses of feeding, housing, and clothing federal inmates. He outlined that the WCSO had partnerships with all the federal agencies they worked with, and a large contingent of the WCSO budget was offset by grant funding, most of which related to collaboration with federal partners. He acknowledged that the BCC was patiently awaiting a grant award submitted on August 1, 2025, but he conveyed that no update had been received regarding that grant. He supposed that the US government shutdown delayed the awards, but he indicated that the WCSO was prepared to provide a full brief regardless. He divulged that arrestees from federal agencies augmented the daily County jail population by anywhere from 50 to 100, but the WCSO had not experienced a large increase. He stipulated that he could not speak to the rest of the State, but there was not an overwhelming increase in the local area. He added that, because the County jail was an ICE detention facility, many of the individuals were in transit to other federal jurisdictions throughout the County but were not arrested in the area. Undersheriff Solferino spoke about the proactive and timely communication efforts of the WCSO, which included adding a frequently asked questions (FAQ) area to their website as soon as community concerns became evident. He said the WCSO engaged in difficult and uncomfortable conversations with the public. He described a partnership with the Nevada Latino Stakeholders Council, part of which included a tour of the detention facility, allowing stakeholders to see the WCSO project plan, understand its scope, and ask questions. He summarized that he was not at liberty to discuss what the federal government was doing in their average daily scope of work, but he affirmed that the WCSO partnered with federal entities and provided services for them. He restated that he had not seen a large increase in ICE enforcement activity in the area, and he supposed that media reports might be representing events that happened in other communities.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Undersheriff Solferino and theorized that, over the past year, the focus at the federal level shifted from enforcement at the US border to enforcement directly in communities and neighborhoods, which she felt increased stress levels throughout the Country. She said the scale, visibility, and geographic reach of the

operations were undeniable. She added that she was vigilant about local actions, from which she discerned that large workplaces in the area were not being affected, and aggressive enforcement actions were not taking place in local streets or in front of people's homes. She recognized that enforcement actions had occurred, but she pointed out that the WCSO was a federal agency and received federal orders accordingly. She voiced that, as a Latina stakeholder, she appreciated attending the special tour set up in collaboration with the WCSO. She added her appreciation for the ongoing communication from the WCSO, not only to the Latino community but to all local immigrant communities. She stated for the record that there were several organizations throughout the State that helped provide resources and investigate the validity of reports. She mentioned a Statewide resource led by the Nevada Immigrant Coalition (NIC) that enabled any person in the State to utilize the text service by texting *JOIN* to 638-232 to report anything worrying, including possible impersonation of a federal agent. She shared that a local community defense hotline was recently established, which people could reach at 775-766-4472. She concluded that the WCSO maintained close communication with the community throughout 2025, regardless of variability at the federal level. She knew that she could always reach out to Undersheriff Solferino or Sheriff Balaam to obtain accurate information. She reasoned that people could focus on communication and preservation of the trust that the WCSO worked hard to build with community members over many decades. She observed that it was not possible to control what was happening at the federal level, and efforts to sow doubt about peace officers could be harmful.

Vice Chair Herman recalled prior years when she received regular calls from constituents who reported that people were camping illegally, often on private property. She said that she was persistent in passing those complaints along to the WCSO and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). She observed that the frequency of calls from her constituents expressing those concerns had decreased markedly, which she attributed to positive impacts from the camping ordinance and the efforts of the HOPE Team. She expressed her thanks.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 9A1 THROUGH 9G1, EXCLUDING PULLED AGENDA ITEM 9F3, HEARD SEPARATELY

25-0885 9A1 Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meeting of November 18, 2025. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0886 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.)

25-0887 9B1 Recommendation to approve the reappointment of Sean Hill for a term beginning January 1, 2026, and ending on December 31, 2029, for the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0888 **9B2** Recommendation to approve an updated interlocal agreement, as authorized by NRS 277.180, between Washoe County (on behalf of the Planning & Building Division) and the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District (NLTFPD), regarding the County's continued collection of fire fees for NLTFPD's plan review and inspection services for planning permits and building permits in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. The agreement shall become effective 60 days from the date of signing and continue until terminated per contract terms. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

25-0889 **9B3** Recommendation to (1) approve the purchase of Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 086-305-02 located at 310 Pompe Way, Reno, Nevada 89506, utilizing the Nevada Department of Public Safety, Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security "Lemmon Valley Home Acquisition Phase I" grant award [in the amount of \$237,500.00 with a FEMA share of \$112,500.00 and a Washoe County match of \$37,500.00 plus an additional amount from Washoe County in the amount of \$87,500.00] for the purpose of purchasing this property to remove it from the Lemmon Valley Swan Lake Flood Plain, subsequently 2) demolition and then removing all existing structures, buildings, materials, and debris associated with APN 086-305-02, located at 310 Pompe Way and APN 086-303-18 located at 455 Pompe Way, thereby returning the two parcels to vacant open space that are deed restricted to prevent any future development, [in the estimated amount of \$279,800.00 with a FEMA share of \$209,850 and a Washoe County match of \$69,950.00], and, 3) Direct the Comptroller's Office to make necessary budget adjustments and, 4) designate the County Manager as the authorized representative with the authority to enter into and execute all necessary grant extensions, construction and purchase agreements for the property. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

25-0890 **9C1** Recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to retroactively acknowledge a supplemental grant of \$9,500.00 which increases the original award to \$13,173.96 [no County match required], awarded to the Second Judicial District Court from the Supreme Court of Nevada, Administrative Office of the Courts to fund a contractor to supplement the court's Information Technology (IT) team in the conversion of the case management system. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0891 **9D1** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the completed audit for the Conflict Counsel program from the Internal Audit Division. The purpose of this audit was to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, and compliance of the program, ensuring indigent defendants receive constitutionally required legal representation. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0892 **9E1** Recommendation to accept a private grant from United Healthcare Health Plan of Nevada Medicaid Community Investment, in the amount of [\$48,800.00; no County match; including up to \$5,000.00 for participant gift cards] effective from January 1, 2026 through December 31, 2027 to support senior needs. Authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to execute the grant and related documents; and direct the Finance Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0893 **9F1** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$55,000.00] for Fiscal Year 2025-2026; District 3 Commissioner Mariluz Garcia recommends a [\$50,000.00] grant to Washoe County Office of the County Manager - a government entity - for the purpose of having an economic study plan conducted for the Sun Valley area; and a [\$5,000.00] grant to Great Basin Community Food Co-op - a nonprofit organization created for charitable, religious, or educational purposes - to support the Co-ops Friends of the Foodshed to promote a healthy lifestyle for all living things; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary net zero cross fund and/or cross function budget appropriation transfers and disbursement of funds. Manager's Office. (Commission District 3).

25-0894 **9F2** Acknowledge receipt of report on the 36th Special Session of the Nevada Legislature (2025). Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

25-0895 **9G1** Recommendation to accept a Grant Award from Petco Love Foundation in the amount of [\$10,000.00; no County match] retroactive to October 16, 2025, through June 30, 2026, to update old clinic equipment and purchase new items to enhance our medical services for pets; retroactively authorize the Director of Regional Animal Services to execute the Grant Agreement; and direct the Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. REGIONAL ANIMAL SERVICES. (All Commission Districts.)

On the call for public comment, Philip Moore indicated that he represented the Friends of the Foodshed and the Great Basin Community Food Cooperative (Co Op). He noted that he was in favor of Agenda Item 9F1 and thanked the Board for its service. He expressed appreciation to Commissioner Garcia for organizing Agenda Item 9F1, as he believed it effectively quoted the mission of the Co Op to promote a healthy lifestyle for all living things. He asserted that Agenda Item 9F1 meant farmers and their employees would be exposed to fewer toxins because they would grow food organically, which would create healthier soil for people and their animals. He said that farm animals would have access to medicines and live healthier lives. He explained that the Co Op's members and shoppers enjoyed more nutritious food, and farmers deserved to receive a reasonable price for their food. He opined that education was crucial to the Co Op's mission because it helped individuals understand the importance of healthier living and that cheap food was

not always affordable for the community. He said that the Friends of the Foodshed and the Co Op's purpose was to promote local food systems and serve as a sustainable cooperative model for access to wholesome food. He reported that the Co Op went to extraordinary lengths to ensure local and other food systems sold at the Co Op met their buying guidelines. He encouraged everyone to visit the Co Op and experience what a health-focused store was. He speculated that providing healthier goods would foster a sense of community and a stronger local economy. He urged anyone interested to attend the Co Op's seedling sale on May 30, 2026, to witness how the Co Op built community and helped keep money in the local economy. He said that hundreds of individuals would buy seedlings from local farmers. He reported that seedling sales provided an early-season income for farmers, while locals received seedlings tailored to the region's specific environmental conditions. He thanked the Board for its support.

* * * * *

Commissioner Andriola requested that Agenda Item 9F3 be removed from the Consent Agenda.

* * * * *

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Chair Hill absent, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 9A1 through 9G1, with the exclusion of Item 9F3, be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 9A1 through 9G1, with the exclusion of Item 9F3, are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

25-0896 **9F3** Recommendation to approve personnel changes (Alternative Sentencing Officer; Alternative Sentencing Sergeant; Chief Alternative Sentencing Officer, DAS Case Manager, DAS Program Manager, Drug Screen Collector, Grants Coordinator, Investigative Assistant, Laboratory Assistant, Lead Drug Screen Collector, Mental Health Counselor II, Supervising DAS Case Manager), including position reassignments, position reclassifications, creation of one new 1.0 FTE Case Manager III (new job classification - J 150), creation of one new 0.40 FTE Case Manager III (J 150), and position abolishments, and equipment services departmental vehicle reassignments, as a result of the Board of County Commissioners' repeal of Chapter 11 of Washoe County Code, elimination of the Department of Alternative Sentencing, and transition of program functions effective January 1, 2026; and direct Finance to make the necessary cross functional and cross-fund budget appropriation transfers. [Net fiscal impact \$-0-] Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Andriola indicated that the County had worked diligently on an ongoing process for the Department of Alternative Sentencing (DAS) and that, after much reflection, research, and discussion, she wished to express her appreciation to the

staff for organizing an implementation plan. She recognized that not every court was pleased with the proposed plan; however, she believed that consolidating pretrial services into a single department would provide efficient services for all defendants within the jurisdiction and align with recommended best practices. She desired a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the Second Judicial District Court (SJDC) and the justice courts, detailing the commitment to maintaining and exceeding pretrial service levels previously provided. She asserted that it was the County's commitment to maintain and exceed the previously offered services and support the community's best interests by having all courts work together professionally and amicably. She said that she was hopeful that any disputes would be referred to the District Attorney's (DA) Office. She recommended that the DA's Office reach out to a retired Supreme Court justice or retired Judge James Hardesty to assist in dispute mediation.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Washoe County Sheriff Darin Balaam and Undersheriff Corey Solferino for their work and willingness to serve and protect the community by committing to provide oversight for the misdemeanor probationers. She believed that the WCSO's oversight would allow the community to be safer and provide a more supportive structure for the probation officers. She thought that the MOU would be beneficial and requested that the Board revisit the MOU in 60 to 90 days to get a status update. She thanked County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas and Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large for their support, as well as others who participated in the MOU discussion. She requested that the MOU be added to the approval of Agenda Item 9F3.

