BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

TUESDAY 10:00 A.M. JULY 14, 2026

PRESENT:

Clara Andriola, Chair
Mariluz Garcia, Vice Chair
Alexis Hill, Commissioner
Michael Clark, Commissioner
Jeanne Herman, Commissioner (by phone)

Janis Galassini, County Clerk
Kate Thomas, County Manager
Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney

ABSENT:

Michael Clark, Commissioner

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:

* * * * * * * * * * *

Chair Andriola announced that Agenda Item 14 would be delayed so that staff could gather additional information and that the item would be brought back at a later time. She stated that the Block vote would be taken after Agenda Item 10.

* * * * * * * * * * *

26-0485 **AGENDA ITEM 3** Invocation.

Pastor Craig from Convo Church provided an invocation.

26-0486 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Public Comment.

Terry Brooks read an original poem regarding discrimination against various cultures.

Cynthia Cooper said that she admired the vision of Library Director Lisa McClure. She speculated that Ms. McClure's vision was for all Washoe County third-grade students to read at the third-grade level, which she believed marked the transition from

Pending Board Approval

learning to read, to reading to learn. She felt that nothing motivated learning better than curiosity and described the library as a valuable resource. She shared that libraries offered books on a wide range of subjects and hosted educational events, including discussions with wildlife biologists and the Reno Philharmonic, workshops, and more. She explained the library had worked to ensure that its materials represented all identities. She emphasized that children and adults were more engaged when they could connect with the stories they read and the history they learned. She said that Ms. McClure had identified discrepancies in literacy rates among communities with varying socioeconomic backgrounds. Ms. Cooper thought that the library and the school district should collaborate to issue a library card to every child enrolled in school to help address those disparities. She urged the Commissioners to appoint a Library Board of Trustees (LBT) member who would defend the principles and practices established by the library and ensure that library materials were accessible and relevant to every Washoe County resident. She wished the library and Ms. McClure success in achieving widespread literacy.

Jeff Church read from a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He stated that he operated the website RenoTaxRevolt.com. He advised that he wanted to address the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)'s five-year gas tax (RTC-5), which had recently increased. He indicated that he did not have time to address Washoe County Question 1 (WC-1), but wanted the record to reflect his opposition to it. He speculated that the RTC-5 was a measure enacted by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and the Legislature, implemented through a layered system of checks and balances, as required by law and due process. He opined that the three primary layers of oversight were ignored, not followed, and that the formula used was inaccurate. He suggested that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) or the Nevada Department of Taxation (NDT) should review the RTC calculations for compliance and accuracy, which he believed was a reasonable request. He requested an expedited outside legal opinion. He mentioned that he had recently met with the RTC's attorneys and that they had openly and candidly discussed many issues, but he had not received further communication since. He alleged that, as part of the system of independent oversight, Washoe County Code (WCC) required the DMV, under contract with the County, to perform calculations. He said that he had written confirmation from the DMV that the calculations had not been completed. He asserted that Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) required the calculations be submitted to the RTC Board at a public meeting for verification before being forwarded to the BCC. He said that the process had been followed through 2022, but believed it had not occurred since then, noting that he had found no evidence that the required increase had been presented to the BCC. He assumed that the calculations and formulas set by WCC had not been followed. He alleged that the RTC's formula was inconsistent with the required formula and, if true, could be invalid. He noted that, had the required system of checks and balances been followed, he would not have needed to bring his concerns before the BCC. He said that although he preferred to wait for the new District Attorney (DA) to take office in January, he felt his opposition to the RTC-5 tax must be addressed immediately. He proposed having the formula reviewed by the DMV or the NDT, as required by law, and obtaining an expedited outside legal opinion to determine whether the law had been followed.

Pending Board Approval

Jane Fox, a member of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) StreetReach Project, expressed gratitude for the Interlocal Agreement between Washoe County and the UNR StreetReach Project. She informed that the agreement demonstrated a shared commitment to serving unhoused individuals. She noted that StreetReach could use the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) to communicate with local housing and service providers. She added that the project would provide blood-borne virus testing, wound care, and nursing assessments at the Cares Campus, the Resource Center, and the Safe Camp. She mentioned that StreetReach could share aggregate, non-identifiable data regarding connections to community services. She shared that StreetReach would continue collaborating to address barriers to care and access. She emphasized that StreetReach appreciated Washoe County's support, the trust placed in their team, and the work being done. She believed that the partnership was a key foundational step toward serving Washoe County's unhoused population with compassion, dignity, and the services needed to improve health and well-being.

Donna Dawson-Schwartz said that, after retiring from a 32-year career as a high school English teacher, she had the opportunity to reflect on the people and institutions that contributed to her students' success. She believed libraries were among the most valuable educational partners. She explained that throughout her teaching career, she relied on both school and public libraries to support student learning. She indicated that many of her assignments required students to conduct research, evaluate sources, and develop critical thinking skills. She noted that projects often began in the school library, where she worked closely with the librarian to ensure students had access to the resources they needed while learning research strategies that would serve them throughout their lives. She pointed out that students expanded their learning through public libraries, where they discovered additional books, databases, and other resources that deepened their understanding of the subjects they were studying. She emphasized that students learned libraries were places of lifelong learning, not just places to complete school assignments. She said her career gave her a deep appreciation for the role libraries played in the community by providing equal access to information, technology, educational opportunities, and welcoming spaces for people of all ages and backgrounds. She advised that libraries fostered curiosity, literacy, and informed citizenship. She stated that, since retiring, she had sought meaningful ways to continue serving the community and believed her experience working with librarians, supporting student research, and witnessing the impact libraries had on individuals and families would make her an effective member of the LBT. She said that if appointed, she would be committed to ensuring that libraries continued to meet the evolving needs of the community. She thanked the Board for their consideration, time, and service to Washoe County.

Maureen McElroy stated that the Board had an unexpected opportunity to benefit the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) and the community. She felt that the Board was fortunate to have another opportunity to select someone who could enhance the LBT, engage in a beneficial manner, work to improve the WCLS, support hardworking library staff, and defend the rights of community members to free access to the vast resources of the WCLS. She urged the BCC to consider not only the district in which each applicant resided but also the qualities that would make an exemplary LBT member. She

Pending Board Approval

identified those qualities as a passion for community involvement, meaningful volunteer experience, working with public libraries, and a demonstrated appreciation for and use of library services. She thanked the Board for their hard work.

Alanna Fitzgerald, District 1 constituent, thanked her Commissioner and the Board for their hard work. She thanked the Board for its prescreening process in selecting the two previous LBT members and hoped that the same criteria would be applied to the current selection. She emphasized the importance of selecting an applicant with a record of engagement with the WCLS, prior board experience, willingness to participate in training specific to the unique situation regarding the County's oversight and provision of human resources and budget work, and someone who was not using a personal or political agenda to create chaos for the WCLS. She believed that over the past several years, an LBT member had appeared to be motivated by an agenda that devalued the needs of some community members, which created challenges for the WCLS, the Board, and the community. She noted that the Washoe County Strategic Plan's basic focus area, innovative services, emphasized equitable services and access to services, and she believed that an LBT member who introduced personal agendas into board decisions was inconsistent with those goals. She referenced NRS 379.002, stating that it identified a goal of publicly supported libraries and information centers to provide resources and trained staff to meet the information needs of all citizens. She believed in the importance of maintaining a healthy, vibrant public library system, which she thought contributed to a healthy and vibrant community and County. She asked the Board to consider her comments during the selection process and thanked the BCC and County employees for their service.

Wendy Leonard, a retired lieutenant from the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), said she had spent her career reading, interpreting, and learning to apply the laws in the public's best interest while mitigating risks to the County. She stated that, as a WCSO manager, it was essential to understand how laws affected the County and the public. She indicated that after retiring ten years ago, she served as a union representative and worked within legal agreements with Washoe County and the NRS to resolve employment issues between the County and its employees. She mentioned that she served on the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board (CAB), where she spent over two years speaking with developers and residents and immersing herself in the community's concerns. She stated that, while campaigning for Washoe County Commissioner District 5, she learned that community concerns often went unheard. She believed that boards had a responsibility to listen, consider, and respond to public input in a way that helped residents understand the reasoning behind decisions. She explained that she currently served as an association manager for a local nonprofit and felt the role provided insight into how communities functioned and how to increase public involvement. She advised that she had no further political aspirations. She asked the Board to consider appointing her to the Planning Commission (PC) and emphasized that her strong legal background would benefit the PC.

Ilya Arbatman displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. Mr. Arbatman read from his document, which detailed his concerns and outlined the potential negative impacts of Denise Myer's appointment to the LBT.

Pending Board Approval

Eileen Ecklund, a resident of Sparks, stated that the Board would be voting to appoint a replacement for the LBT and congratulated them on having an impressive pool of candidates. She asked the Board to select someone who understood and loved libraries, recognized their critical role in promoting literacy and lifelong learning, and understood how library staff partnered with schools and educators to improve opportunities for the youth. She emphasized that libraries provided essential information, education, training, and connection for the entire community, especially in a digital age. She shared the importance of having an LBT member who understood that every library branch should be attuned to the needs of the community it served, from toddlers to seniors, and be an inclusive and welcoming space for everyone. She noted that over the last few years, she had heard people say that libraries were no longer necessary because information was available on cell phones. She mentioned that some believed libraries suffered from mission creep and should focus on lending books. She stated that such views suggested that libraries were failing because they welcomed everyone, regardless of who they were, what they believed, or how much money they had. She suggested that libraries were not broken but instead were among the last free, egalitarian community spaces available, and that in today's fragmented and contentious society, they were more important than ever. She asked the Board to appoint someone who would be a tireless advocate for the vision of what libraries should be. She explained that she was not suggesting libraries should remain unchanged, noting that any institution must continue learning, growing, and adapting in response to changing community needs and desires. She praised library staff as knowledgeable, committed, and deeply engaged with communities throughout Washoe County and urged the Board to select trustees who valued, supported, and advocated for libraries.

Bri Schmidt, a local advocate and activist, said she agreed with the previous comments regarding the LBT appointment. She pointed out that the community needed an LBT member who could steadfastly defend the library as an institution that would uphold First Amendment rights. She argued that libraries were among the few protected places for free speech, free communication, freedom of knowledge, and freedom to read. She shared a library joke, saying that libraries were taller than people thought because they had so many stories.

Penny Brock displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She indicated that when the Commissioners took their oath of office, they swore to uphold the Constitution, which included the Bill of Rights. She alleged that the community was not being allowed to exercise its First Amendment right to redress elected officials. She stated that Agenda Item 6A1 would be a PowerPoint presentation by Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald. She noted that when the agenda was posted, it did not include an attachment and expressed concern that public comment should have been allowed on the item, but was not. She requested that Agenda Item 7F1, which was included in the Block vote, be pulled and considered separately because it related to elections. She said that voter observers had asked for additional cameras and monitors in the current mail ballot processing room for the 2026 election to allow for meaningful observation as required by federal and State law. She suggested that the additional equipment could be moved to the new facility. She shared that when observers asked Public

Pending Board Approval

Information Officer (PIO) George Guthrie why there were not enough cameras in the current mail ballot processing room, he responded that funding was limited. She commented that the budget approved by the Board in May provided the ROV's Office with $3.4 million for election operations, furniture, personnel, and storage. She questioned whether the ROV's Office had unlimited funding and argued that some of the funding allocated for election operations could be used to purchase seven additional cameras and four monitors for the mail ballot processing room. She emphasized that the additional equipment was necessary to provide meaningful observation and transparency as required by federal and State law. She speculated that the lack of equipment obstructed observers' ability to perform their role and undermined transparency. She encouraged the Board to direct the ROV's Office to install additional cameras in the mail ballot processing room to increase transparency.