Commissioner Garcia asked CDDA Large if the MOU could be attached to an agenda item. CDDA Large recommended that Agenda Item 9F3 pass as written, and the MOU could be discussed later. He stated that the Board and stakeholders could collaborate to implement the MOU. Commissioner Garcia asked if Commissioner Andriola's request was more appropriate for Agenda Item 22. CDDA Large confirmed that Commissioner Andriola's request was a better fit for Agenda Item 22. Commissioner Andriola indicated that she would not read the statement previously provided during Agenda Item 22 for the sake of brevity; however, she would reflect on the statement as a reminder.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Chair Hill absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9F3 be approved and directed.

**BLOCK VOTE – 10, 11, 12, 16 THROUGH 18 EXCLUDING PULLED ITEM 10
HEARD SEPARATELY**

* * * * *

Commissioner Clark requested Item 10 be pulled from the Block vote.

* * * * *

25-0897 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to approve the purchase of a new 2027 Western Star 47X Truck with dump body, sander spreader and plow from Velocity Truck Centers, 1550 South McCarran Boulevard, Sparks, Nevada [\$361,243.25], utilizing Sourcewell (a public agency created by the Minnesota legislature) contract #060220-NAF, pursuant to the joinder provision of NRS 332.195. This requested purchase will replace an existing vehicle that has been in service for 17 years and has reached the end of its useful life. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

25-0898 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to authorize Sierra Nevada Construction, Inc., as the Construction Manager-At-Risk (CMAR) and approve a Guaranteed Maximum Price 1 (GMP 1) Agreement to construct reclaimed water pipelines, gravity sewer pipelines, sewer force main pipelines, and appurtenances, to support the Pleasant Valley Interceptor Reach 3 Project [in the amount of \$6,538,873.95]. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Chair Hill absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be authorized and approved.

25-0899 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Recommendation that the Board of County Commissioners authorize the Chair to execute a settlement and release agreement between Washoe County and Madison AI, Inc., a Delaware corporation, reflecting the previous and ongoing collaboration between Washoe County and OnStrategy, Inc. in the development of intellectual property. Pursuant to the proposed agreement, Washoe County will receive a cash payment of five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) and (ii) a ten (10) year non-exclusive, non-transferable, and royalty-free license to utilize the Platform and memorialized in a Software License Agreement to be executed contemporaneously with and contingent upon the execution of this Agreement, in consideration for (i) the ongoing and continuing product

development, marketing, and sales services supporting the commercialization of the Platform a knowledge assistant for local governments to research, reference and generate documents based on County's code, board decisions, agendas, and policies. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

25-0900 AGENDA ITEM 17 Recommendation, in accordance with NRS 244.1505 and NRS 433.742, to approve allocation of Washoe Opioid Abatement and Recovery Fund (WOARF) non-bankruptcy funds through the One Nevada Agreement, in the total amount of [\$1,067,720], to Washoe County Human Services Agency Housing and Homeless Services Division Street Outreach project and authorize the County Manager to sign necessary award documents.

And, if approved, direct Finance to make necessary net zero cross-fund and/or cross-functional budget appropriation transfers and budget amendments. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Chair Hill absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 17 be approved, authorized, and directed.

25-0901 AGENDA ITEM 18 Recommendation to approve the award of a contract resulting from Request for Proposal (RFP) 3285-26 for Regional Fire and EMS Feasibility, Efficiency and Service Enhancement Study to the most responsive and responsible bidder, Emergent Global Solutions, Inc. The contract will be awarded for a one-year term period of January 1, 2026, to December 31, 2026, in an amount not to exceed \$380,935.54, with the cost of the contract to be shared equally between Washoe County, the City of Reno, and the City of Sparks [total estimated cost to Washoe County of \$126,978.52], and recommendation to approve the use of General Fund Contingency in the amount of [\$380,935.54] for Fiscal Year 26 in accordance with Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005 to increase expenditure authority in the Office of the County Manager for the Regional Fire and EMS Feasibility, Efficiency and Service Enhancement Study; and if approved, authorize the Washoe County Manager or her designee to proceed with contract negotiations with Emergent Global Solutions, Inc. consistent with the terms of the RFP and Emergent Global Solutions, Inc.'s

proposal, and to authorize the Washoe County Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the resulting Professional Services Agreement and related documents; and to direct Finance to make the appropriate budget appropriation transfers. [Total Fiscal Year impact \$380,935.54; net fiscal impact \$-0-] Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Chair Hill absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 18 be approved, awarded, authorized, and directed.

25-0902 AGENDA ITEM 10 Recommendation to: 1) approve the Arrowcreek Soundwall Abandonment Agreement for Access, Concrete Panel Replacement and Repair (Abandonment Agreement) to define the responsibilities of Washoe County and 14 residential property owners and their respective lots which abut Arrowcreek Parkway, beginning at 13430 Fieldcreek Lane and ending at 13560 Fieldcreek Lane; and 2) award a bid and approve the construction Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Arrowcreek Parkway Wall Repair Project, PWP-WA-2015-414 [staff recommends Frank Lepori Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$387,642.03; and approve a project contingency in the amount of \$12,000.00 to be used on a time and materials basis if needed, for a total project cost of \$399,642.03]; and 3) upon completion and inspection of the wall replacement and repair project, direct staff to prepare a Boundary Line Adjustment to transfer ownership of the newly repaired wall to the property owners listed within the Abandonment Agreement and record the Abandonment Agreement against the 14 benefitting assessor parcel numbers: 049-312-23, 049-312-24, 049-312-25, 049-312-26, 049-312-27, 049-312-28, 049-312-29, 049-312-30, 049-312-31, 049-312-34, 049-312-33, 049-312-02, 049-312-03, and 049-312-04. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

Commissioner Clark noted that the process had been ongoing for nearly 14 years and requested a brief history of the project.

Division Director of Engineering and Capitol Projects of the Community Services Department, Dwayne Smith, explained that the project represented the culmination of significant efforts and concern over the past 12 to 15 years related to a sound wall constructed as part of the Arrowcreek residential development and improvements made along Arrowcreek Parkway, formerly known as Fieldcreek Lane. He indicated that the improvements were effectively dedicated to Washoe County and required the County to own, operate, maintain, repair, and replace facilities located within the right-of-way. He mentioned that there were initial concerns and confusion regarding the responsibility for the sound wall, likely because it was integrated as the back wall of many abutting residential parcels along the north side of Arrowcreek. He explained that it ultimately

became clear that Washoe County was responsible for resolving the issue. He added that the recommendation to accept the competitive bid for the repair was consistent with the direction previously provided by the Board. He noted that through a competitive bidding process, bids were received to repair the wall in its entirety. He pointed out that, in determining the most cost-effective approach, there was concern about replacing certain wall panels that were in good condition, rather than only those that had failed. He indicated that the recommendation was ultimately made after Washoe County received a competitive bid to replace all wall panels at a lower cost, which was less time-consuming and costly than evaluating which panels required replacement. He stated that staff met with the community on multiple occasions and obtained signatures from all abutting property owners to accept Washoe County's role in repairing and replacing the wall. He said that once repairs were complete, the agreement provided for the warranty to be transferred to the property owners, followed by the transfer of ownership of the wall to the individual property owners. He explained that Washoe County's internal survey team would handle creating the boundary line adjustment. He noted that the County's right-of-way would shift the property line slightly to the south to encompass the wall entirely. He added that abutting property owners would have an access easement to the County side of the wall for any future necessary maintenance. He stated that it was a comprehensive solution based on prior Board direction. He shared that replacing the entire wall would provide better cost savings for Washoe County. He added that staff were prepared to initiate the project with the Board's consideration and approval.

Commissioner Clark stated that there were allegations that the initial materials used were of poor quality and had deteriorated. He added that the company that initially constructed the wall did not have insurance and had since been dissolved. He noted that, after a lengthy process and numerous discussions, Washoe County had assumed ownership of the issue. He questioned whether, once the wall was repaired, the homeowner would assume ownership and the County would no longer be responsible for future issues. He requested clarification to confirm that the County would no longer own any portion of the wall or the newly constructed fence. Although the process would be costly, he believed it was the right course of action, as it would give the homeowners full responsibility and the County would no longer be involved. Mr. Smith stated that Commissioner Clark's comments accurately reflected all the conditions captured in the agreement.

Commissioner Clark inquired whether the homeowners' ownership of an additional one to two feet of land, along with a new fence, would affect their assessments or property values, and whether Mr. Smith had discussed the matter with the Assessor's Office. Mr. Smith clarified that he was not acting in the role of the Washoe County Assessor. He explained that during a brief conversation, the term *de minimis* was used, and he suggested that the property owners contact the Assessor's Office with any questions.

Commissioner Clark said that because the County was assisting a small percentage of the community to remedy an issue, some taxpayers might question the decision. He stated that although the repair was costly, it would ultimately be more beneficial, as the County would no longer bear the burden of maintaining the wall in the future. He believed that taking immediate action would result in cost savings, and delaying

the repair could lead to increased future construction material costs. He requested confirmation that the current cost would be less than the initial projection. Mr. Smith said he was pleasantly surprised when the bids were opened because the revised approach had resulted in a better price.

Commissioner Andriola recognized Mr. Smith, staff, and the homeowners for finding a viable solution despite the challenges they faced. She commended Mr. Smith for his hard work and noted that the public might not be aware of the many hours required for such initiatives. She acknowledged that collaborating with homeowners and actively seeking a solution proved successful. She shared her excitement about how the bid was received and believed it would be beneficial for the County. She thanked Mr. Smith for consistently pursuing solutions while maintaining a customer service-oriented approach.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

25-0903

AGENDA ITEM 13 Recommendation to approve a Lease Agreement between Washoe County, Lessee, and 6550 Longley LLC, Lessor, for the occupancy of 49,500 square feet of warehouse and office space at 6550 Longley Lane, Suite 145, Reno, Nevada 89511 on a 126 month term, commencing January 1, 2026 and terminating on June 30 2036, [\$5,574,758.16 Total Base Rent and \$1,426,775.28 Total Estimated Common Area Maintenance]. The Registrar of Voters will use the space to establish a centralized operational hub and consolidate existing leased space. Base rent was negotiated to be free for the first 6 months and \$39,600.00 per month after, with 3.5% annual increases, and the common area maintenance is currently \$9,405.00 per month. [FY26 expense of \$56,430.00 FY27 total expense of \$588,060.00]. Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 244.275 and NRS 332.400 authorize the County to enter into lease agreements for property necessary for county use and require the inclusion of a funding out clause, which allows for termination of the lease without penalty if funds are not appropriated in future fiscal years. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas explained that, in addition to sharing information about the base rent negotiations, she noted that the space would be shared among the Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office and other uses, given its large size. She indicated that during previous discussions about the purchase of ballot marking devices (BMDs), she had also mentioned the need for additional space. She said staff had been looking for extra space for quite some time and that negotiating a lease required a decent amount of time. She acknowledged Commissioner Clark, noting that his background and expertise helped guide staff through the process and enabled them to negotiate six months of free rent, which would be beneficial in the long term.

Commissioner Clark commented that negotiating with the landlord resulted in savings of \$237,600 for six months of free rent.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Commissioner Clark for helping save taxpayers more than \$237,000. She recognized the ROV and the Board's action to participate in the State's Request for Proposals (RFPs), which would result in savings of hundreds of thousands of dollars. She thanked Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald for consistently seeking efficiencies while maintaining a secure environment. She thought that CM Thomas would take the initiative to develop a space that would be beneficial to all. She shared her appreciation for Mr. McDonald's hard work, keeping the Commissioners informed, and sharing information with the public.

Commissioner Garcia reiterated previous comments from Commissioners regarding cost savings and efficiencies and asked the ROV to share its vision related to transparency and public access.

Mr. McDonald thanked Commissioner Clark for assisting with the lease negotiations and further thanked other staff members who helped secure the lease for the new building. He explained that the vision was to enhance real-time coordination and collaboration. He shared that operations were currently spread across two warehouses and a separate headquarters, which made communication and efficiency challenging due to the lack of a single location. He believed that consolidating operations into a single facility would reduce delays and miscommunication between headquarters and logistical warehouse staff. He indicated that the new location would improve response times during elections. He added that, on Election Day, election support staff could work more collaboratively with warehouse staff and the ROV leadership to coordinate the rapid deployment of resources as needed. He explained that consolidating operations into one facility could streamline logistics for returned vote-by-mail ballots, supplies, voting machines, check-in stations, and vote center supplies, including cradle points, ballot drop boxes, secure election vaults, forms, chairs, feather flags, and other stored items. He noted that the intake of election equipment and ballots during early voting and on Election Day would be consolidated to a single facility, reducing the number of transportation steps. He said it would streamline returns and coordination of efforts into one seamless location for election workers, supplies, ballot runners, and tech runners, while also increasing security and oversight. He shared that centralizing ballot storage, processing, and logistics would improve both physical and procedural security by making it easier to control and monitor movement and maintain a secure chain of custody procedure. He explained that, at the new location, his goal was to establish separate areas to maintain the chain of custody in accordance with best practices. He indicated that individuals responsible for mail ballot processing had access to tabulation areas when they should not, and that badge access controls would be implemented to restrict access to only those authorized for specific areas. To achieve successful operational scalability and extendibility, he proposed a parallel process for all stages of the ballot, which could not be accommodated in the current limited space. He said that a larger space would allow the ROV's Office to conduct ballot sorting, signature verification, batching, ballot extraction, the counting board, duplication, scanning, digital adjudication, and tabulation simultaneously.

Mr. McDonald believed that the signature verification process could be increased by 30 percent with the allocation of more resources and utilizing the larger space. He noted that the ROV's Office would store all ballots in its warehouse rather than transferring them to record retention, allowing them to maintain chain of custody records. He added that when a federal contest appeared on the ballot for 22 months, all the Presidential Preference Primary (PPP) and general election ballots would be housed in the warehouse. He believed that the processes would provide transparency and credibility for the ROV's Office. He shared that, after the implementation of BMDs, in-person vote center ballots would be full-length and require storage. He indicated that, because there would no longer be small voter-verifiable paper audit trail (VVPAT) rolls, those ballots would need to be stored on site. He noted that all 11 ballot scanners would be available for use on election night and throughout the process as needed, representing a 45 percent increase in scanning capacity. He said that the new facility would include an on-site training room for poll and election workers. He explained that the ROV's Office currently used the training room in Building C for most of the year, during the PPP and general election cycles. He mentioned that the new training room could also be used by other County offices outside of the election season. He stated that the new facility would provide numerous benefits, improving services by enabling parallel processing and completing tasks more efficiently, as well as delivering election night results to the public more quickly. He shared that a public gallery would be incorporated to allow members of the public to observe each stage of the ballot process, which he believed would significantly enhance transparency.

Regarding Mr. McDonald's mention of security, Commissioner Andriola asked him to provide additional details on security measures beyond those currently in place. She emphasized that the current facility was secure but requested that the ROV discuss potential enhancements at the new facility.

Mr. McDonald said that when he began working in the ROV's Office, he questioned why all functions were housed in a single room rather than divided into separate rooms for each part of the process, with badge access and enhanced security. He noted that, currently, anyone could access the room and all equipment. He stated that it was not ideal and he wanted the process to be segregated, with access granted only as needed. He explained that individuals would have access only to the areas required for their specific roles and would be restricted from other areas.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. McDonald for providing insight and identifying ways to enhance security to the greatest extent possible. She expressed appreciation for his allocation of additional savings over time, as well as his attention to detail, experience, and the dedication of his staff. She noted that she looked forward to a future presentation discussing his vision for the warehouse, including creating a mock election to demonstrate opportunities for public participation and transparency.

Vice Chair Herman expressed concern about the new facility, noting that completing the project within the one-year timeframe would be a significant undertaking. She indicated that she felt a responsibility to consider the budget, as costs often exceeded initial estimates. She reiterated her long-standing concerns regarding election integrity and

emphasized that she believed it was important for the other Commissioners to consider her comments.

On the call for public comment, Penny Brock provided a document, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She asserted that voters had lost confidence in elections, the ROV, and the ROV's Office. She alleged that the ROV was new to his position and had never previously overseen an elections department. She indicated that she attempted to contact him during the November election but was unable to reach him. She believed that he lacked experience and suggested that his interest in new technology stemmed from his background in San Diego, which she characterized as a technology-focused area. She stated that she had repeatedly requested the use of paper ballots and hand-counting, which she felt were viable options, and asserted that the points previously presented by Mr. McDonald were unnecessary. She mentioned that his proposals were forthcoming because voting was one of President Donald Trump's top three priorities. She suggested that President Trump favored the use of paper ballots and hand-counting and wanted to eliminate electronic voting machines and BMDs. She indicated that none of the previous ROVs had used BMDs due to prior issues with the devices. She felt that Mr. McDonald proposed the use of BMDs without sufficient knowledge of those prior issues. She alleged that the adoption of BMDs was combined with the contract for the Dominion Voting System, which she felt did not allow the Board adequate time to conduct research. She shared her concerns regarding the proposal and questioned why the plan included relocating the ROV's Office to an off-site location, stating that voters would not know where to register to vote or where to go with questions relating to voting issues. She stated that Manager Thomas, who would oversee the ROV Office, would not be located at the same facility. She believed that the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) top responsibilities were the budget and ensuring safe and secure elections. She felt that a larger concern would be the cost to taxpayers and questioned how operational costs were calculated. She thought that relocating to a new facility could increase voter frustration and contribute to greater distrust of the elections department and the voting process. She cited potential transparency and accountability issues and stated that the new facility would create distrust in elections in Washoe County, the ROV, and the ROV's Office. She remarked that one of the Commissioners appeared disengaged during her comments.

Ryan Vortisch, self-identified as a paid lobbyist for Silver State Voices (SSV) and Neo Philanthropy, stated his organization's mission centered on building a more robust democracy by expanding voter access and ensuring transparent, efficient, and secure election processes. He requested that the Board support the item, which would grant the ROV the necessary expansion and warehouse space to ensure elections could run smoothly and securely.

Jennifer Willett stated that she was the senior campaign manager for All Voting is Local (AVL) Nevada, an organization that advocated for policies and legislative priorities aimed at expanding voter access. She mentioned that her organization supported Agenda Item 13. She explained that ensuring fair and efficient elections was the ROV's most crucial responsibility. She explained that, as Washoe County had grown and election laws had evolved, the need for additional space for the ROV had become urgent. She noted

that, as stated at several prior BCC meetings, the back room used by the ROV was extremely crowded, making meaningful observation difficult. She thought that adding BMDs in that space was not logistically feasible. She said that the elections group audit identified the existing split facility model as a deficiency and recommended transitioning to a single facility to improve workflow, efficiency, and transparency. She mentioned that her organization agreed with those findings and stated that expanding space for the ROV was an investment in the democratic process. She suggested that providing the ROV with adequate space and resources to operate at the highest standards would strengthen public confidence in the election system and better serve the community.