Steve Malone explained that he was a 58-year-old retired union operator, a native Nevadan, and had worked in the area for 38 years. He shared his concerns about statements made at a recent Sun Valley CAB meeting regarding food trucks and the transfer of Sun Valley Boulevard from the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) to Washoe County. He stated that he had lived in Sun Valley for 56 years and did not believe that Washoe County would maintain Sun Valley better than NDOT had. He remarked that one of his concerns was the dispatching of snowplows and how Sun Valley had historically been the lowest priority. He reminded the Board of what happened in Sun Valley when former President Barack Obama was in office. He argued that Washoe County closed the Sun Valley pool and park and transferred responsibility for those facilities to the Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID). He noted that the SVGID charged residents a $3.50 monthly recreational fee to keep the pool and park open, while residents continued to pay the County fees for maintaining those services. He believed that Sun Valley faced issues across the community, including areas from Sun Valley Boulevard to Seventh Avenue, Seventh Avenue to Pyramid Highway, and from Sun Valley Boulevard to Golden Valley. He stated that the artwork installed by Washoe County was no longer visible after nearly five years due to overgrown weeds. He expressed concerns about traffic speeds along Sun Valley Boulevard to Golden Valley, stating that he lived in that area and had observed vehicles and semi-trucks traveling at speeds he believed were well above the posted limit. He disagreed with comments at the Sun Valley CAB meeting about potential flooding, stating that he had experienced only two floods in his 56 years in Sun Valley and did not believe flooding was a significant concern. Regarding food trucks, he thought the Board should support existing Sun Valley businesses rather than encourage activities that could take business away from them. He argued that food trucks negatively affected local businesses and stated that many food truck owners did not speak English. He thought that Vice Chair Garcia encouraged food truck events, and he suggested that it took business away from established businesses that paid taxes and operated in the community.

Chair Andriola reminded Mr. Malone that his comments needed to be directed to the BCC as a whole. She reiterated that the public needed to abide by the rules when making public comments.

Pending Board Approval

Mr. Malone remarked that the BCC should support local businesses rather than take customers away from them. He asked how Commissioners would feel if they owned a business in Sun Valley and it was affected by food trucks. He stated that a tamale stand operated daily on Sun Valley Boulevard from 6:00 to 8:00 a.m. and believed the issue was that Commissioners were encouraging that activity rather than taking action to address it. He opposed transferring the authority of Sun Valley Boulevard from NDOT to Washoe County. He speculated that if Washoe County experienced financial difficulties, Sun Valley would likely be the first area to face budget cuts.

Nicholas St. Jon displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He recalled presenting the document at a previous meeting to provide information to the public. He explained that the document included early voting statistics and suggested that the dips below the line on the graph represented ballots that were moved from third-party to Republican and Democrat. He requested an explanation from Mr. McDonald regarding the data, and noted that County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas had informed him Mr. McDonald would address the matter. However, he said he was later notified that something had come up, and Mr. McDonald was unable to address his concern. He stated that he had again requested an explanation during the current meeting. He reported that he had added additional Election Day information showing that 487 ballots were moved from third-party to Republican and Democrat. He alleged that he had conducted a similar analysis for every other county in the State and that no other county, including Clark County, which had 5.2 times as many voters as Washoe County, had similar findings. He felt the information that he presented made Washoe County the object of ridicule because it could not get its voting counts correct. He argued that the Board should find the information he presented concerning and asked for it to be investigated. He commented that when he previously presented the information, the Board had ignored his concerns, and he was presenting it again to seek the Board’s attention and obtain an explanation from Mr. McDonald. He shared that the number of early voting ballots transferred was significant and added that, on Election Day, 19 percent of ballots were removed from third-party and redistributed to Republican and Democrat. He alleged that the issue occurred only in Washoe County and not in any other county in the State. He requested that the Board discuss the matter further with him to determine and explain what had occurred. He said he was hopeful that CM Thomas had asked Mr. McDonald to explain the discrepancy and address why the counts appeared inaccurate after he downloaded the information from the Secretary of State (SOS) website.

Veronica Cortes displayed a document. No copy was submitted for the public record. She mentioned that she had brought a book that contained information from all the meetings she had attended since December 2024. She explained that Vice Chair Garcia appointed her to the Sun Valley CAB. Although she lived in District 5, she noted that a one-mile amendment allowed her to serve on the Sun Valley CAB. She shared that after joining the CAB, she reviewed the meeting minutes and recognized that a significant amount of work had been accomplished. She asserted that the CAB listened to residents’ concerns and began addressing property cleanup efforts. She stated that she was provided with a handbook and code of conduct that she was required to follow to participate on the CAB. She highlighted the CAB's values of integrity, effective communication, quality

Pending Board Approval

public service, tolerance, fairness, courtesy, and professionalism. She recalled that after reviewing the code of conduct, she realized those were the same values she wanted to emulate when advocating for Sun Valley. She shared that the book she brought with her was her accountability book and explained that she had reviewed it, highlighting the promises and statements made. She stated that, a year and a half later, many of those items still had not been completed. She shared the exciting news that funding had been approved for a beautification project in Sun Valley. She expressed disagreement with a Commissioner’s statement that Sun Valley had experienced an 80-year crisis. She explained that when her grandparents arrived in the 1960’s, Sun Valley was an amazing place with a two-lane road, and agricultural land. Having lived in Sun Valley her entire life, she said she did not believe there had been an 80-year crisis and felt it was unfortunate that a Commissioner viewed the community that way. She speculated that the Sun Valley CAB minutes reflected that residents had been requesting bus pullouts along Sun Valley Boulevard for more than a year. She mentioned that the representative acknowledged there were differing opinions but confirmed that the project would continue.

Oscar Williams stated that Agenda Item 11 was the proposed Bill Draft Request (BDR). He noted that the Staff Report indicated that the Board had requested that staff explore the likelihood of a bill regarding automatic recounts of elections. While he appreciated that effort, he believed there was a missed opportunity. He indicated that the public did not want automatic recounts but wanted a revised definition of how recounts were conducted. He suggested creating a BDR to amend NRS 293.404 (3). He acknowledged that everyone could agree on basic math and added that if someone audited their own work, they should use a different method the second time. He explained that NRS 293.404 (3) required recounts to be conducted using the same methods as the original tabulation. He believed that was a way for vendors to protect themselves, but it did not address election integrity or voter trust. He thought that amending NRS 293.404 (3) to require recounts to be conducted by hand rather than the same method used for the original tabulation would resolve the issue. He recommended that the Board revisit its commitment to ensuring integrity in the recount process and consider his proposal. He mentioned that Agenda Item 7F1 was an Interlocal Agreement with the SOS regarding the Voter Registration and Election Management Solution (VREMS) and KNOWiNK. He asked that the item be removed from the Block Vote to allow for separate discussion and a separate vote. He speculated that the SOS wanted Washoe County to pay for the KNOWiNK poll pads and had refused to classify them as critical infrastructure, which he asserted prevented proper inspection and approval by the SOS's Office. He suggested that implementation of VREMS included requirements to upgrade systems to accommodate VREMS and Automatic Signature Verification (ASV), which he believed had not been approved by voters or taxpayers.

Brian Wadsworth said he was a member of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe and a Democratic candidate for Washoe County Commissioner District 5. He shared his excitement about the many Consent Agenda items related to Washoe County audits. He noted that his background was in auditing and accounting. He added that he had spent several years working for NDOT in its Internal Audit Division, where he conducted compliance audits of various contracts and agreements, and several years serving as an

Pending Board Approval

Executive Branch Auditor in the Governor's Finance Office. He shared that his responsibilities included conducting performance audits to evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of Executive Branch agencies. He emphasized disappointment that several Audit Committee meetings had been canceled and said he hoped the committee would resume holding quarterly meetings. He mentioned that audits were very important and that businesses should not fear auditors. He thought audits were a valuable tool for government and businesses to understand how money was being spent and to evaluate agencies' policies and procedures, helping ensure they operated as efficiently and effectively as possible. He expressed his support for Katherine Yriarte's appointment to the PC, acknowledging that some might find it surprising for a Democrat to advocate for a Republican. He said he was impressed with Ms. Yriarte, noting that she was one of the Republican candidates for Washoe County Commissioner District 5. He shared that he was impressed by Ms. Yriarte's advocacy and her presence at various community meetings and events. He stated that Ms. Yriarte asked questions and wanted to learn more about the County. As a member of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, he said he appreciated that Ms. Yriarte was the only Republican candidate for Washoe County Commissioner District 5 to mention tribes and discuss tribal sovereignty, which was meaningful to him. He believed that tribes needed greater representation and more people thinking about tribes, noting that tribal representation mattered for the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and the Washoe Tribe. He surmised that it would be valuable to have someone on the PC who would consider tribes and tribal sovereignty.

Rob Pierce said he was appointed to the PC four years ago and described the appointment as one of the greatest honors of his life. He explained that throughout his tenure, he approached every meeting, application, and vote with the understanding that the PC's decisions had a lasting impact on Washoe County residents. He stated that he worked hard to prepare for meetings by asking thoughtful questions, listening carefully to staff, applicants, and the public, and making decisions based on the Master Plan, WCC, and State law. He mentioned that over the past four years, he had maintained an excellent attendance record and devoted countless hours outside of meetings to reviewing staff reports, visiting project sites, and studying issues. He believed that his preparation and consistency mattered and said he took the responsibility seriously. He shared that he was a candidate for Washoe County Commissioner District 5, and regardless of the general election outcome, his commitment to serving Washoe County would remain unchanged. He said public service had been a significant part of his life for many years and that he welcomed the opportunity to continue serving on the PC. He opined that planning was more important than ever as the County continued to grow and faced increasingly complex issues involving infrastructure, transportation, housing, open space, public safety, and responsible land use. He believed that his experience, institutional knowledge, and dedication would allow him to continue contributing in a meaningful and productive way. He stated that it was not the right time to appoint someone new to the PC because there was too much going on. He urged the Board that, if it did not reappoint him, it should appoint someone with experience. He pointed out that he had worked hard over the past four years and believed replacing him with someone new would not be the right decision. He respectfully requested reappointment for another four-year term and said that, if reappointed, he would continue to serve with the integrity, professionalism, independence, and the commitment he had

Pending Board Approval

demonstrated throughout his term. He thanked the Board for its trust, consideration, and the opportunity to serve the people of Washoe County.

26-0487 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas announced that there was a partial term opening for the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (WCOSRPC), an advisory board to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), responsible for providing guiding decisions regarding the County's parks, open spaces, and recreation resources. She clarified that the WCOSRPC opening was a partial term, beginning at the time of appointment and ending on June 30, 2027, with the application deadline on July 15, 2026. She relayed that there were ongoing district-specific openings for Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs), which were open indefinitely. She explained that those interested in serving on the CABs should visit their district's page on the Washoe County website to explore openings. She reported that the BCC had an upcoming summer break with its next meeting not occurring until August 25, 2026.

Commissioner Herman recalled that many commenters expressed concern about Consent Agenda Item 7F1. She suggested that the Board pull the item from the Consent Agenda to be heard separately. Chair Andriola indicated that when the Consent Agenda was open, the Board would discuss Commissioner Herman's request.

Commissioner Hill expressed gratitude toward the reopening of the Women's Crossroads facility and all the healing that had already taken place in the building. She commended the Board for supporting the program while ensuring community members had second and third chances to change their lives. She recalled hearing from a mother who had received custody of her children, which she found very touching. She opined that it was exciting to witness the reinvestment in the community. She thanked the Crossroads staff and the BCC for their work. Chair Andriola expressed that the reopened space was very welcoming and believed the staff had done a great job.