Trista Gomez questioned whether the funding allocated during the original budget process was intended for the facility. She said that she did not recall hearing that information, and she did not have access to specific line items in the budget. She expressed surprise that the County would consider updating voting technology, given her belief that Nevada was included on a national list and involved in federal lawsuits related to elections. She wondered if it would be prudent to expand the use of voting technology, while she believed the government's goal was to restrict it. She said that she supported the idea of a public gallery to allow observation of voting operations and expressed appreciation for the ROVs' efforts to address community concerns and improve election integrity. She raised concerns regarding the budget and the cost of leasing a new facility and asked whether there would be any cost savings associated with the ROV's current space and how it would be used in the future.

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

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

25-0904 AGENDA ITEM 14 Introduction and first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Three- Regulation of Uses, Division Four- Development Standards, and Division Nine- General Provisions. These amendments include adding various sections to: establish small lot residential development standards and establish infill residential and commercial development standards. These amendments also include amending various sections to: include an example of the multi-family, minor residential use type and allow cottage courts on multiple parcels; modify the maximum size of attached and detached accessory dwelling units from 50% to 80% of the size of the main dwelling; modify the maximum floor area from 1,000 square feet to 1,200 square feet for cottage court developments; specify that only one community accessory structure is allowed for every four (4) cottages in a cottage court development; clarify the calculation of setbacks for cottage court developments; modify lot and yard standards for common

open space developments; add various definitions; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

And if supported, set a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for January 13, 2026. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1943.

Senior Planner, Katherine Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WDCA25-0008 (Small Housing and Infill Development); Background; Articles 302, 304, 306; Cottage Courts; Small Lot Development Standards; Infill Standards; Infill Incentives; Other Changes; Proposed Modification; Planning Commission; Recommendation; Motion; Thank You; Sun Valley; Verdi; Wadsworth; Gerlach.

Ms. Oakley explained that the Washoe County Development Code (WCDC) amendments would address small housing and infill development. She reviewed the slide titled *Background* and stated that, as previously mentioned, the housing supply was not aligned with household trends. She stated that a growing gap existed between housing availability, supply, and the needs of residents. She noted that staff had identified a need for a greater variety of housing types, particularly smaller units, and explained that the amendments were intended to address that issue. She highlighted that the trend from 1970 to 2022 was that the medium-density suburban (mds) zone was the most common suburban zone. She added that the new home size had increased from approximately 1,200 square feet (sq ft) to 2,200 sq ft, which was a substantial increase. She stated that during the same period, the mean household size in the United States (US) decreased from 3.14 people to 2.5 people, and trends were moving in opposite directions. She noted that currently, about two-thirds of households in Washoe County were 1 or 2-person households, and many community members could potentially benefit from smaller units.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Articles 302, 304, 306*, and outlined the proposed changes, beginning with the use table, use definitions, and then accessory use sections of the Code. She indicated that some refinements would be made to the definitions of multifamily, minor, and cottage courts, as outlined in the packet that the Board received. She explained that the more significant change involved modifying the size limit for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) to increase from 50 percent to 80 percent of the main dwelling's size to a maximum of 1,200 or 1,500 sq ft, depending on the zoning district. She stated that the change was intended to impact parcels with smaller main homes, creating the ability to have an ADU that was more reasonably sized for 1 to 3-person households without penalizing existing smaller homes, which was a positive change for the housing market. She said that the overall maximum cap would remain unchanged and the accessory nature of the ADUs would be maintained, while providing additional housing opportunities.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Cottage Courts* and said that staff were

proposing changes to the cottage court standards. She thought that the Board might recall seeing the proposal as part of the middle housing package. She indicated that the change was intended to allow cottage court subdivisions. She explained that currently, a cottage court development consisted of multiple small units on a single parcel that could be rented. She stated that the proposed changes would allow those units to be subdivided into individual parcels and sold, creating more entry-level homeownership opportunities. She added that the proposal would increase the maximum cottage size from 1,000 sq ft to 1,200 sq ft. She explained that the change would allow three bedroom units to accommodate small families better and would include other improvements, such as limiting community accessory structures to one per four cottages to ensure the development maintained its character and would avoid clutter. She explained that the figure on the slide illustrated the concept of each cottage being located on its own parcel and surrounded by open space, as required by the Code. She noted that the change would allow developments with multiple clusters for each cottage to be individually sold.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Small Lot Development Standards* and stated that the proposed small lot development standards would allow for starter homes, encouraging and enabling smaller houses on small lots to provide additional housing opportunities. She suggested that the standards could be applied to subdivisions with 1,200 sq ft single-family detached homes, as well as single-family attached homes, such as townhomes. She asserted that the change would allow for alternative, smaller setbacks to enable the development of those types of parcels, a reduction in minimum lot size, and an alternative road design when those roads were privately maintained.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Infill Standards* and explained that infill standards were common Nationwide and were intended to encourage appropriate development and redevelopment of underutilized parcels in areas that were largely built out before zoning regulations were established. She indicated that not conforming to current zoning standards could present challenges. She stated that staff utilized the Geographic Information System (GIS) analysis to identify four areas where the proposed changes would be beneficial. She noted that there would also be proposed alternate infill standards that would apply only to parcels below a specific size. She added that those parcels were generally substandard, which created development challenges, and that the applicable parcel sizes were listed on the slide and in the staff report.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Infill Incentives* and said that the proposed standards would include specific incentives. She explained that, for residential development, the incentive would allow a reduction in the front yard setback when conforming to the existing setbacks for the area. She noted that those areas tended to have a significant amount of nonconforming development and were built before the adoption of the zoning Code, so they were developed legally, but did not align with the current Code. She added that setting a structure back 20 feet when other structures on the street were set back 10 feet would be inconsistent with the neighborhood. She felt that was a missed opportunity that the staff was trying to resolve. She said that, for commercial development, the proposal included fixed, reduced setbacks of 10 feet and then 5 feet from the side and

rear yard. She stated that the overall intent was to allow variations when development was consistent with the historic and existing character of the area.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Proposed Modification* and proposed that, if the Board approved the first reading, a modification be made for the second reading. She noted that the change would affect the small lot development standards, specifically the section regarding roadways. She explained that staff had determined the language was not as flexible as needed and conflicted with other sections of the Code. She said that the proposed modification would resolve that issue.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Planning Commission* and reported that the Planning Commission (PC) heard the item on November 4, 2025, and voted unanimously to recommend approval. She noted that only one finding was required and that the PC could make all four findings.

Ms. Oakley reviewed the slide titled *Motion* and said that she had a slightly modified motion, noting that the text in red reflected an addition to the original motion.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Ms. Oakley for the presentation and acknowledged that, after the housing packages were completed, the equine proposal would be brought forward. She believed that the changes aligned with the Governor's legislation, Assembly Bill (AB) 540, with a focus on attainability, and that market demand drove development outcomes. She expressed appreciation for Ms. Oakley's analysis of matching potential demand to help drive the market and identifying the necessary gap. She thought that more than 15,000 homes would need to be built over the next ten years and that the proposed changes were positive progress. She thanked Ms. Oakley for supporting the changes, the Governor for the foresight to include what was needed in the legislation, and locals for doing what they could to meet that demand.

On the call for public comment, Pat Davison, a resident of District 5, expressed excitement about the housing program that was forming. She indicated that some changes in the proposed package reflected public feedback to staff about the ADUs and small lot standards. She felt that was a good thing, as it showed that people were paying attention, asking questions, and providing input. She indicated that even with the changes, safeguards remained in place, such as the maximum size for the ADUs, which remained unchanged. She shared that her favorite part of the package was the change allowing cottages to be individually sold, and she hoped that residents would participate in those efforts. She believed that the primary purpose of the changes was to entice, motivate, and encourage owners and developers to provide lower-cost, market-rate housing options for rent or purchase. She noted that, as highlighted in the presentation, the market was not supplying smaller, lower-cost housing units. She said that demand for those units came both from current residents who were struggling and from future residents who hoped to live in the area. She explained that whether the units were townhomes, condominiums, cottages, duplexes, or ADUs, keeping costs down and reducing unnecessary development barriers was essential. She provided and read a document that she found on the *Reno Gazette-Journal's (RGJ)* website regarding housing costs and the lack of affordable

housing, copies of which were placed on file with the Clerk. She thought that the message intended for Reno could also apply to Washoe County. She shared that she did not know the author of the letter or his reasons for writing it, but she felt his concerns were not unique. She believed that many families needed the option to rent a cottage within a cottage cluster. She urged the Board to follow the lead of the PC, which made all four possible findings and voted unanimously to recommend approval of the Code changes.

Trista Gomez said that she would not share her concerns regarding development, which she thought the Board might find surprising. She explained that she had recently moved back to town and shared that, as a child, she lived in Spanish Springs, and as a young adult, and often as an adult, she lived in town. She mentioned that when she lived in town, she saved eight hours per week in commute time because the roads and infrastructure were adequately built. She indicated that, given the number of residences in town using existing roads, traffic impacts were less severe than in the valleys, including the North Valleys and Spanish Springs. She alleged that residents in northern Sun Valley were often stuck in traffic for long periods. She felt that those roads were not well planned or designed to accommodate heavy traffic. She suggested that infill development could be a solution, allowing homeowners to keep family members on their properties or potentially add a small rental unit. She cautioned that infrastructure in the valleys was inadequate and that residents experienced significant challenges when commuting. She indicated that by living in town, she saved the equivalent of one workday per week in commute time. She urged the Board to consider the existing infrastructure and its impact on residents, who spent long periods in traffic each morning and evening. She emphasized the need to find a solution to ongoing traffic issues, which she said she frequently heard about from community members. She said that although she supported approval of the item, she voiced concerns that the measure could create hardships for residents who lived in town. She shared that she enjoyed living in town because driving was generally easier, and she encouraged the Board to consider her concerns when evaluating additional development.

Bill No. 1943 was introduced by Commissioner Andriola, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

25-0905 AGENDA ITEM 15 Introduction and first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Two- Area Plan Regulations to establish standards for permanent employee housing in the High Desert Planning Area; to allow permanent employee housing on parcels zoned General Rural (GR) within the High Desert Planning Area at a density of up to 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres as an allowed use; and to allow permanent employee housing on such parcels at a density of up to 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres with the approval of a special use permit; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

And if supported, set a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for January 13, 2026. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1944.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas asked if the Board desired a staff presentation on Agenda Item 15, and it was determined that no presentation was needed. Commissioner Andriola indicated that she was confident the Board had thoroughly reviewed the Staff Report and that by introducing Bill No. 1944, the Board was closer to addressing equine issues.

Bill No. 1944 was introduced by Commissioner Andriola, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

* * * * *

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas indicated that the Agenda contained a 1:00 p.m. time-certain public hearing. She recommended that the Board take a brief 30-minute recess, where the closed session could take place. Commissioner Garcia recommended continuing the meeting without the 30-minute recess, as she believed there was a significant amount of public comment regarding Agenda Item 20. Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large indicated that Agenda Item 20 was time-certain for 1:00 p.m. and could not be heard before that time. Commissioner Garcia expressed the desire to take a short recess until 1:00 p.m. Vice Chair Herman said that the Board would take a 12-minute break until 1:00 p.m.

* * * * *

12:47 p.m. The Board recessed.

1:03 p.m. The Board reconvened with Chair Hill and Commissioner Clark absent.

PUBLIC HEARING

25-0906 **AGENDA ITEM 19** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Three-Regulation of Uses. These amendments include: modifying the title of Article 336 from “Affordable Housing Incentives” to “Housing Incentives”; adding provisions to describe the purpose of Article 336 Housing Incentives, and create incentives for senior housing; and amending provisions to include “Senior Housing” as a residential use type in Table 110.302.05.1 and define the term; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. In making its determination, the Board shall either affirm, modify or reject the findings of fact included in the Planning Commission’s recommendation. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1751, Bill No. 1941.

Ms. Galassini asked if the Board desired a staff presentation on Agenda Item 19, and it was determined that no presentation was needed.

On the call for public comment, Pat Davison thanked the Board for notifying the Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs) of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting. She expressed gratitude to the Community Services Department (CSD) Senior Planner Katherine Oakley and Senior Planner Christopher Bronczyk for being great team leaders and the Board for making changes in Washoe County.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, with Chair Hill and Commissioner Clark absent, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 17751, Bill No. 1941, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

1:05 p.m. **Commissioner Clark returned to the meeting.**

25-0907 **AGENDA ITEM 20** Public Hearing: Appeal of the Washoe County Board of Adjustment's denial of Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP25-0013 (Sanctuary of God) for the Religious Assembly use type and major grading to allow the construction of a 15,000-square-foot single-story church and site grading in the amount of 18,000 cubic yards. The appellant is Sierra Builders of Nevada. The subject parcel is located at 3485 Rolling Ridge Road (APN 082-512-32), has a master plan designation of Suburban Residential (SR) and a regulatory zone designation of Low Density Suburban (LDS).

The Board of County Commissioners (Board) shall consider the appeal based on the record on appeal and any additional evidence submitted at the Board's public hearing. The Board may affirm, modify or reverse the Board of Adjustment's decision. If the Board reverses the Board of Adjustment's decision, the Board may remand the matter back to the Board of Adjustment or directly grant the special use permit. If the Board directly grants the special use permit, staff is recommending the modified conditions included as Exhibit G. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

Senior Planner Eric Young introduced himself to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He noted that Agenda Item 20 related to an appeal of a Board of Adjustment (BOA) denial for the special use permit (SUP) Case Number WSUP25-0013.

Mr. Young conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Appeal of BOA Denial for WSUP25-0013 (Sanctuary of God); Special Use Permit Request; Location- 3485 Rolling Ridge Rd; Site Plan; Elevations; Subject Appeal; Appeal Cont.; Public and Agency Comment; Findings; BCC Motion Options; Thank you.

Mr. Young displayed the slide titled *Special Use Permit Request*. He explained that the SUP request related to the Sanctuary of God Church permit for a religious assembly use type and major grading to construct a church up to 15,000 square feet (sq ft), including a parking area for 154 parking spaces. He noted that while the grading for the project was considered major, it was consistent with what was typical for a development of that kind.

Mr. Young showed the *Location- 3485 Rolling Ridge Rd* slide. He described the parcel's location shown on the slide's maps as being on the eastern edge of Golden Valley, where West 7th Avenue toward Sun Valley becomes Golden Valley Road. He noted that the subject parcel was shown on the sketched map on the left side of the slide and depicted again with an arrow pointing to the location on the aerial photograph on the right. He introduced the slide titled *Site Plan* by explaining that the image on the slide had been provided by the applicant. He noted that the site plan depicted a church on the northern portion of the property, with the majority of the parking located on the southern portion, and a retention pond situated on the eastern portion, which he observed as being representative of a typical layout for what might be expected. He displayed the *Elevations* slide and stated that the elevations depicted a pre-fabricated type of metal building structure, with some improvements, such as wainscoting and extra windows. He noted that the elevations could be seen on the slide for both the front and side of the building.

Mr. Young displayed the *Subject Appeal* slide. He reported that on October 2, 2025, the BOA denied WSUP25-0013 by a vote of four to one during their meeting that day. He showed the *Appeal Cont.* slide and noted that the appellant, Sierra Builders of Nevada, had previously stated that they believed the decision to vote no on the SUP request was personal and not based on the staff recommendation. Mr. Young noted that the appellant continued to assert that the BOA had not adequately stated why it could not make the required findings. He introduced the *Public and Agency Comment* slide and reported that 37 properties had been notified of the application, and 13 speakers had commented during the related public hearing. He showed the slide titled *Findings*. He explained that the findings required to be made previously by the BOA and currently by the BCC for the application being discussed under Agenda Item 20 included consistency, improvements, site suitability, issuance not detrimental, and effect on a military installation. He reported that no military installations were impacted; however, the first four findings he had listed were discussed extensively during the previous BOA meeting.

Mr. Young showed the *BCC Motion Options* slide. He explained that the slide listed three potential options the Board could take on Agenda Item 20, which included affirming the BOA's decision by denying WSUP25-0013 or reversing the BOA's decision and approving WSUP25-0013 subject to the amended conditions of approval as described in Attachment G in the Staff Report. He explained that the Staff Report included details regarding the new conditions of approval. He elaborated that one of the conditions for approval regarding secondary access had been removed during the staff review that occurred following the BOA meeting and before the BCC's current public hearing. He stated that the current amended conditions of approval reflected a new review by the engineering program. He explained that the Board's third option was to reverse the BOA's

decision and remand the matter to the BOA with instructions from the BCC to be reviewed. He noted that the full motions were provided in the Staff Report for the Board to read or use, should they decide to do so. He displayed the *Thank you* slide and stated that he was available to answer questions from the Board. He believed the applicant was also present at the current meeting.

Steve Denney, Vice President of Construction for Sierra Builders of Nevada and Lead Project Manager for the proposed Sanctuary of God Church project at the designated site, introduced himself. He conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Sanctuary of God Special Use Permit; Preliminary Landscape Plan Sanctuary of God.

Mr. Denney displayed the slide titled *Sanctuary of God Special Use Permit*. He expressed his desire to thank the staff for the recommended approval of the project with specific conditions, which he stated he had no objections to whatsoever. He noted that three of the five conditions for which the project had been denied were listed in the Staff Report under the findings labeled B, C, and D. He explained that he wanted to briefly draw a connection between the improvements and site suitability findings, noting that he did not believe he had much more information to offer after satisfying those aspects in their appeal application. He opined that it was essential to note that all changes made by Sierra Builders of Nevada would be made in accordance with Code by regulation and would be designed in such a way that the project could pass through plan review, receive a permit, complete final inspection, and ultimately be issued a Certificate of Occupancy (C of O).

Mr. Denney reiterated that all actions taken toward the project had been done in accordance with the Code regulations and stipulations provided by the staff. He acknowledged that drainage had been a concern and was set by staff as a condition to be adjusted. He stated that he would not object to having a hydrology report conducted for 50-year and 100-year storms to ensure that the project's retention pond, curb, and gutter would not have any negative effect on neighboring properties. He explained that the third finding involved the issuance being detrimental to the neighborhood. He affirmed that while Sierra Builders of Nevada wanted to construct the project, they also wanted to be good neighbors to the residents, so his organization had been sensitive to the design of the project and how it would look on the property. He explained that the height of the building design was kept to a minimum, and was actually planned to be lower than the height of his two-story home. He referred to Mr. Young's earlier comments regarding the planned building being constructed out of metal. He explained that the building would feature a hardy plank lap siding material, which would ultimately not appear to be a metal building, as it would be sided and painted to match the neighboring houses. He noted that there would be a 42 to 48-inch rock veneer wainscoting across the bottom of the building as well.

Mr. Denney acknowledged that there was concern regarding the lights being used for the project. He explained that the electrical engineer for the project had kept the light height to a minimum and had implemented motion sensors, photocells, and house shields around the lights. He emphasized that the lights would project in a very specific location and would not flood out into the neighborhood. He added that his organization had

also proposed surrounding the entire property with a fence to ensure that the light from car headlights would not pose an issue for neighboring homes. He stated that it was also important to note that a traffic study based on Washoe County requirements was conducted by a third-party engineer, Chris Smoltz of Heartfelt Engineering, Limited Liability Company (LLC). He explained that the engineer's final finding on the traffic study was that, due to the low number of trips, estimated to be less than 80 peak-hour trips generated by the project, the need for additional traffic analysis was not required. He recalled that his organization had heard additional concerns from neighbors regarding parking spaces, which he acknowledged Mr. Young had mentioned totaled 154 spots for the project. Mr. Denney clarified that the number of parking spaces had since been reduced to 120, and the amount of seats inside the worship assembly had been decreased to 300, which resulted in the overall size of the structure being reduced. He stated that there was often some opposition to development and change, and he wanted to ask the Board to consider the facts within the application, as well as what his organization would do in terms of meeting Code requirements and their commitment to the conditions, while they made a ruling on the project findings. He thanked the members of the BCC for their time and noted that he would be available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Garcia described having watched the full BOA meeting on the project. She explained that she needed clarification about the secondary access road, as it was a significant topic that had been discussed during that meeting. She recalled having recently heard during the introduction of Agenda Item 20 that the secondary access road had been removed, and she asked if that particular topic could be revisited so the changes could be explained.