Vice Chair Garcia thanked everyone who provided public comment. She recalled that a few commenters had mentioned the Sun Valley Boulevard Improvement Project, to which she thanked Commissioner Hill for her work as the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Chair. She said that the RTC was an amazing board comprising the Cities of Reno and Sparks and Washoe County. She speculated that many competing needs and desires were presented to the RTC; however, she believed that, for the first time, Sun Valley was the RTC's top priority. She felt that prioritizing Sun Valley Boulevard demonstrated the RTC's leadership, open-mindedness, and professionalism. She said that the RTC applied for three grants, with two failing and the third approved. She opined that the Sun Valley Boulevard Improvement Project was special because the County, the RTC, the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), and the federal government were working together to improve the antiquated stretch of road. She said that there would no longer be ditches and culverts that many cars, bicycles, and wheelchairs crashed into. She mentioned that the project would include new bicycle facilities, sidewalks, lighting, improved bus stops, and a modernized stormwater drainage system.

Pending Board Approval

She said the project would bring safety and infrastructure to the Sun Valley area at a cost of $87 million. She reiterated her thanks to the RTC and expressed additional thanks to congressional delegates and the County staff for being good partners.

26-0488 **AGENDA ITEM 6A1** Andrew McDonald, Registrar of Voters, to give quarterly update regarding the Road to the 2026 General Election.

Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Road to the 2026 General Election; Registration; List Maintenance; Historical Turnouts; Mail Ballot Trends; Automatic Signature Verification; BMDs and ADA Curbside; Vote Centers / Super Centers; WCSD Partnership; Federal Election Actions; Important Dates; Thank you.

Mr. McDonald shared the slide titled *Road to the 2026 General Election* and explained that as the County progressed towards the 2026 November general election, he wanted to provide the Board with some historical data to inform what the County could expect in November, and to update them on the efforts his office would be undertaking for the general election. He noted that Election Day was only 112 days away, and early voting was only 95 days away, so his office was already working hard.

Mr. McDonald shared the slide titled *Registration* and explained that, due to time constraints, he would not go into detail on every slide. He stated that there were currently 326,638 active registered voters. Referring to the slide, he pointed out that it showed the demographics for Democrats, Republicans, Nonpartisans, and Other. He noted a dramatic drop in active registrations in October 2025. He explained that it was due to completing bulk voter list maintenance and inactivating voters who did not meet the requirements to remain active voters. He added that right before the 90-day National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) blackout period in March 2026, which was 90 days prior to the June election, the Board could see that same dip, and that now the statistics were increasing as people were starting to register to vote.

Referring to his slide titled *List Maintenance*, Mr. McDonald clarified that, for voter list maintenance, they were currently working on bulk list maintenance activities. He announced they mailed approximately 19,500 forwardable address confirmation cards to voters after the primary Canvass of the Vote. He noted that was required before any inactivations would occur. He stated the total number of confirmation cards sent included 13,800 due to the primary undeliverable ballots from the most recent election, 3,200 through the Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC) program, and approximately 2,500 due to undeliverable mail prior to the primary election.

He explained that voters had 33 days after the July 2 mailing date to respond and prevent their registration from becoming inactive. He stated they could do this by mailing back the postcard they received, visiting the ROV's Office, or updating their voter registration online. He noted that the ROV's Office only had until August 5 to complete valid inactivations per the NVRA bulk list maintenance deadline, after which they could no longer perform bulk voter list maintenance on the voter rolls. However, he noted that if

Pending Board Approval

a voter completed the necessary steps, the ROV would take action. He added that if a voter became inactive, they would not receive a mail ballot, but they could reactivate their registration at any time before the general election by updating their voter registration record.

Mr. McDonald noted that the slide titled *Historical Turnouts* contained a few quick graphs. The first, he explained, showed historical turnout and voting methods from past general elections. He detailed that a 60 to 70 percent turnout in the 2026 general election should be expected based on history, and that anything above 70 percent would be a very strong voter turnout. In the 2018 General Election, he continued, the dominant voting method was in-person voting, prior to COVID-19 (C19) and the implementation of mandatory universal mail-in ballots in Nevada. He noted that, out of the 70 percent turnout, 63 percent of voters voted in person, while only 7 percent voted their mail ballot or absentee ballot at that time. He shared that in 2020, after C19, all voters were sent a universal mail-in ballot, and out of that 83 percent turnout, 43.5 percent voted their mail ballot, and 39.6 percent voted in person. By 2022, he continued, general voters were used to receiving a universal mail-in ballot and utilized it, so that out of the 64 percent turnout, 34 percent voted by mail and 30 percent in person. He explained that in the 2024 General Election, among the 79 percent turnout, 39 percent voted by mail and nearly 40 percent voted in person. He assumed that the 2026 General Election would model the 2024 General Election and be a roughly fifty-fifty split, based on historical data.

Mr. McDonald explained that, on his slide, Mail Ballot Trends, as the Board looked to the upcoming election for mail ballot trends, they could see all the different elections at the bottom of the slide. He encouraged them to focus on the right side of the chart. That, he said, showed the majority of mail ballots were being dropped on Election Day itself. Therefore, he concluded, in four of the previous six elections, 20 percent of mail ballots were dropped off on or shortly after Election Day. He added that in the 2026 Primary Election, they received 21 percent of total mail ballots on Election Day and night, leaving the ROV's Office to process 12,500 ballots on Election Day. He explained that if they were expecting a 100 percent increase in turnout in the upcoming election, it was possible that 25,000 ballots could be dropped off on Election Day. Therefore, he noted, it was a huge effort because they were receiving those ballots at night and would be working multiple shifts to process them. Unfortunately, he added, at this time, they did not have the institutional knowledge to put two different 12-hour shifts together. He reiterated that it took approximately 12 hours to process the mail ballot from start to finish, depending on the number of mail ballot drop-offs from the United States Postal Service (USPS) each day. He stated that the number of ballots dropped on election night created a bottleneck, depending on how many were received and when. He identified the biggest bottlenecks in the process as signature verification, extraction, and the counting group. He opined that if given a grant, he would purchase more signature verification stations and ballot extraction machines for the new warehouse, though they did not have much space to install them for the current election. But, he added, the upcoming warehouse was where he would spend that money.

Mr. McDonald shared the slide titled, *Automatic Signature Verification*, and explained that the ROV's Office processed envelopes through its mail ballot sorter. He

Pending Board Approval

explained that for the current election, they used Automatic Signature Verification (ASV) on the mail ballot sorter, and that the ASV software compared the signature on the vote-by-mail envelope against a reference signature in their database. If the signature matched and exceeded the threshold, it was automatically accepted. If not, it went to a bipartisan team of two to verify the manual signature. In the last election, he noted, 19,432 signatures were automatically verified, or 31 percent of all mail ballots, saving 324 labor hours of processing. He emphasized that his team took a conservative approach, setting a confidence level of 72 for the most recent election. He noted that if they felt comfortable lowering that in the future, they would actually process more mail ballots even faster. He explained that, per Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), the ROV's Office was supposed to audit 1 percent of the ASV, but actually audited 100 percent more than that minimum, for a total of 2 percent. He declared that 374 ASV signatures were audited.

Mr. McDonald, sharing the slide titled *BMDs and ADA Curbside*, said that the most recent election was the first in which the ROV's Office used both Ballot Marking Devices (BMDs) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) curbside voting, and that they received very positive feedback from the community. He commented that voters loved the tangible ballot, and that they could cast the ballot themselves and see it enter the machines. He shared that initial concerns of voters leaving their ballot behind as a receipt were proved wrong. But, he added, staff would continue to monitor and train. He admitted they had a few discrepancies, as mentioned in his Canvass of the Vote report, and confirmed they would continue their education with staff to address them.

Mr. McDonald related that the ROV's Office had approximately 40 people who voted curbside. He announced he was very passionate about the program and hoped they could continue to provide curbside voting to those who wanted it. He mentioned that just because a person was disabled did not mean they could not get out of their vehicle, but that if they could not exit their vehicle for any reason, the ROV's Office provided curbside voting so they could vote in the comfort of their vehicle.

Mr. McDonald shared the slide *Vote Centers / Super Centers* and stated that they would also be taking out a full-length graphic in their sample ballot booklet. He explained that the ROV's Office was rightsizing its vote centers based on data-driven decisions. He related that, after looking over data from the last election, the ROV's had offered too many early voting locations, and the numbers proved that it would be saving taxpayer dollars by opening 6 fewer early voting locations over the two weeks, and 13 fewer Election Day locations, compared to a normal general election. He explained that the trade-off for fewer locations was having voting supercenters, and that they would place one supercenter in each commission district based on factors such as the region and the number of voters. He stated that the five locations they were currently proposing were Depoali Middle School, the Reno-Sparks Convention Center (RSCC), Spanish Springs High School (SSHS), O'Brien Middle School, and Hug High School (HHS). He clarified that a supercenter was designed to enhance the voter experience by increasing capacity and providing a better customer service experience. He suggested that each super center would offer additional BMDs, additional checking stations, and larger election boards to improve voter flow on Election Day.

Pending Board Approval

Mr. McDonald acknowledged that he had reached the time limit. Chair Andriola asked how much more he had to present. Mr. McDonald stated he had a few more slides, but could cover them very quickly if needed.

Continuing, Mr. McDonald noted that, per NRS, they would place a minimum of 15 early voting locations and 25 Election Day locations. He announced they would exceed that number and would still be within the guidelines. However, he noted that, moving forward, they would begin reviewing vote centers and the data after each election. He reminded voters they still had two weeks to vote early, almost three weeks to send their mail ballot, and Election Day itself. He reiterated that there were plenty of ways to vote.

Mr. McDonald shared the slide titled *WCSD Partnership* and highlighted their partnership with the Washoe County School District (WCSD), noting that approximately 67 percent of their Election Day locations were from the WCSD. He felt that was significant, and that they could not hold the election successfully without that partnership. He stated they were also very excited to work with their high school recruiting program so students could engage in civic activities while earning some income.

Mr. McDonald shared the slide titled *Federal Election Actions* and mentioned that nothing was really changing for the 2026 general election based on the federal lawsuits that had been filed. He reiterated that there were no changes for Washoe County.

Mr. McDonald announced important dates from his final slide, titled *Important Dates*, including that sample ballots were coming October 13, and that they were hoping to have in-state ballots by October 14. He stated that early voting began on October 17, ended on October 30, and that Election Day was November 3. He added that the Canvass of the Vote would be on November 13.

Chair Andriola appreciated the efficiency of the presentation, including his analysis of the consolidation of the voting supercenters. She was glad to see the RSCC was back on the list. She hoped they would continue to support that very important role in the community. She opined that *vote early, vote in-person* was an important quote to help with ballot processing.

Commissioner Herman appreciated the information and that the ROV was reducing the number of voting locations.

Vice Chair Garcia requested that Mr. McDonald display his slide regarding the bottlenecks in the vote counting. Vice Chair Garcia shared that, as elected officials, they often interacted with people of all ages, new voters, people with mobility issues, and others. She asked, regarding voters using the mail-in ballot, what date they should have their ballot dropped in their mailbox or have it handed off to the USPS by.

Mr. McDonald recalled that during the last election, the Secretary of State (SOS) said he wanted the mail-in ballot sent a week before Election Day, but he

Pending Board Approval

recommended it only needed to be sent three days before Election Day. He encouraged voters to simply drop their ballot off at the ROV to ensure it arrived on time. He recommended that, three days before Election Day, voters drop their ballot off at a vote center, where it would be sent directly to the main office for counting. He added that by dropping it at a vote center, there was no risk of it getting lost in the USPS mail or not being postmarked.