Director of Engineering and Capital Projects, Dwayne Smith, explained that engineering staff initially placed a condition on the project for the implementation of secondary emergency access. He referred to the map on the *Sanctuary of God Special Use Permit* slide, noting that the area in question was located toward the south and spanned to an adjoining roadway. He explained that the condition was placed erroneously, as the Washoe County Development Code (WCDC) did not require secondary emergency access for the specific use type to which the project was categorized. He recalled that the condition was revealed to him during discussions with some of the neighboring residents who had concerns about the project. He explained that staff reviewed the matter further following those conversations, and he subsequently conducted research to see if organizations like the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) would require the same secondary emergency access. He stated that as a County engineer, he recognized the condition was not pertinent to the development type in question, and he requested that the condition be removed as part of the project.

Commissioner Garcia inquired whether there would now be only one entry and exit point from the Sanctuary of God Church project if it were constructed, which Mr. Smith confirmed. He explained that the project's driveway, which he noted was not depicted in the map on the *Sanctuary of God Special Use Permit* slide, extended to a residential road that further connected to an additional residential roadway. He noted that

there were 14 existing residential properties that utilized the local roadway that the project would also connect to.

On the call for public comment, Michael Marquiz displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board. He greeted the Board and stated that the project failed to satisfy several provisions within Washoe County Code (WCC) Section 110.810.30 and should be denied. He noted that a commercial facility was inconsistent with the community aesthetic of homes on sites of one or more acres in an area zoned for low-density residential use. He explained that reports from staff acknowledged the change to the character of the community. He noted that Rolling Ridge Road was a narrow, low-volume residential road without sidewalks, curbing, street lights, traffic controls, and it contained several erosion areas. He opined that the road was not suited to the expected volume of traffic from the project. He explained that the condition listed under 2(e) in the staff report from the previous BOA meeting, pertaining to roadway improvements, only applied to the driveway and parking areas for the church, and not to the associated travel paths to the building. He recalled that the expected traffic impact was a major concern to several members of the BOA during their previous hearing regarding the project. He opined that staff had grossly underestimated the traffic impact on the community by not factoring in the maximum capacity values of the church or the potential for large-scale, rapid departure from the building following church events or in an emergency. He stated that the project included no emergency secondary access, which he suspected would contribute to a greater number of casualties in an emergency. He explained that he had developed a computer model to better illustrate the traffic impact of the project, as there had been substantial discussion on the topic during the previous BOA meeting. He noted that the model he created had also been shared with staff. He explained that the data from his model revealed that the average number of cars in the lot would exceed the number of available parking spaces. He stated that a high percentage of parking lot overflows occurred without a parking solution, representing a safety impact to the area's residents and hindering access for emergency service personnel. He explained that the travel path for the project was approximately 2,261 feet (ft), with two stop signs for cars exiting after an event or in the event of an emergency. He noted that, based on the average car length in the United States (US) of 14.7 ft and the computer model, he believed that a significant traffic issue would occur due to the length of the exiting cars exceeding that of the travel path. He stated that such an occurrence would also impact the safety of church attendees and neighborhood residents. He opined that the project had numerous detrimental impacts, including runoff from the parking lot entering the water tables and wells, pollution from noise and lights, safety concerns, increased criminal activity, and economic changes to properties in the community. He requested that the Board deny the appeal for those reasons.

Judy Mackay displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board. She recited from her submitted document and introduced herself as a resident of Rolling Ridge Road in a home located directly near the property in question for Agenda Item 20. She stated that she was in attendance at the BCC meeting that day to voice her concerns about the request for a SUP to allow a church to be constructed at the end of Rolling Ridge Road. She stated that, although the property in question was zoned for residential use, the request asked for a commercial-style permit to be issued for a property

located in the center of a quiet neighborhood. She recalled that she and her husband had purchased their property 52 years prior, which had always been zoned for one-acre horse parcels that were designed to protect the quiet, residential character of the area. She stated that she and her husband raised their family in the neighborhood with the expectation that the original zoning would be respected and upheld. She said that allowing a church to be constructed at the end of Rolling Ridge Road would bring traffic, parking issues, and noise to a neighborhood that was not designed to handle such use. She opined that large gatherings, particularly those held on evenings and weekends, would create safety concerns as well as disruption to the residents' peaceful environment, as the street was quiet and narrow. She asked the Board to deny the SUP. She reiterated that her neighborhood was planned and zoned as residential, and she opined that it should remain as it was originally to protect the quality of life that families like hers had invested in for over half a century. She noted that the approval of the SUP would cause a significant change in her life as well as the lives of her neighbors on Rolling Ridge Road, Spearhead Way, Golden Valley Road, and Opal Station Drive. She thanked the Board for their time and consideration of her concerns.

Lorrie Aguilar displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board. She introduced herself and explained that she and her husband had lived on Rolling Ridge Road for over 24 years. She noted that there were 11 homes on Rolling Ridge Road, which were occupied mostly by retired residents who had lived in the neighborhood for 14 to 52 years. She described Rolling Ridge Road as a small, quiet area zoned for low-density suburban (lds) residential use, situated on a narrow cul-de-sac. She stated that Rolling Ridge Road was approximately 1,600 feet long and had a grade of about 1,000 feet at the top of the road before reducing to a grade of 600 feet toward the end of the cul-de-sac. She explained that residents rarely saw snowplows operating on the road in the winter, and they would only drive to the top portion of the Rolling Ridge Road once, not even servicing the end of the cul-de-sac. She elaborated that such actions would leave large berms for the residents to remove. She noted that the residents of the area all had concerns about the SUP for the Sanctuary of God Church, and she expressed her intent to discuss her personal worries about the matter. She stated that a development of the project's scale was incompatible with the established character and physical infrastructure of the residential cul-de-sac, as it was not designed to accommodate large gatherings. She explained that the cul-de-sac was intended for low-density residential use rather than institutional or semi-commercial purposes. She opined that the proposed 15,000 sq ft development presented significant physical safety concerns directly related to the ingress and egress of the cul-de-sac. She reiterated that the road was designed for low-volume residential traffic and would be unsuitable for higher traffic volumes or larger vehicles, such as those required for deliveries or emergency services, to accommodate a large institution. She explained that residents were significantly concerned about the projects impact on the water table and residential wells on Rolling Ridge Road, as contaminated runoff residue from the paved parking lots, drainage from oil or gases, the possibility of the projects retention pond not perking, and any overflow could affect the water table, contaminate residents well water, or cause flooding of properties adjacent to the church. She stated that the multiple church services being held on Sundays and various events, such as Bible studies, weddings, or group functions, conducted throughout the week would

disturb residents' routines, the rural lifestyle they had become accustomed to, and negatively impact their animals. She recalled that staff had stated in the past that a secondary emergency access road was a requirement for the issuance of the SUP. She noted that such a requirement was also mentioned during the previous BOA meeting by Senior Licensed Engineer Janelle Thomas. She stated that Sierra Builders of Nevada had since requested that the secondary emergency access road requirement be removed during the appeal process. She asked how that requirement could be removed from the SUP, emphasizing that the project was of a significant size. She thanked the Board and hoped they would consider denying the SUP on Rolling Ridge Road, as the project would create heavy traffic congestion, noise, and safety issues for the 11 adjacent homes and the residents and livestock located in the nearby rural communities and surrounding areas.

Emily Hagler urged the Board to uphold the denial for the SUP associated with the proposed Sanctuary of God Church on Rolling Ridge Road. She opined that the BOA's denial was based on clear findings and was a justified determination that was necessary to protect public safety throughout the surrounding residential community. She stated that the critical infrastructure needed to support the project was not present in the area, as Rolling Ridge Road lacked sidewalks, streetlights, and safe traffic control measures, which included the absence of turning lanes and signals at Opal Station Drive and Spearhead Way. She noted that Spearhead Way and Rolling Ridge Road lacked dividing lines, and the nearest public transportation was located nearly two miles away. She stated that a comprehensive traffic study to evaluate the capability of narrow roadways with no outlet, like Rolling Ridge Road and Spearhead Way, to safely and adequately accommodate the traffic generated by the project was not required, despite the constraints she mentioned. She opined that the submitted traffic generation estimate of 50 peak-hour trips significantly trivialized the scale of the proposed development, which included over 120 parking spaces for a building capacity that exceeded 300 occupants. She explained that access to Spearhead Way had no sidewalks at that time, which was a route that students from North Valleys High School (NVHS) regularly walked throughout the winter to get to school and after-school or evening activities. She noted that students walked those paths in the dark without streetlights, which she opined had represented a safety concern that the proposal did not adequately address. She believed that the project's impacts would not be exclusively limited to a single day of road use per week, as the current location of the Sanctuary of God Church advertised multiple weekday services in addition to the standard services on Sundays. She stated that the intensity of use was not fully disclosed in the project's application, and she expressed concerns about a lack of transparency regarding the facility's true operational scope. She noted that the proposal introduced approximately five acres of impermeable surface in an area that had already experienced challenges with groundwater, and the water treatment pond raised concerns from residents about the potential impacts it could pose to private wells. She reported that many residents of the community had faced septic system failures, and the soil in the location further increased the risk of runoff contamination. She noted that the proposal sought to remove the condition listed under 2(f) in the staff report from the previous BOA meeting, which required secondary emergency access. She opined that the condition was critical, as a commercial facility of such substantial size and located on a narrow, dead-end street required adequate emergency access. She believed that removing the requirement represented a public safety

risk. She noted that the BOA's previous determination was that granting the SUP would be injurious. She opined that upholding the BOA's decision affirmed the Board's duty to protect residential neighborhoods from incompatible development and ensured that zoning standards were applied consistently and fairly.

David Perdue displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board. He stated that his original intent for commenting was to address the project developer's inability to receive secondary emergency access, although he noted that he would not comment on it since the requirement had since been removed. He stated that the condition had been previously identified as a requirement, and he suspected that staff had been convinced it was no longer necessary, despite the residents' disagreement. He referred to the mention of relocating the church to a lower elevation on the property in the document he submitted. He stated that the current elevation plot was divided into two levels, with the large metal building located at the top of the hill, making it the tallest structure in the area. He opined that, if approved, the property should be relocated to a lower region within the property's elevation so that it would not be taller than the surrounding buildings, which would contribute to reducing the noise reaching homes immediately to the east of the parcel. He noted the third point listed in his submitted document was related to disrupting the peace of the neighborhood. He stated that there were no other non-residential buildings within a mile of the church aside from the NVHS, which he believed to also be disruptive to the area's peace during the majority of the day. He noted that neighboring lots were approximately 1 to 1.25 acres or 5-acre horse properties, all of which he described as peaceful. He believed that the church would not be quiet, and residents did not want 200 to 400 vehicles on Sundays and throughout the week, depending on the number of services the church hosted. He referred to the fourth item listed in his document, and he stated that the church did not conform to the neighborhood. He said that the plan for the church involved a metal building and roof, a vinyl fence, and some stone on the face of the building, which he noted would not conceal all of the metal elements. He reported that all of the neighboring homes were made of stucco with tiled roofs, and none of them were constructed of metal. He acknowledged that the building might look nice initially, but he suspected that it would quickly lose that appearance. He inquired how a metal building and a plastic fence might look after 5 to 25 years, or what might become of the landscaping's maintenance should the foliage be allowed to die if the church's attendance dwindled or funding ran out. He explained that the project was located on his property line, and his property was the closest to the structure, with a distance of approximately 25 feet away. He stated that he and his neighbors currently had a beautiful view of Pine Mountain, which would be replaced with a metal building should the church be constructed. He opined that a nicely appointed house of standard size would not be as intrusive. He referred to the project's plastic and chain link fence, which he noted had been changed several times before the current materials were proposed. He opined that the fence should be stone or powder-coated metal panels with landscaping on either side. He emphasized that residents did not want to see a chain link fence with plastic inserts that would fade and deteriorate over time.

Elaine Hanford displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board. She introduced herself as a retired professional geologist and holder of a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree. She expressed her desire to address the geologic and

hydrologic conditions at the proposed site that made it unsuitable to host the proposed project. She explained that the exposed bedrock at the site was Tertiary-age volcanic materials that had been hydrothermally altered, resulting in a high clay mineral content. She referred to the area depicted in purple on a map in the document she had submitted, noting that it represented geologic materials that repeatedly failed percolation tests, which were situated in an area where Washoe County required engineered septic systems. She explained that those conditions meant that onsite materials were not suitable for a retention or detention pond, as accumulated waters would not infiltrate the ground. She noted that stagnant ponded water would allow for the breeding of mosquitoes that could carry West Nile Virus and Equine Encephalitis, which posed serious health risks to humans and livestock. She explained that onsite clay-rich geologic materials were characterized by high shrink-swell capacity, runoff rates, and poor soil nutrients, which made them unsuitable for construction, foundation materials, and landscaping. She stated that the project developer had indicated that 80 percent of the 5-acre site would be covered by impervious materials. She reported that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Point Precipitation Frequency Estimate for the designated 100-year design event ranged from a predicted 3.3 to 4.3 inches of precipitation in the area in the event of a 24-hour storm, which occurred frequently in Golden Valley. She elaborated that her calculations indicated that 1.3 acre-feet of water would need to be contained to prevent runoff from the project site, though the maximum dimensions of the suggested pond shown on the proposed project plan indicated it would only hold 0.3 acre-feet of water. She explained that the surplus runoff would flow off-site as floodwater, posing numerous risks to residents and properties located downstream, as the runoff from the impervious area and landscape would contain toxic heavy metals, petroleum hydrocarbons, fertilizers, and pesticides that would accumulate in the retention and detention pond before being carried off-site by excess floodwaters. She elaborated that if the contaminated floodwaters flowed past the volcanic outcrops, they could contaminate domestic wells and the local groundwater supply, posing a health risk to residents of Golden Valley. She stated that the geology of a region could not be changed, and she asked the Board to deny the appeal.

Paul Hinrich introduced himself and stated that he was opposed to the project. He referred to comments made previously that stated that the concerns about the project were not based on fact, but rather an emotional plea. He expressed his desire to focus his comment on the findings and requirements outlined in WCC Section 110.810.30. He stated that the proposed use of the project was not consistent with the policy standards and land use objectives of the Envision Washoe 2040 Master Plan (Master Plan) in the applicable area. He explained that Golden Valley was designated and historically maintained as a rural, low-density residential area. He opined that introducing a high-traffic facility of institutional use in a location with inadequate infrastructure and a sensitive rural character was a contradiction to those adopted designations. He opined that the project was incompatible with the area's established development patterns, noise expectations, traffic capacity, and environmental constraints. He believed that the finding could not be met, as the project's use could not be integrated into the rural residential setting without substantial adverse impacts. He referred to the finding for the adequacy of utilities, roadway improvements, water, sanitation, drainage, and related facilities, and he stated that the project site lacked the necessary infrastructure to support the proposed use. He noted that

utilities could not be provided to the site without crossing privately owned land, including his own and that of neighboring properties, which he believed was inappropriate and infeasible. He explained that the single narrow access road lacked sidewalks and was not designated for an institutional level of traffic volume. He stated that Golden Valley Drive, which would be the primary roadway leading to the project site, was already overburdened, prone to serious accidents and fatalities, and in need of substantial widening and safety improvements to meet current demand and increased volume generated by a church. He noted that there were multiple fatalities less than 100 feet from the project's entrance at the three crossroads placed on Golden Valley Drive, and he opined that the required finding of adequacy could not be met due to the project's dependency on infrastructure and roadway improvements that did not exist and could not be reasonably provided. He recalled previous discussions regarding driveways in the neighborhood and the project's secondary alternate access. He noted that the proposed access route was immediately adjacent to his property, and he expressed concern that, should that route be fenced off, if the drivers of the 150 estimated vehicles in the church's parking lot considered navigating Rolling Ridge Road too difficult, they might park on Golden Valley Drive or on the property of the residents located to the west of the project. He opined that there were many reasons to deny the permit, which he believed was not a personal decision but rather a matter of common sense.

Chuck Allen introduced himself and his wife, noting that they had resided in Golden Valley for 32 years. He explained that he, his wife, and many of his neighbors were in attendance at the BCC meeting to express and state a strong opposition to the SUP for the Sanctuary of God Church. He recalled that the BOA had listened to a significant number of concerned neighbors during their October 2, 2025, meeting and ultimately decided to deny the SUP as it did not meet the four requirements outlined in the WCDC Section 110.810.30, subsections A through D. He expressed his intent to address the subsection regarding the issuance of the SUP not being detrimental. He recalled that when he purchased his new home in 2017 on a one-acre lot on Opal Station Drive, bordering the five-acre parcel in question, he was aware that a new neighbor would eventually be on that property, with a newly constructed home. He stated that he and his neighbors in that area had never envisioned a commercial building being allowed in a low-density residential neighborhood. He stated that should the SUP be approved, the view from his porch or back patio would be a 15,000 sq ft building that would accommodate a congregation of 400 or more members and over two acres of asphalt to accommodate 154 vehicles. He noted that the number of project parking spaces had suddenly been reduced to 120. He speculated that residents would hear a lot of unnecessary noise, and he opined that, despite the pastor's statement at an earlier community meeting that he would only hold services on Sunday, residents suspected there would be additional assemblies throughout the week to accommodate funerals, weddings, meetings, and fundraisers. He urged the Board not to believe statements indicating that there would only be services held on Sundays. He stated that he had never envisioned the County allowing the five-acre parcel to be designated as a commercial lot. He said that other detrimental concerns of the project included excessive vehicular noise pollution, too much artificial lighting, and runoff pollution from the sloped property flowing onto Rolling Ridge Road and potentially affecting the wells and septic systems of residents. He asked the Board to keep the five-acre parcels designation as a residential lot, consider every public comment voiced that day, and affirm the BOA's

decision to deny the SUP. He described his previous careers as a sheriff, trooper, and public safety official, noting that he would have liked more time to discuss the numerous safety issues associated with the project.

Craig Goodfellow introduced himself as the resident of 3475 Rolling Ridge Road. He expressed the emotional pain of hearing his neighbors echo everything he had wanted to mention during his comment. He explained that 200 to 150 space parking lots were commonly found at high schools, and he stated that the projects' similar parking facilities would generate the same volume of evacuation as those schools three times a week. He recalled that those associated with the project had stated that there would only be services at the church on Sundays, despite the church's website indicating that a service would be held that night. He reported that the church hosted services on Tuesdays and Fridays from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. He noted that the end of Rolling Ridge Road was not a cul-de-sac that could allow full-size trucks to easily turn around, as only small vehicles could achieve that maneuver. He explained that drivers for the United States Postal Service (USPS) had to conduct a three-point turn in order to turn their vehicles around on that street, and he expressed uncertainty about how the road could be considered a cul-de-sac rather than a dead-end road. He noted that the road had no lighting, which made him concerned about the safety of anyone living in the area. He opined that a commercial building being constructed in the area was detrimental to the character of the neighborhood, and he stated that he would not have opposed a 15,000 sq ft home being built on that property instead, as he would not expect such a development to involve a 154-space parking lot as the driveway.

Michael Rodriguez displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He introduced himself as a 37-year resident of Golden Valley. He noted his intent to comment on traffic, parking, and safety. He reported that the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation manual, which was referred to by staff during the previous BOA hearing, had estimated that there would be 50 peak-hour trips on Sundays for a 4,000 sq ft gathering space, based on the area of the project containing the pews. He expressed uncertainty regarding how the initial estimated requirement for the project's 154 parking spaces could be reduced, as mentioned earlier, because the initial figure was calculated in accordance with the requirements for a religious assembly's parking spaces listed on page 410-3 of the WCDC. He questioned the estimated 50 peak-hour trips, despite the County's requirement for the project being for 154 parking spaces. He reaffirmed earlier comments regarding the assembly's meetings, which were held for two hours on Sundays, as well as on Tuesdays and Fridays. He suspected that even if there were only 50 vehicles for those services, traffic would still be heavily congested if they all tried to attend or leave services at the mentioned times. He thought that such traffic was not feasible because the only divided road in that area was Golden Valley Drive, as Spearhead Way was undivided with dry ditches on either side, similar to Rolling Ridge Road. He believed that there would be overflow parking if an event like a wedding or a funeral were held at the project site, especially if the number of parking spaces was reduced. He recalled having researched details regarding the number of people who could occupy the space, noting that 4,000 sq ft of space could seat 150 to 300 people, depending on the layout of the aisle space, which would equate to 10 to 20 sq ft per person. He stated

that the estimate could instead be calculated for the seating of 200 to 400 people at 12 to 17 sq ft per person while still remaining within a comfortable worship accommodation. He noted that the property owner and pastor had stated that they currently had approximately 150 parishioners and less than 4,000 sq ft in which they were gathering.