Vice Chair Garcia asked whether Mr. McDonald meant the bottleneck occurred when everyone was holding onto their mail-in ballots. She relayed that she had done that before herself, holding onto her mail ballot or keeping it in her desk or car, and then, on Election Day, she found herself just dropping it into the mail. She reiterated that Mr. McDonald said to get mail-in ballots into the ballot boxes before October 30, so the ROV's Office had time to process them.

Mr. McDonald confirmed that date. He then detailed that mail-in ballots went through a series of steps: first passing through the sorter; then ASV; then manual signature verification (MSV); another pass through the sorter; and finally, batching groups of 15-25 ballots. He noted the next steps were: ballot extraction; counting board adjudication; duplication due to errors, rips, tears, and soiled ballots; scanning ballots; digital adjudication for voter intent; tabulation; and then, finally, uploading the results. He stated that all of those steps were part of processing mail-in ballots. He contrasted that with in-person voting, which he described as very fast and very efficient. He detailed that once the ballot was scanned into a tabulator, those came back on election night and were uploaded. He stated that he used to vote by mail but voted in person for the most recent election, as he had seen the amount of work that went into processing mail-in ballots. He referenced the public continuing to say that Nevada was always the last to certify their elections, but that Nevada was not necessarily last. He declared that California had a 30-day certification deadline, whereas Nevada's deadline was 10 days. He shared that his goal was always to be more efficient, but that with people holding onto their ballots until the last minute, they were putting a lot of work on the ROV's Office, which Mr. McDonald clarified was fine, but slowed the release of results. He said that if people voted earlier, then the results would come out faster, and that there would be less work on the ROV's Office.

Vice Chair Garcia stated that voting was obviously a personal preference and that the County would never tell people how they should or should not vote. But, she contrasted, they would gently remind people that October 30 was the day that, if one still had their ballot, they should drop it into a mailbox.

Commissioner Hill thanked Mr. McDonald for his great work on the previous election and stated that she was looking forward to the general election with the new accessibility tools Mr. McDonald and his team had built. She asked whether the Northwest Library would still be an early voting center. Mr. McDonald confirmed it would be, and noted that it was not used in the previous election because the air conditioning was being replaced. Mr. McDonald stated they had received confirmation from Assistant

Pending Board Approval

County Manager (ACM) Ryan Gustafson that they would have the location for early voting and for Election Day.

Commissioner Hill reiterated that that was the only complaint she had received about the entire election. She stated she was glad to hear the location was back online and would not be replaced by a supercenter, as she thought it was a busy location. She expressed support for voting early and in person.

Mr. McDonald shared that he was working with the SOS's Office to see if they could change the law to allow people to vote with their mail-in ballot at a vote center by scanning it in, which he felt would require some changes to the laws. He noted that he was actively pursuing it.

Commissioner Hill explained that the Board was discussing even more ways for people to drop off their ballots between early voting and Election Day, because that was technically not permitted under State law. Commissioner Hill asked whether people could drop off their ballots at the ROV's Office.

Mr. McDonald stated that voters could drop their ballots off at the main ROV's Office. Commissioner Hill suggested they might look into more options within those few days, but that it was less of an emergency for the upcoming election, as they could accept mail-in ballots later due to the Supreme Court ruling. She surmised that it was one additional way they could ensure that people could have their voices heard and be part of the representative democracy.

Chair Andriola suggested starting a new hashtag communicating to *vote early and vote in person*. She reiterated the October 3 deadline and that voters could drop their ballots off at the ROV's Office. She felt there was a variety of communication that could be helpful, and that the County's communication team was always supportive. She asked County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas to follow up with ACM Gustafson or Mr. Nicholas St. Jon.

26-0489 **<u>AGENDA ITEM 6A2</u>** Abbey Pike, Extension County Coordinator, to present the Fiscal Year 2027 budget for the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension operations in Washoe County.

Extension County Coordinator Abbey Pike indicated that the Extension program was a partnership among federal, state, and county governments to bring resources, knowledge, and research from land-grant universities to the populations around them. She explained that the Washoe County Extension program collaborated with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). She said that the Extension had a few programs, including Head, Heart, Hands, and Health (4-H) Youth Development, Master Gardeners, Nevada Radon Education Program, Weed Warriors, Health and Nutrition, and the Community Development program, which worked with the Washoe County Leadership Academy (WCLA). She noted that she was present to fulfill the Extension's Nevada

Pending Board Approval

Revised Statutes (NRS) requirement to provide what the program was doing with County funds.

Ms. Pike referred to the *Memorandum* and noted that most of the County's Extension revenue went to personnel. She said that the personnel funded through the Extension were the ones teaching in classrooms, community centers, and gathering sites across the County to deliver important educational resources. She mentioned that personnel also included administrative staff who supported the teachers, ensuring that new funding was secured through federal grants and gifts, and that programs were reported and administered appropriately. She relayed that much of the personnel had remained consistent throughout the programs, but the Extension wished to implement the Workforce Development program that year, which was introduced by UNR President Brian Sandoval.

Ms. Pike said that the Workforce Development program would use real-time workforce development software along with a curriculum for skill development. She expressed that the Extension hoped to focus on interest and skill development for high school students who wanted to explore which career they wanted to pursue in the future. She said the real-time workforce development software would assist students with a quiz that identified their skills and how they aligned with jobs available in the community. She noted that the results would explain the path the student would need to take to enter the career, such as four-year degree programs, industry certifications, online programs, and any other Nevada educational programs. She reported that the program had been in development for over two years with industry leaders, the State, and State partners regarding how the Extension could effectively help. She indicated that the 2024 Nevada Job Seeker Survey sparked the idea for the Workforce Development program, as it found that 38 percent of Washoe County residents identified the challenge of obtaining necessary training and credentials as their primary barrier to finding and keeping a good job.

Ms. Pike explained that the program hoped to start with high school students, with future expansion to other age groups. She said that the Extension wished to hire one faculty member to lead the program in Washoe County, with one community-based instructor to disseminate information and deliver instruction. She said the program hoped to secure industry buy-in to partner with nearby counties undergoing rapid workforce transformations, ensuring the program's sustainability.

Ms. Pike recalled that the Extension had its Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) funding terminated, but the program was able to use rollover funds in the last fiscal year (FY) to continue health nutrition education. She said that the Extension was able to use County funding to support one full-time program officer and one part-time community-based instructor to continue delivering health and nutrition education in Washoe County. She explained that the program would not be based on SNAP-Ed and that the curriculum would no longer be updated as federal nutrition guidelines changed. She said that the Extension was working with its faculty members in Nevada and across the Country to ensure the program continued to deliver the most up-to-date, research-based health and nutrition education.

Pending Board Approval

Ms. Pike mentioned that the Living With Fire (LWF) program had experienced changes in federal funding due to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the wildland firefighting federal agency. She said that the LWF program wanted to ensure it was meeting the objectives of educating residents on adapting to living with wildfires and preparing for emergencies. She explained that the Extension supported one full-time faculty member for the year, funded by County funds. She recalled that the staff member had a five-year contract that changed partway through; therefore, bridge funding for the current fiscal year was used to ensure the faculty member could continue their Kindergarten through 12th-grade (K12) wildland firefighting education and curriculum development while continuing work with the County to develop the Community Wildfire Protection Plan. She relayed that the Extension supported two faculty members at 20 percent of their full-time equivalent (FTE) positions to ensure they could continue community education, proactively provide resources, and attend events. She asserted that the LWF program was critical.

Ms. Pike indicated that she had provided an overview of what had changed in the Extension's personnel. She highlighted that the Extension's contingency funds contained $200,000 set aside for bridge funding. She recalled that last year the program had $500,000, with much of it appropriated to support continued education, including the Early Childhood Education program. She said that Commissioner Hill had addressed the importance of moving forward with the Early Childhood Education program; however, the Extension did not have funding anticipated. She asserted that she may follow up if there were any philanthropic connections. She pointed out that she understood the Extension was not the only program experiencing funding challenges; therefore, the program was working with partners, State and county agencies, nonprofits, and educational institutions to research emergency needs and the gaps arising from funding changes. She said that the program wanted to ensure it was using all resources effectively and efficiently. She noted she was available to provide further details if needed.

Chair Andriola thanked Ms. Pike for the presentation. She added that the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) created a committee for all 17 counties to research educational gaps. She believed it was important for everyone to understand the Extension program's commitment. She noted that it would be interesting to learn how the committee progressed. Commissioner Herman thanked Ms. Pike for the presentation and hoped to find additional funding for the Extension program. She recalled that the Nevada State Fair was a great time. Ms. Pike agreed with Commissioner Herman and indicated that the State Fair was great.

<u>11:22 a.m.</u> **Commissioner Herman left the meeting.**

<u>11:23 a.m.</u> **Commissioner Herman returned to the meeting.**

Pending Board Approval

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 7A1 THROUGH 7E4, EXCLUDING AGENDA ITEM 7F1, HEARD SEPARATELY

26-0490 **7A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' workshop of June 2, 2026, regular meeting of June 16, 2026, and the canvass of June 18, 2026. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0491 **7B1** Recommendation to: 1) accept the State of Nevada, Division of State Parks, Recreational Trails Program RTP 2026-15 "Nature Loop Trail Improvements" grant [in the amount of $100,000.00 with a Washoe County cash/in-kind match in the amount of $25,000.00, equaling 20% of the $125,000.00 project total]; and 2) approve the Project Agreement with a grant period from execution through September 30, 2029; and 3) authorize the Director of the Community Services Department [Eric Crump] to sign the Project Agreement and any subsequent documents related to the grant on behalf of the County; and 4) direct the Department of Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. This grant supports trail improvements, trail bridge repairs, and sign replacement throughout the Nature Loop Trail area in Rancho San Rafael Regional Park. Community Services Department. (Commission Districts 3 and 5.)

26-0492 **7C1** Recommendation to approve the Fiscal Year 2027 Internal Audit Schedule. The proposed work plan was developed through the Internal Audit Division's annual risk assessment process and incorporates management input, Audit Committee feedback, statutory requirements, prior audit results, and emerging organizational risks. The Fiscal Year 2027 work plan includes six planned audits, four follow-up reviews, and ongoing advisory services designed to provide independent assurance over areas of higher risk while maintaining flexibility to address emerging issues. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0493 **7C2** Recommendation to acknowledge the Annual Report from the Internal Audit Division for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2026. Washoe County Code 15.569 requires the Internal Audit Division to submit an annual report identifying audits completed, major findings, corrective actions taken, and significant findings not fully addressed. Audit activities completed during fiscal year 2026 included the Conflict Counsel Program Audit, Housing and Homeless Services Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Audit, Continuum of Care Governance Review, Technology Services E911 Surcharge Revenue Cash Control Audit, departmental cash control audits, and cash examinations for the Treasurer's Office, Recorder's Office, Juvenile Services, Community Services Department - Building Services, Registrar of Voters, and Regional Animal Services. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

Pending Board Approval

26-0494 **7C3** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the Continuum of Care (CoC) Structure and HMIS Governance Memorandum prepared by the Internal Audit Division. The memorandum was developed at the request of management and provides preliminary observations and recommendations regarding governance, organizational structure, segregation of duties, HMIS oversight, and operational accountability within the Continuum of Care framework. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0495 **7C4** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the Internal Audit Report for the Housing and Homeless Services - Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). The audit evaluated HMIS governance, user access administration, federal reporting oversight, and operational controls to determine whether processes effectively protect data integrity, confidentiality, regulatory compliance, and program management. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0496 **7C5** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the Internal Audit Report for Technology Services - E911 Surcharge Revenue Cash Control Audit. The audit evaluated cash handling procedures, E911 surcharge revenue collection processes, compliance with County Code and Nevada Revised Statutes, internal controls, reconciliations, safeguarding of assets, and oversight of E911 surcharge revenues. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0497 **7C6** Request for Board of County Commissioners approval of revisions to the Washoe County Audit Committee Charter pursuant to Washoe County Code 15.545(6). The revisions clarify the role and authority of the Audit Committee, align the Charter with Washoe County Code Chapter 15, update governance provisions, clarify responsibilities of the Audit Committee, Internal Audit Division, and management, improve organization and readability, and incorporate audit committee governance best practices. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0498 **7D1** Recommendation to approve an Interlocal Contract between the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and Washoe County to implement StreetReach, a program designed to expand access to basic medical care, screening and referral services for individuals experiencing homelessness in Washoe County; and if approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the Contract. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0499 **7D2** Recommendation to accept the Children's Justice Act (CJA) FY27 sub-grant from the State of Nevada, Division of Child and Family Services in the amount of [$14,709.00; no county match required] for the period of July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027; authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to retroactively execute the grant and related documents;

Pending Board Approval

and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0500 <u>**7D3**</u> Recommendation to accept a private grant from AARP Community Challenge, in the amount of [$5,750.00; no County match] retroactive from June 24, 2026 to December 31, 2026 to enhance pedestrian safety and mobility at the 9th Street Senior Center; retroactively authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute the grant award and related documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0501 <u>**7D4**</u> Recommendation to retroactively accept a private grant from the Lutheran Church of the Good Shepherd Endowment Fund, in the amount of [$1,000; no County match; including up to $100.00 for volunteer gift cards] effective from July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027 to strengthen and expand the senior volunteer program; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute the grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0502 <u>**7D5**</u> Recommendation to accept a FY25 Continuum of Care Supportive Services Only Coordinated Entry grant award from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development in the amount of [$33,705.00; $8,426.25 county match] retroactive for the period May 1, 2026 through April 30, 2027 to support the Continuum of Care initiative with coordinated entry matchmaker activities and implementation of specific policies; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0503 <u>**7D6**</u> Recommendation to accept a FFY25 Continuum of Care Planning grant award from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development in the amount of [$152,980.00, $38,245.00 county match] retroactive for the period July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027 to support the Continuum of Care initiative with planning, annual funding competition process, implementation of specific policies and procedures to develop a community-wide process involving the coordination of various providers to develop strategies for ending homelessness, identification of resources that are available to meet that goal, evaluation of the outcomes of the Continuum of Care projects, and monitoring and improvement of the quality and performance of the recipients projects while enforcing compliance with program requirements; retroactively authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to execute grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

Pending Board Approval

26-0504 **7E1** Recommendation to approve Washoe County Sheriff's Office selected contract employees who have successfully completed the established training process to drive County vehicles to support the Sheriff's Office. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0505 **7E2** Recommendation to approve the Forensic Support Services Agreement between Office and City of Reno on behalf of the Reno Police Department for the retroactive term of July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026 for the provision of Forensic Science Services. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0506 **7E3** Recommendation to accept a fiscal year 2025 State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program (SLCGP) grant award [amount not to exceed $93,000.00, $62,000.00 in-kind County match required] as administered from the State of Nevada Office of Emergency Management/Homeland Security, project number to be determined, to support the Northern Nevada Cyber Center (NNCC) through the purchase of digital forensics software, encrypted data transmission software, and NNCC employee cybersecurity training for the retroactive grant period of September 1, 2025 through August 8, 2029; authorize the Sheriff to execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0507 **7E4** Recommendation to accept additional fiscal year 2026 U.S. Forest Service grant award funding [increased amount not to exceed $3,000.00, for a total of $13,000.00, no County match required] as administered from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Forest Service Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, federal project number 26-LE-11041700-017, for patrol of U.S. Forest Service designated roads, campgrounds, developed sites, or dispersed areas for the retroactive grant period of February 13, 2026 through January 31, 2031; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Andriola recalled that Commissioner Herman had requested that Agenda Item 7F1 be pulled from the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Hill disclosed that she was an attendee of the Lutheran Church of the Good Shepherd. She explained that the church's donation came from its Endowment Fund and that she was not part of that committee. She asserted that she had no pecuniary interest in the donation. Vice Chair Garcia also disclosed that she was an employee of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) and was not part of the StreetReach project related to Agenda Item 7D1; therefore, she had no pecuniary interest in the interlocal agreement.

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

Pending Board Approval

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Clark absent, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7E4, with the exclusion of Item 7F1, be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7E4, with the exclusion of Item 7F1, are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

26-0508 **7F1** Recommendation to approve a two-year Interlocal Agreement between Washoe County and the Nevada Secretary of State, outlining the duties and obligations of each party for ongoing maintenance of the Voter Registration and Election Management Solution (VREMS), implemented pursuant to NRS 293.675. The Agreement requires the County to contribute a share of the cost of the KNOWiNK Total Vote Election Management system in the total amount of $238,000.00 for FY27 and FY28 ($119,000 per fiscal year). If approved, authorize the Division Director of Purchasing and Contracts to execute the agreement. Voters. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas explained that Agenda Item 7F1 concerned the County's share of the State’s top-down system, which she said all counties used. She reported that the top-down system replaced the legacy system, Data Information Management System (DIMS), which was the in-house, unsupported system. She asserted that if there was any ambiguity about Agenda Item 7F1, Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald was in attendance to answer questions.

On the call for public comment, Penny Brock thanked the Board for pulling Agenda Item 7F1 from the Consent Agenda. She said that the KNOWiNK Total Vote Election Management system was introduced during the 2024 General Election, but did not recall the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) approving its use by the County. She recalled that many vote centers had delays due to the KNOWiNK Total Vote Election Management system. She said she was delayed in voting due to the system, which prevented her from advancing to the voting stage and ultimately barred her from voting. She noted that she attempted to vote again and confirmed the required numbers, but after advancing to the confirmation page, she was asked to show her driver's license. She believed that voters should have to show their driver's licenses to vote, but the poll worker tried to scan her license into an electronic poll book, which she did not approve of. She expressed her disagreement with having her license scanned and noted that she was turned away from voting again. She indicated that people did not have to enclose a photo of their driver's license when voting via mail-in ballot, and said she felt discriminated against for voting in person. She said that she heard from another woman who also did not want her license scanned and who was then denied access to voting. She mentioned that a fellow observer informed her that they voted at the Reno Public Market (RPM) on Election Day and were not required to show their driver's license. She reiterated that she was discriminated against three times when trying to vote. She referred to an *Election Integrity Network* article that explained why they believed Dominion was a disaster that threatened ballot secrecy, transparency, and security. She asserted that the approval of Agenda Item

Pending Board Approval

7F1 would cost taxpayers millions and that Mr. McDonald wanted even more money for equipment.

Commissioner Herman indicated that she had no comments. She said she agreed with public concerns. She asserted that there were problems with Agenda Item 7F1.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Commissioner Clark absent and Commissioner Herman voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 7F1 be approved and authorized.

11:38 a.m. **The Board recessed.**

11:46 a.m. **The Board reconvened with Commissioner Clark absent, Commissioner Herman appearing by phone, and Vice Chair Garcia appearing by Zoom.**

26-0509 **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to:
(1) approve the appointment of one candidate to the Washoe County Planning Commission representing Commission District 1 (generally includes Incline Village and Crystal Bay, most of the Forest area along the west side of Mt. Rose Highway and portions of the Southwest Truckee Meadows area), to serve a full term beginning on the date of appointment and ending on June 30, 2030, or until such time as the candidate no longer serves on the Planning Commission or a successor is appointed, whichever occurs first. Applicants for the vacancy include: Daniel Lazzareschi (incumbent). Ineligible applicant(s): Keith Hayes. (Commission District 1.)

(2) approve the appointment of one candidate to the Washoe County Planning Commission representing At-Large North of the River (includes areas of unincorporated County north of the Truckee River), to serve a full term beginning on the date of appointment and ending on June 30, 2030, until such time as the candidate no longer serves on the Planning Commission or a successor is appointed, whichever occurs first. Applicants for the vacancy include: Applicant(s) for the vacancy include: Larry Chesney, Leslie (Don) Christensen, Sarah Chvilicek, Wendy Leonard, Rob Pierce, Katherine Yriarte. Ineligible applicant(s): Danny Clarke, Keith Hayes. Community Services. (Commission Districts 1, 3, 4, 5.)

Chair Andriola asked if the motions could be heard separately. Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Jennifer Gustafson affirmed that she would recommend that. Chair Andriola agreed and announced she would call for separate Public Comment as well. Because there was only one eligible candidate for the first appointment, she felt a ballot was unnecessary. She called for Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Pending Board Approval

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Clark absent, it was ordered that Daniel Lazzareschi be reappointed to the Washoe County Planning Commission representing Commission District 1 for a term beginning on the date of appointment and ending on June 30, 2030, or until such time as the candidate no longer serves on the Planning Commission or a successor is appointed, whichever occurs first.

For Item 8(2), Commissioner Support Program Liaison Alexandra Wilson stated that the appointment affected four of the five districts. She noted that there were six eligible candidates and that, after public comment, the Commissioners would select their top two candidates for the one opening.

On the call for public comment, Wendy Leonard began by noting Mr. Rob Pierce's request to be added to the Planning Commission (PC). She alleged that Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 278.040 would not allow him to serve as a Commissioner and also sit on the PC. She stated that one could not sit on an appellate board. She believed that Mr. Pierce's request was motivated by self-interest rather than consistency within the County. She wanted the Board to appoint someone who could be consistent, which would allow Mr. Pierce to focus more on his campaign. She felt he was very likely to become a sitting County Commissioner in the near future, and she hoped the Board would appoint someone with no political interests outside the PC. She expressed that it was important to ensure all the needs and recommendations of the public, as well as the County, were met by the PC. She clarified that meant taking into consideration not only NRS and County Code, but also what the public wanted and needed. She alleged that the County did not want to experience a $286 million settlement like Las Vegas did in 2024, because the PC and the Board continued to deny development requests, leading to a Supreme Court ruling against the Board, resulting in the citizens having to pay for the settlement. She felt that if they did not have someone on the PC who could review laws, rules, and regulations and act within them rather than in their political interests, it would harm the County. She asked to be considered based on her history and experience reviewing rules, laws, regulations, and case law, and on figuring out how to apply them to issues before the PC. She stated that although she did not know all of Washoe County Code (WCC), Chapter 110, as it was 1,236 pages, she did know how to look into the Code and apply it based on the issues, as well as the NRS 278, which dictated the rulings and recommendations of the PC to the Board. She felt it was important that the Board have somebody who could actually read and apply the Code, and also act as a voice of reason for the Board.