Clyde Cordova displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He explained that he lived two lots away from the project site. He explained that he had intended to discuss the project findings, though he noted that he had addressed them previously and wanted to avoid redundancy. He reported that he had already experienced people driving their vehicles into his driveway to turn around after traveling down the road and noticing the small cul-de-sac. He suspected that adding 124 vehicles to that road would create traffic in his driveway, which he would have to repair over time. He stated that the surrounding roads were not designed for commercial use or designated as suburban, as they had been intended for rural accommodations, with no sidewalks or gutters. He asked the Board to picture that road during an evacuation, with 124 vehicles trying to leave in a panic, while police, ambulances, and fire services were attempting to travel to the incident. He believed that such an event would be chaotic, as residents already had to pull over to the side of the road with the current traffic demands just to let one another pass. He noted that United Parcel Service (UPS) drivers used his driveway to turn around, which he described as a constant problem. He noted that the area was intended for light rural traffic, single-family homes, farm vehicles, and low-density residential use. He referred to Mr. Smith's comments regarding the map on the *Sanctuary of God Special Use Permit* slide and explained that the road shown surrounding the church was an easement where residents took their horses to get across Golden Valley Drive and reach the mountain behind Sun Valley. He opined that the construction of a commercial building near that easement would serve as a hindrance, as the only other way for residents to reach the mountain was to take their horses down Spearhead Way across from Golden Valley Drive, which they would also have to use to reach their destination.

County Clerk Jan Galassini stated that emailed public comment was received and placed on file.

Commissioner Garcia stated that, while she appreciated the congregation's desire to build a new home for their assembly and staff's time and expertise in working with the project developer, she was unable to make the finding that the SUP issuance was not detrimental. She noted that she had tried to approach the issue with receptiveness to information from both arguments, but after watching the BOA meeting, reading the submitted emails, and listening to public comment, she could not make the finding. She did not believe that the safety and welfare of the residents and parishioners could be sustained with the project's type of use at the end of a very narrow road and the addition of no secondary emergency access. She opined that the project would not fit the character of the surrounding area, even after the developer provided options for adjusting the structure's height, transitioning from a metal building exterior to a rock veneer, and adjusting the height of the light posts. She apologized to the congregation and acknowledged that they had been looking forward to the opportunity to grow and locate a

new home for their assembly. She stated her intent to affirm the BOA's decision to deny the SUP.

Commissioner Andriola opined that the staff presentation had been very clear. She thanked Mr. Young and stated that everyone should refer to him as Doctor (Dr.) Young, in acknowledgement of his educational background. She noted that the Board had only three actions Commissioners could take regarding Agenda Item 20, which she listed as affirming the BOA's decision, denying the BOA's decision, or remanding the matter back to the BOA. She indicated that she would have preferred to have the option to table the item to have the developer meet with residents to communicate what she believed were misunderstandings. She recalled that she had also watched the previous BOA meeting on the matter and described her confusion when hearing current reports that the parking spaces for the project had been reduced from 154 spaces to 120, as staff during the BOA meeting had mentioned that they calculated the parking space number at 154 through a formula and specific guidelines. She reiterated her confusion on that matter and noted the guidelines used by staff were based on very specific compliance regulations they were required to follow. She stated that she felt professionally compelled to share her belief that the inference that the choice to change to the secondary access requirement was one made strictly based on influence by the applicant was unfounded. She said that staff worked very hard to ensure precision and attention to detail, as they were required to do so. She noted that if staff failed to take those actions, their work could be subject to continued judicial review, which would ultimately result in a decision from a judge. She emphasized that staff, the Board, the BOA, and the applicant took those matters seriously.

Commissioner Andriola reiterated that she had watched the previous BOA hearing in its entirety and had read all of the emails. She thought that when staff had presented during that meeting and used the word *cul-de-sac*, they had shared that the road they referred to was not necessarily what someone might consider a traditional cul-de-sac. She recalled the earlier public comment from Clyde Cordova, who had spoken about the vehicles entering his driveway because there was no other way they could execute a turn on that road. She opined that the non-standard design of the cul-de-sac was apparent and could be confirmed from the concerns he had mentioned in his comment. She explained that members of the Board were required to state on the record whether they would choose to affirm the BOA's decision or take another action on the item. She stated that she would be affirming the BOA's decision based on the fourth finding, which was listed under D in the Staff Report. She noted that she had wished not to need to take that action, as she thought the church did great things. She explained that the decision was difficult, stating the following reasons: the Board was aware that the project was not for a traditional commercial building due to the lack of intention for commercial activity, the project was allowable as it met the findings of the Master Plan, and a lot of time had been taken by people who had done substantial work to produce some of the presentations and materials that the Board had received. She noted that Board members were required to uphold the record and openly state their reasoning for their action on the item. She stated that her decision was based on making the finding that the issuance was of a detrimental character to the surrounding area, as well as the concern regarding the maneuvering of a substantial number of vehicles. She noted that despite several numbers having been changed since the

initial BOA meeting, including the number of parking spaces changing from 154 spaces to 120, and the project's estimated 400-person seating having been adjusted, those alterations did not change the character of the plot of land on which the project was planned to be constructed. She stated that it was clear to her that, although the commenters had spent a lot of time, the area in question was their home, and she hoped they realized that the Board had a responsibility to ensure that their decision was compliant. She explained that she had spent many hours deliberating on the matter, and it was not a decision the Board minimized or made based on emotion. She acknowledged that the subject was emotional for the residents, and while it was the subject that the BCC oversaw that often created the most emotion from those impacted, Commissioners had to make a decision based on fact without considering their own personal opinions. She expressed her hope that she had clearly stated for the record why she was going to affirm the BOA's decision.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Chair Hill absent, it was moved to affirm the decision of the Board of Adjustment denying WSUP25-0013 (Sanctuary of God) based upon the inability to make the findings required by WCC Section 110.810.30.

25-0908 AGENDA ITEM 21 Public Comment.

Elana Tabor noted that she was a high school senior at the Academy of Arts, Careers, and Technology (AACT). She expressed concern regarding community homelessness during harsh weather. She said that the region experienced freezing winters and scalding summers. She explained that she drove on Virginia Street at least four times a week and recalled a significant number of homeless people on each corner, gas station, and intersection. She believed there were approximately 2,000 people, ranging from men and women to children and veterans, who were accounted for through the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). She said that meant that hundreds or thousands of homeless individuals were unaccounted for. She reported that the County's shelter census dashboard indicated that out of 700 beds, only 20 were empty at the three shelters. She expressed concern about the process of accessing the shelters, as some required a prior phone call or placement on a waitlist for an unknown amount of time. She indicated that some shelters required individuals to be 18 years old or of a specific gender, which she thought made the process restrictive. She said that many individuals were starving and fighting for survival on the streets because they could not afford rent due to a variety of reasons. She explained that many individuals did not want to be homeless; however, it was challenging to become housed after experiencing homelessness. She recognized that many initiatives in the Reno and Sparks area addressed concerns about homelessness, and she understood that it was unrealistic to abolish homelessness altogether. She stated that the Washoe County Strategic Plan included the goal of enhancing facilities for vulnerable populations. She urged the Board to create more beds, shelters, and safe spaces for those in need. She requested that the Board organize a reformed process for those wishing to visit the shelters to prevent high competition and provide a better chance for those who needed resources. She said that providing education to the public could make a difference because she believed that those struggling with homelessness did not need judgment or false hope, but instead needed shelter, food, empathy, and a second chance.

Holden Grant, a student from AACT, expressed concern about homelessness in the region. He believed that there were homeless individuals everywhere in Reno. He said that there were not enough shelters for them, and while some were able to get into homes, others were not. He opined that there was a lot of competition during the winter to get into the shelters. He stated that 2,000 homeless people were recorded in 2024, but some shelters could only accommodate 900. He urged the Board to prioritize homelessness and find ways to prevent individuals from sleeping on benches. He thought that focusing on extensive facilities was wrong and that the County should instead have smaller shelters throughout the County. He speculated that good shelters could help clear addictions and create a place to practice safe and ethical drug practices with nurses on standby. He said that shelters could help individuals find jobs to ensure they gained the income needed to secure their own apartments. He asserted that homelessness did not need to be a lifestyle and could be temporary.

25-0909 AGENDA ITEM 22 Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Garcia thanked the Academy of Arts, Careers, and Technology (AACT) students for providing public comment, noting it took a lot of courage to speak at the podium.

Commissioner Andriola echoed Commissioner Garcia's remarks regarding the AACT students. She said that the County's website had a Housing and Homeless Outlook Newsletter that contained great information regarding homeless services. She urged anyone interested to sign up for the newsletter to stay informed regarding County resources. She referred to her comments made during Agenda Item 9F3 and said that to save time, she did not wish to repeat the same request. Commissioner Clark urged Commissioner Andriola to remember that an attorney was waiting for the Board to convene the closed session. Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large informed Commissioner Andriola that he noted her request from Agenda Item 9F3.

* * * * * * * * * *

2:10 p.m. Chair Herman adjourned the meeting, and the Board of County Commissioners went into a closed session.

* * * * * * * * * *

25-0910 AGENDA ITEM 23 Possible closed session for attorney client meeting to discuss potential or existing litigation pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 241.015.

* * * * * * * * *

ALEXIS HILL, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

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

Minutes Prepared by:

*Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk
Brooke Koerne, Deputy County Clerk
Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk
Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk*

Pending Board Approval