Katherine Yriarte asked the Board to support her appointment to the At-Large North of the River seat for the Washoe County PC. She detailed that she had lived in Washoe County since 1986 and, since 2016, had lived and operated her business in Rancho Haven, in the North Valleys area of unincorporated Washoe County. She recounted that she had been showing up at the dais before the Board and others in the County for years, as both a business owner and a community member with a stake in how decisions were made. She explained to the Board that, as they looked at the candidates before them for the position, she wanted to highlight something she felt was important. She stated that, for the current appointment in particular, she was the only applicant who had been regularly

Pending Board Approval

attending PC, Board of County Commissioners (BCC), and Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) meetings and actively engaging with the County process. She noted that this was apart from Mr. Pierce, who currently served on boards, but agreed with Ms. Leonard that, because Mr. Pierce was currently running for a County Commissioner seat, it might create a conflict of interest in the future. She mentioned that, as a previous candidate, she did not actually apply for the current seat until after her election because she did not want to create that same conflict of interest. She attested that she brought sustained, ground-level engagement along with a fresh perspective. She added that, as someone who had been watching the process closely and learning it from the outside in, she believed that a combination of active involvement and fresh eyes was something that the PC could put to good use. She shared that her 13-year career in preclinical research had trained her to review complex technical material, ask precise questions, and evaluate evidence before reaching conclusions; skills she felt directly translated to reviewing land-use and development applications. She explained that she had developed a habit of gathering input from multiple sources before making a decision, and had been meeting with consultants as well as residents of the neighborhoods directly affected by the PC decisions. She felt that the PC made better decisions when every member came to the table prepared. She told the Board that her work as a member of the Rancho Haven Property Owners Association had brought her together with people with competing interests, leading them to a shared understanding and outcome while ensuring that the thoughts, concerns, and opinions of community members were heard. She expressed that that was exactly what a cohesive Board needed; members who could listen carefully, weigh the full picture of the matter at hand, and move forward together even on difficult decisions. She commented that as a co-owner of Team Yriarte Horsemanship and as founder and president of the Nevada Equine Council, she had spent nearly three years navigating Washoe County's equine business code in its current state and participating in the amendment process, championed and led by Chair Andriola. She added that the effort led to a unanimous vote and approval by the PC the week prior, on July 7. That recent success represented years of sustained engagement, collaboration with planning staff, and a willingness to keep working even when the progress was slow, which, she related, was exactly how she would approach the PC seat. She added that earlier in the year, she spoke before the PC about a gap in the Development Code regarding road improvement timelines, in which approvals were moving forward based on infrastructure schedules that could shift before construction was complete. She noted that it was the type of issue she would watch for: places where the process worked on paper, but fell short for the people already living there.

Don Christensen stated that he was conflicted about reaffirming his application to the PC for the At-Large district. He explained that he had worked with Mr. Pierce extensively over the past six years and served as his Vice Chair on the Board of Adjustment (BOA). He shared that he was conflicted: he did not like the idea of running against Mr. Pierce, yet he endorsed him completely. However, he noted, he would be remiss not to also run for the seat. He related that his experience on both the CAB for Spanish Springs and the BOA had given him a unique opportunity to learn the procedures, codes, ethics, and everything else involved in the position. He declared that he would serve diligently. He noted that he had an exemplary voting and attendance record for the BOA over the four years he had served, and that he took it seriously. He added that he had

Pending Board Approval

attended many PC meetings silently, as it might have been inappropriate for a BOA member to speak on issues they might have to hear later. He reiterated that he was very familiar with PC procedures and its philosophy, and that he would adhere to the law. He stated that he looked forward to perhaps being appointed, that he loved Washoe County, had lived in the area for almost 50 years, and that he loved the area and the people, too. He commented that he was well-regarded in his neighborhood for his ethics, integrity, and a caring attitude toward issues that could come before the PC.

Ms. Wilson explained that ballots would be distributed for the At-Large North of the River seat, and that the Commissioners would select their top two candidates.

Commissioner Hill asked if they could make a statement before the vote. She stated that she typically voted for the incumbent, especially if they were showing up, doing a good job, were engaged, and were doing the work. She believed the incumbent in the seat had been doing that, so she wanted to explain why she would not be voting for them. She felt that Mr. Pierce running for office and sitting on the PC made her feel uncomfortable. She felt it was a good opportunity to ensure they had people who did not have that conflict. She expressed her appreciation for Mr. Pierce's service but reiterated that she would not be voting for the incumbent.

Chair Andriola thought there would be opportunities for the Board to later discuss potential conflicts for candidates who also held a seat, especially those in quasi-judicial roles. She noted she would be working with DDA Gustafson at a later time to bring something before the Board on the matter.

Chair Andriola asked Ms. Wilson for clarification on the voting process, with Vice Chair Garcia and Commissioner Herman voting remotely. Ms. Wilson stated they should first tally the in-person votes, then ask those joining via telephone for their votes.

DDA Gustafson suggested beginning with the Commissioners joining remotely so their votes would not be influenced. Chair Andriola felt that was a good idea, and asked Vice Chair Garcia to share her votes first.

Vice Chair Garcia announced her votes for Sarah Chvilicek and Wendy Leonard.

Commissioner Herman announced her votes for Katherine Yriarte and Don Christensen.

County Clerk Jan Galassini read aloud the votes of Commissioner Hill for Don Christensen and Wendy Leonard. She read aloud Chair Andriola's votes for Sarah Chvilicek and Wendy Leonard. Chair Andriola stated there were three votes for Ms. Leonard for the At-Large North of the River PC seat and indicated she would need a formal motion to appoint Ms. Leonard to the Planning Commission.

Pending Board Approval

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote, with Commissioner Clark absent and Commissioner Herman voting no, it was ordered that Wendy Leonard be appointed to the Washoe County Planning Commission representing At-Large North of the River for a term beginning on the date of appointment and ending on June 30, 2030, until such time as the candidate no longer serves on the Planning Commission or a successor is appointed, whichever occurs first.

26-0510 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to appoint one candidate from a pool of 23 applicants including: Fred E. Avera, Elizabeth A. Cadigan, Jacquelyn J. Cheun-Jensen, James Chuck, Donna R. Dawson-Schwartz, David A. Dulcey, Alyssa Goins, Sharon Goldrup, Martha Growdon, Karen A. Hayes, Nicôl L. Herris, Katherine Hollingsworth, Lizeth Lechuga Gomez, Douglas L. Miller, Billy James Moton, Denise Myer, Laurie A. Nahser Martin, Anne S. Pettigrew, Cody Phinney, Amy Pulver, Earl V. Ravid, Sean Sullivan, and Brandi J. Tripp Russell to fill one midterm vacancy on the Washoe County Library Board of Trustees pursuant to NRS 379.020(3) beginning on August 1, 2026, and ending on June 30, 2027. Library. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Support Program Liaison Alexandra Wilson noted her intent to provide the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) with background details for Agenda Item 9. She explained that the Board had voted on 2 of 25 applicants for the Washoe County Library Board of Trustees (LBT) during the previous BCC meeting. She explained that because two individuals had been appointed previously, the applicant pool currently comprised a list of 23 for the Board to deliberate on, and, as with the previous appointment, the Commissioners would select their top two for the single vacancy.

On the call for public comment, Sean Sullivan greeted the Board and introduced himself. He stated that the Board had heard him pitch his resume at a previous BCC meeting. He expressed his intent to describe his priorities and platform to the Board, as he had not been able to do so at the meeting at which he had previously spoken. He stated that he was grateful to have a second chance to speak. He opined that one of the major issues was ethics, which he said had been partially dealt with. He noted that his focus on the LBT would be on preventing similar issues in the future, advocating for holding himself accountable, and committing to the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) referenced in the bylaws, as he said there was currently no consequence for violating those NRS codes. He stated that he would also work on restoring the library hours, which would require addressing the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) budget. He acknowledged that Library Director Lisa McClure was already pursuing those efforts and said that working with her on them would be one of his priorities. He stated that he met Ms. McClure in person at the 60th anniversary celebration and opined that they could collaborate without issue. He explained that the other budget-related issue was the 10 percent acquisition rule, which he wanted to restore to that rate. He reiterated that the problem was funding-related and described it as critical. He stated that he liked Ms. McClure's data-driven approach and opined that, due to his background as an engineer, they would work together

Pending Board Approval

efficiently. He agreed with the comments provided during previous items that collaborating with schools was important. He recalled having recently attended a dinosaur-themed painting activity, which he said was lots of fun, with many children in attendance. He stated that providing library cards for all students seemed like a good idea, and he wanted to research the details of its implementation. He said he had a record of attending the LBT meetings, though he noted he did not have a record of visiting the library, as he tried to avoid signing up for things online for security reasons. He recalled that it had been mentioned previously that LBT members should receive training, and expressed his support for that statement. He stated that he would be happy to lend his time and any knowledge he could offer to the LBT, and asserted that he would expedite his haircut plans should he be chosen for the appointment.

Ms. Wilson noted that the ballots could be distributed to the Board and that the Commissioners attending the meeting virtually would be asked to read their votes before those present in person.

Vice Chair Garcia read her vote for Elizabeth Cadigan and Lizeth Lechuga Gomez aloud, and Commissioner Herman recited her vote for Denise Myer and Earl Ravid. County Clerk Jan Galassini read Chair Andriola's vote for Billy James Moton and Karen Hayes, as well as Commissioner Hill's vote for Donna Dawson-Schwartz and Katherine Hollingsworth. Commissioner Hill requested that Ms. Galassini repeat the candidates Chair Andriola had voted for, and Chair Andriola reiterated her choices. Chair Andriola asked whether any further clarification was needed from the Board, and it was determined that none was. She indicated that they would proceed to the second round of voting.

Vice Chair Garcia announced her second-round vote for Ms. Cadigan and Ms. Gomez, and Commissioner Herman recited her second-round vote for Mr. Moton and Mr. Ravid. Ms. Galassini read Chair Andriola's second-round vote for Mr. Moton and Ms. Hayes, as well as Commissioner Hill's vote for Ms. Cadigan and Ms. Gomez. Chair Andriola explained that the Board would proceed to the third round of voting. She asked whether Vice Chair Garcia and Commissioner Herman could hear the discussion taking place in the Washoe County Commission Chambers. Vice Chair Garcia inquired whether the candidates the Board was voting on had been narrowed down throughout the previous rounds of voting. Chair Andriola responded that the Board had not made any selections that had created a majority.

Vice Chair Garcia noted that there had been two votes for both Ms. Cadigan and Ms. Gomez during the previous round. Chair Andriola agreed that those candidates had each received two votes, but she explained that Mr. Moton had also received two votes in that round. She asked whether Vice Chair Garcia wanted to proceed with the Board voting on whether to appoint Ms. Cadigan or Mr. Moton, and Vice Chair Garcia agreed. Ms. Galassini noted that three candidates had received two votes, and Chair Andriola requested that Ms. Galassini recite the names of those candidates. Ms. Galassini summarized that the top three candidates in the previous round were Ms. Cadigan, Ms. Gomez, and Mr. Moton. Chair Andriola inquired how Ms. Wilson would suggest the Board

Pending Board Approval

proceed, and Ms. Wilson indicated that it might be best for the BCC to complete another ballot between those three candidates.

Vice Chair Garcia read aloud her third-round vote for Ms. Cadigan, and Commissioner Herman recited her third-round vote for Mr. Moton. Ms. Galassini read aloud Chair Andriola's third-round vote for Mr. Moton, as well as Commissioner Hill's vote for Ms. Cadigan. Chair Andriola summarized that the top candidates from that round were Ms. Cadigan and Mr. Moton. She said the BCC would vote on their choice between the two candidates in the fourth round.

Vice Chair Garcia recited aloud her fourth-round vote for Ms. Cadigan, and Commissioner Herman stated her fourth-round vote for Mr. Moton. Ms. Galassini recited aloud Chair Andriola's fourth-round vote for Mr. Moton, as well as Commissioner Hill's fourth-round vote for Ms. Cadigan. Chair Andriola stated that the results had reminded her of a previous appointment, as she had been the one to break the tie for that item. She indicated that if the same votes were continued to be cast, the BCC could be voting indefinitely. She noted that the Board had narrowed the candidates to Ms. Cadigan and Mr. Moton and asked whether staff wanted the BCC to select one appointee, which Ms. Wilson affirmed.

Vice Chair Garcia announced her fifth-round vote for Ms. Cadigan, noting that she was advocating for that candidate based on her experience and connection to the Washoe County School District (WCSD). Commissioner Herman read her fifth round vote for Mr. Moton aloud. Ms. Galassini recited Chair Andriola's fifth-round vote for Ms. Cadigan, as well as Commissioner Hill's fifth-round vote for Ms. Cadigan. Ms. Galassini stated that the results had indicated that Ms. Cadigan was the candidate who received the majority. Chair Andriola remarked that the voting had reached five rounds and asked whether a formal motion would be made for the appointment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Clark absent, it was ordered that Ms. Elizabeth A. Cadigan be appointed to fill one midterm vacancy on the Washoe County Library Board of Trustees pursuant to NRS 379.020(3) beginning on August 1, 2026, and ending on June 30, 2027.

Chair Andriola thanked Ms. Wilson for her hard work on Agenda Item 9. She congratulated the selected candidates for both Agenda Items 8 and 9 and expressed appreciation to all who served on the LBT and had applied.

26-0511 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to consider an easement purchase and sale agreement between Washoe County ("Grantor") and Dandini Spectrum Holdings, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation ("Grantee") (DSH) for design, construction, installation, use and maintenance of a requested emergency access road, including relocation of an existing public utility easement and associated improvements over, across and through a portion of Washoe County property Assessor's parcel

Pending Board Approval

number (APN) 520-250-31, (5100 Spectrum Boulevard, Regional Public Safety Training Center) located at the terminus of Spectrum Boulevard Reno, Nevada at a cost of [$650,000.00]. Said easement request would provide for emergency ingress/egress to the adjacent City of Reno approved residential development; and if approved, authorize the County Manager to execute all necessary documents. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Easement purchase and sale agreement consideration; Washoe County: Economic Impacts; Vicinity Map; Items to consider; Questions?.

ACM Solaro displayed the slide titled *Easement purchase and sale agreement consideration*. He explained that he wanted to put on the record that several numbers had been transposed in error, and clarified that the correct Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) for the subject property was 502-250-31, and that the address was 5190 Spectrum Boulevard, not 5100 Spectrum Boulevard. He apologized for the mistake, acknowledging that the incorrect numbers had been included on meeting agendas three times previously, but noted that it had not been noticed until recently. He reminded the Board that the item had a fairly long history of appearing before the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He recalled that the developer of the subject property had first brought the item before the BCC in 2023, and the Board had directed staff to investigate whether an easement agreement across County property could be negotiated.

ACM Solaro showed the *Washoe County: Economic Impacts* slide and reminded the Board that the request outlined in Agenda Item 10 was for an easement of a water line and emergency access to be implemented across a portion of Washoe County-owned property. He explained that the County property housed the Regional Emergency Operations Center (REOC) and the Regional Public Safety Training Center (RPSTC). He noted that Agenda Item 10 was not for the BCC to make a decision on the development project, which he acknowledged there had been confusion about in the past. He clarified that the City of Reno's City Planning Commission and the Reno City Council had authority over property zoning for the subject property, so the item had nothing to do with property zoning or the request of the neighboring apartment complex. He explained that Agenda Item 10 specifically concerned a requested easement across property owned by Washoe County. He reiterated that the BCC had directed staff in August of 2023 to negotiate an easement with the grantee. He reported that staff from the District Attorney's (DA) Office spent considerable time working with the applicant to process several matters. He reminded the Board that several promises had been made in August of 2023, and staff had tried to ensure that those factors could be captured appropriately in any legally available agreement. He noted that Agenda Item 10 represented those efforts to create that legal agreement, and he recalled that the agreement had appeared on BCC agendas several times in the past. He stated that the applicant had requested that those items be pulled from previous agendas, which he clarified was the reason there had been no action on the items since 2023.

Pending Board Approval

ACM Solaro displayed the slide titled *Vicinity Map* and explained that the RPSTC was a large property. He said that the map on the right side of the slide showed the easement area, and the areas highlighted in red depicted the existing paved access locations currently within the RPSTC property. He explained that the blue area showed the undeveloped area that proceeded upwards and connected to Ranger Road. He noted that the road served as a secondary means of egress for the approved development along Spectrum Boulevard within the City of Reno and was used only during an emergency. He stated that there was a necessary water line easement underneath the road highlighted in red. He reported that the green area within the map on the right represented a blanket easement currently underlying the entire portion of the RPSTC for public utility easements. He recalled that when Washoe County purchased the property, the purchase was originally only for the areas shown in green. He explained that, at the time, the owner had a blanket easement for utilities on that property, and Washoe County eventually purchased the entire property depicted in blue on the left. He noted that the green area on the right was part of the property, which included an underlying public utility easement, a fact he acknowledged the applicant might mention during their presentation. He emphasized that his intent was to ensure the Board understood why the underlying public utility easement existed only on a portion of the property.

ACM Solaro introduced the *Items to consider* slide by reiterating that the City of Reno had authority over the zoning on the properties, and that Agenda Item 10 was not about zoning and approval for apartment complexes. He explained that the Board needed to determine whether the proposed access and water line would inhibit existing or future use of the property, and whether the suggested agreement was appropriate for the BCC's needs based on the information provided in the Staff Report. He displayed the *Questions?* slide and stated that he was available to answer the Board's questions. He noted that the property owner, Kevin Grant, was in attendance to provide additional information to the Board, and that he would wait to answer any questions until the Board had heard from Mr. Grant.

Mr. Grant greeted the Board and conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Spectrum-Dandini Apartments; Spectrum Blvd. Area; City of Reno Approval; City of Reno Conditions of Approval; County Commission Directive; The Easement Purchase Agreement; Existing Easement; Agreed emergency fire secondary access and TMWA easements; Planned Impact Mitigations; Traffic and Sewer Improvements; Additional Benefits to RPSTC; Tax Revenues; Noise Study; Reno Housing Shortage; Increasing Housing Supply; Conclusion; Questions.

Mr. Grant recalled that he had come before the Board in April and had attended the current meeting to answer questions. He offered to provide his presentation and noted that he had already presented the materials to them in the past. He displayed the *Spectrum-Dandini Apartments* slide and reported that the project was large, with 420 units. He reported that the project was estimated to cost $120 million and had been in progress for approximately six years. He stated that he built very nice projects, and clarified that he did not undertake such projects often, as he was a landowner, not a developer. He noted that he would do a project similar to the Spectrum-Dandini Apartments once every five

Pending Board Approval

years, and he tended to develop projects that he would keep. He explained that he incorporated amenities into his projects that were very nice and that he planned to live with, as he would hear all the potential complaints about the project. He stated that he would attend the ribbon-cutting and emphasized that he had taken care of his tenants.

Mr. Grant noted his intent to provide the Board with background on the project. He reported that he was the individual who initiated the project's partnership with an equity firm in Boston. He noted that the project had three equity partners who were prepared to invest additional equity capital and seek bank financing to reach the necessary $120 million in funding. He reiterated that the project was substantial and something he took seriously. He explained that the equity partner in Boston had not been taking on many real estate projects recently, as construction and capital costs had risen substantially. He acknowledged the need for housing and his strong commitment to the project.

Mr. Grant displayed the slide titled *Spectrum Blvd. Area*. He recalled that ACM Solaro had already provided an overview of the land on which the subject property was located. He showed the *City of Reno Approval* slide. He noted that, as ACM Solaro mentioned, the project's special use permit (SUP) had already been approved by the City of Reno. He introduced the slide titled *The Easement Purchase Agreement* and explained that emergency egress and water access were needed to satisfy safety requirements. He acknowledged that there was a substantial amount of water nearby, though the requested easement was the most reliable way to access water, as it was gravity-fed. He noted that the developers would not prefer to utilize pumps as an alternative, but would do so if that were the only option. He showed the slide titled *Existing Easement* and noted that the developers would give up the easement they currently had over the County's property, as they had no use for it outside of negotiations. He predicted that the existing easement could represent an encumbrance on the County's property in the future, as Washoe County might decide to use the property for something different in 50 years. He suspected that removing the developer's easement might benefit the County, and that the developers would be happy to exchange the two easements.

Mr. Grant displayed the *Tax Revenues* slide. He recalled that substantial work had previously been done to calculate the County's potential benefits from the project. He reminded the Board that the development was a 420-unit commercial apartment facility and would be taxed accordingly. He noted that the developers tasked a municipal finance banker with calculating the project's projected property tax (p-tax) revenue and estimating the property's bond potential. He explained that if p-tax revenue was being generated, bonds could be issued against it for other projects the County wanted to finance. He stated that the municipal finance banker used a 4.5 percent rate in the calculations, and he suspected that the p-tax on the project could be bonded to generate approximately $75 million in bond revenue if the County chose to do so in the future.

Mr. Grant showed the slide titled *Noise Study*. He acknowledged that there had been some discussion about the project regarding potential noise. He reported that a noise study had been commissioned. He explained that he had visited the property himself multiple times and asserted that the noise would not scare his very timid dog. He stated

Pending Board Approval

that the noise study had informed developers that the noise was generated by the highway and could be mitigated. He noted that the noise issue was commonly addressed by construction companies through the use of materials such as triple-pane glass.

Mr. Grant reviewed the slide titled *Reno Housing Shortage*. He explained that housing shortages were being experienced throughout the United States (US), which was a commonly known issue. He explained that the development could currently produce 200 units without approval of the easement request. He reported that site costs were very high, and that if the project were approved for 420 units, the infrastructure and production costs per unit would be approximately $30,000. He explained that the cost per unit would instead be $60,000 if only 200 units could be constructed, which would amount to approximately $300 more per month in rent for tenants. He emphasized that such an increase was the last thing developers wanted. He reiterated that he kept the properties he developed and stated that he did not like raising rents in the long term. He opined that the last thing he wanted to do as a property owner was to increase rent, but it was sometimes necessary when expenses rose. He displayed the *Questions?* slide. He noted that he was happy to answer any questions he could, given his background, and reminded the Board that he was only the property owner and had hired developers, construction companies, and engineers to understand the details he had provided.

<u>12:30 p.m.</u> **Vice Chair Garcia left the meeting.**

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas acknowledged that the Board had been reminded earlier in the meeting that Vice Chair Garcia would need to leave early, and confirmed for the record that she left at 12:30 p.m. She noted that there was still a quorum.

Chair Andriola thanked Mr. Grant for coming before the BCC again. She expressed appreciation for his having also attended a meeting in the past to provide background and an update on the project's status.

Commissioner Herman noted that she had no questions for ACM Solaro or Mr. Grant. She noted that she had followed the project for several years and that the Board's action was needed for the developers to complete it. She noted that she would support the approval of Agenda Item 10.

Commissioner Hill asked ACM Solaro to clarify details about the existing easement over County property that the developer owned. ACM Solaro explained that there was an existing blanket easement on the site and displayed the *Existing Easement* slide. He noted that the County's entire parcel was outlined in black on the image, with the area shaded in gray showing an existing blanket utility easement beneath a portion of the property. He explained that the easement was originally established to benefit the property to the north, which was not within the shaded area on the map, so that development could occur along the northern property line. He reported that, based on his review of the easement documents, the parcels were intended to benefit the underlying property owner at the time of the initial sale. He expressed uncertainty about whether Mr. Grant had been the original property owner for the land from which all of the Spectrum Boulevard parcels

Pending Board Approval

in question were created. He noted that Washoe County purchased the benefiting property, and he supposed that there were some properties further north that could also request an easement through the portion of the property shaded in gray. He explained that any of those property owners would need to go through the same process as Mr. Grant if they wanted to request an additional easement through Washoe County-owned property that was not encumbered by the easement. He noted that he was uncertain about whether he had been clear in answering Commissioner Hill's question, and reiterated that a portion of the property owned by Washoe County was encumbered by a blanket utility easement, which meant that someone could put a public utility anywhere underground across the boundaries of the easement. He opined that questions could arise about what might happen when the easement's boundaries were approached, as an additional easement would be needed to extend beyond them. He thought it was strange that a small portion of the property had been separated for the easement for the benefit of the property owned by Washoe County, and noted that the County had combined the property it had purchased to the north of the parcel to create one larger parcel for the RPSTC.

Chair Andriola stated that the BCC had heard a lot about the project over the previous several years. She noted that the most recent information indicating that the RPSTC Executive Board did not support Agenda Item 10 was listed as July 6, 2025, in the Staff Report. She asked whether there had been any discussions with the RPSTC Executive Board about the item, and what the current status was with that matter. ACM Solaro noted that the RPSTC Executive Board had been approached about the project several times. He suspected that there had been three conversations with the RPSTC Executive Board throughout the entire length of the item's deliberation. He believed that a letter from the RPSTC Executive Board related to their concerns about the item had been provided during the BCC's deliberation of the project in August of 2023. He explained that the contents of the RPSTC Executive Board's letter were used by staff to create some of the terms within the development agreement for Agenda Item 10. He stated that one of the primary concerns from the RPSTC Executive Board was the concern that people were fearful of gunshots and similar noises. He acknowledged that while Mr. Grant had previously mentioned that utilizing construction materials like triple-pane glass could mitigate those concerns, the RPSTC conducted firearm shooting activities at the facility's outdoor shooting range on a regular basis, and the RPSTC Executive Board feared that tenants moving into the development project would petition the BCC to halt those activities at the RPSTC because of the sounds of gunshots.

ACM Solaro described the RPSTC Executive Board's concern that the development project could interfere with future use of the RPSTC property. He explained that the BCC was tasked with determining whether the statement was true. He opined that the impact the development would have on access across the parcel during an emergency would not pose a substantial issue, as staff would likely not be training at the facility during an active emergency. He acknowledged that there were other impacts to the property that the Board needed to consider, including the RPSTC Executive Board's concern about a potential impact on the quiet enjoyment of the RPSTC property that the County operated for the purposes of training the community's law enforcement and fire services.

Pending Board Approval

Chair Andriola asked how the BCC granting the requested easement could impact the Washoe County Sheriff's Office's (WCSO) plans if it wanted to proceed with constructing an indoor shooting range, which she noted the WCSO had hoped to do for a long time. She inquired about what kind of legal jeopardy those plans or related permitting could face from the project that would prevent the WCSO from continuing its long-term endeavor to create the indoor facility. ACM Solaro explained that staff had negotiated the purchase and sale agreement so that it would include $650,000 in compensation that could be invested in several projects listed in the Staff Report. He reported that one of the suggested projects was to enclose one of the bays of the shooting range to create an indoor location, but he clarified that there was nothing related to permitting that would be problematic for Washoe County to pursue such a project. Chair Andriola asked if there were any representatives of the WCSO in attendance at the meeting, and it was determined that there were none present.

Chair Andriola stated that she remained concerned about the RPSTC Executive Board, who she noted had been involved in the negotiation and long-term discussions to mitigate the concerns, which she expressed appreciation for. She said that it seemed as though at least one of the concerns of the RPSTC Executive Board had continued. She commended ACM Solaro for having gone through the list of concerns and trying to satisfy the RPSTC Executive Board, though she reiterated that it seemed as though they had not changed their position overall. She asked ACM Solaro whether that was a fair assumption. ACM Solaro noted that he did not want to speak on behalf of anyone else, but reported that the RPSTC Executive Board was opposed to the granting of the easement during the last time staff presented the project to them for their review. Chair Andriola thanked ACM Solaro.

Mr. Grant stated that, depending on what the Board decided, he would go back to his three partners who own the land, and they would choose whether they would construct the project with 420 units or 200 based on the BCC's action on the item. He explained that their choice would be based on the math showing whether the project's return on equity warrants constructing it with 200 units. He noted that he was unsure what their decision would be, but he suspected they would proceed with the engineering process and possibly complete the project. Chair Andriola asked for clarification whether he meant that they would make that decision for the project with 200 units. Mr. Grant explained that the developers would only need to move some roads and infrastructure on the property to construct the project, and Chair Andriola asked if that would still be possible without the BCC granting the easement, and Mr. Grant confirmed that there was a possibility the project would be constructed with 200 units regardless of the BCC's decision on Agenda Item 10. Chair Andriola asked how Mr. Grant wanted to proceed with the item, and whether he wanted the Board to take a vote or bring the item back before the Board another time. Mr. Grant opined that, given how long the item had been pending, the landowners would like clarification to know for certain whether the project would consist of 200 or 420 units.

Commissioner Hill stated that the issue troubled her, and she recalled that she had been very receptive to it when the item originally came before the BCC, as the Board had been discussing the need for housing in the region. She noted that there was

Pending Board Approval

substantial pressure on the Board to consider an easement that would double the potential for housing at an apartment complex in the region, while also making a regional decision for the RPSTC that could affect other matters. She explained that she had approached Agenda Item 10 with uncertainty, as she was not sure whether she could participate in the item due to it having gone through a difficult process with the Board, and her having disclosed that an individual related to the project had inquired if they could provide support for her gubernatorial campaign in exchange for her vote in favor of the project. She noted that the interaction had personally created a negative impression. She reported that the matter was under investigation by the State and that she had publicly disclosed the interaction, though she acknowledged the need for housing in the region and that the easement would enable the project to provide twice as much housing. She expressed uncertainty about why the easement needed to run through the middle of the property, noting that there had been a different proposed easement plan that would instead go around it. She questioned why the other plan was not being suggested and suspected that ACM Solaro might be able to clarify it for her. She stated that she respected the public safety workers and their concerns.

Commissioner Hill opined that if the County did not want anyone to develop the neighboring property, Washoe County should probably have purchased it. She acknowledged that the developers were guaranteed a certain number of units by right without being granted approval for the easement. She stated that there was a great need for workforce housing, though she noted there was no guarantee the property would be used for workforce housing, as developers could charge whatever they wanted for rent. She recalled that during the most recent discussion of Agenda Item 10, she expressed a desire to see deed-restricted housing to ensure that at least some of the units in the project would be affordable. She said she was having difficulty deciding what she wanted to do regarding the item, as she had initially approached it with certainty that she would vote against granting the easement but was now unsure. She apologized to Chair Andriola and stated that she was still processing her thoughts about the item, as it was a very difficult decision. She opined that it was very important for the Board to protect the County's assets. She stated that the Board needed to consider the region as a whole and how they could support the housing issues, especially due to the developer having expressed interest in providing $650,000 to implement a solution for problems currently faced on the subject property. She described the outdoor shooting range as disruptive to the entire area, including a shelter for animals. She requested that ACM Solaro remind her as to why the location had changed since it was first discussed in 2023, and why it was not possible to have the easement not go through the middle of the RPSTC when it was already very difficult to find land where the County could work and train with regional partners. She explained that she did not want concerns about the easement to return before the BCC in a decade, with claims that the County did not protect its asset.

ACM Solaro stated that there were three proposed routes for the easement across the property based on engineering possibilities. He noted that the route Commissioner Hill had referred to was located parallel to US Highway 395. He reported that a canine training facility had been built since discussions for Agenda Item 10 began, which interfered with that northern route. He explained that two route options for the

Pending Board Approval

easement remained after that interference, noting that one option was shown in red on the *Vicinity Map* slide, and the other extended farther to the right, closely following the border of an outdoor circular track at the facility. He recalled that during negotiations requested by the BCC, the facility's users indicated that, if they had to choose, the least impactful easement route might be the one shown on the slide. He noted that some engineering work had been done since then and acknowledged questions about whether that route would be suitable during actual evacuations, as it was not straight. He stated that it was not in the County's purview to make such a decision, as any determination about the usability of the route would need to be made by the Reno Fire Department (RFD). He explained that the developers of the project communicated that the RFD had already investigated those matters and had indicated that the organization had no concerns about the route. Commissioner Hill asked whether the RFD had voiced approval of the route that ran northward, and ACM Solaro clarified that he had referred to the evacuation route that went through the center of the property. He explained that the route consisted of several tight turns that might cause difficulties during an event requiring evacuation. He reiterated that he was not in a position to determine the route's usability, as the RFD had authority and jurisdiction over the road's layout. He noted that the County was simply determining whether the easement would affect the future use of the RPSTC and whether it offered benefits that the Board needed to make a decision.

Commissioner Hill asked whether the northward route she had mentioned was no longer under consideration or whether that matter would be brought up in a future discussion. ACM Solaro suspected that it was not currently an option. He stated that both the northward route and the one suggested on the *Vicinity Map* slide impacted the RPSTC training ground in nearly the same way. He explained that another factor considered in choosing the route was which route would have the least impact on the RPSTC facility during construction. He noted that the route suggested in his presentation was the one that had been generally chosen as the least impactful during roadway construction, which he suspected had been the reason why it was given preference over the northern route. He stated that the northern route would also have impacted a large portion of the RPSTC if chosen. Commissioner Hill asked whether, in his opinion, the northern connection point served any benefit to the residents. ACM Solaro explained that both of the route options connected to Ranger Road, so he opined that the connection she had described would not matter. He noted that during an evacuation, residents to the north could use the route and travel through the training facility. He clarified that the roadway was not a one-way road and that, because both routes shared the same access point, they would have the same impact on the community. He stated that all of the evacuation routes would connect to and from the same streets. Commissioner Hill asked whether he meant there could be an increased evacuation impact on other residents in the area, regardless of the chosen route. ACM Solaro explained that if the proposed apartment complex was evacuated through the surrounding neighborhood, he did not think either route would make an impact in that regard. He noted that there were very limited locations where an easement could go from the applicant's property to anywhere in the northern direction. He reported that the property to the east of the project was open space with very difficult terrain, and he did not believe there was any possibility of placing a roadway there. He expressed hope that the RFD would understand the additional impact of the proposed emergency access on the

Pending Board Approval

neighborhood to the north. He expressed his belief that the neighborhood had only one means of egress as currently constructed. Commissioner Hill asked for confirmation that the County had not conducted any studies on whether another evacuation route was necessary, and ACM Solaro confirmed that no such studies had been conducted.

Chair Andriola stated that she sympathized with Mr. Grant's frustration, as he had what appeared to be a clear way to proceed with the project after getting the City of Reno's approval, only to find that there was a barrier to continuing by needing to come before the BCC for the easement. She noted that her hesitation regarding the item was due to her wish that the City of Reno's approval could be revised after they gave greater consideration to the matter before granting the project blanket approval, as approving the easement to the project was optional and not required by the BCC. She explained that, while the BCC did not have to grant the easement, the Board needed to balance the RPSTC that was already located on the property. She noted that she had asked her previous questions regarding the RPSTC Executive Board because they considered what needed to be done, both currently and in the future, from a regional perspective. She referred to ACM Solaro's earlier comments regarding the three easement route options and noted that she remembered that there were concerns with each one of the various easements. She stated that she was not aware of a single option among the routes that was amenable to everyone. She acknowledged that the professionals with the WCSO were taking the matter seriously and opined that the RPSTC Executive Board's opinion should be taken into consideration, despite them not having authority over the matter. She explained that the RPSTC, Washoe County Emergency Management (WCEM), and the REOC were all located in that area and had collectively spent a substantial amount of time reviewing the various options associated with the project. She opined that it was great that Mr. Grant had taken on the position of serving as the public representative for the project and its investors. She reported that she shared a similar experience as Commissioner Hill, as she had also been approached by an individual who expressed willingness to write her a check for her support of the item while she was running for office, which she had disclosed to those investigating the matter. She noted that the facts had been provided to the Board and that, while ACM Solaro, staff, Mr. Grant, and the project investors had spent an immense amount of time and effort, she would not support Agenda Item 10 due to concerns raised in the past. She acknowledged that, although the RPSTC Executive Board's list of concerns had been partially addressed, some issues remained uncorrected. She surmised that if there were a possibility of a different easement everyone agreed upon being implemented, she might feel differently. She said she felt the need to be honest with Mr. Grant and hoped he would respect that the BCC was trying to find a solution, which she believed he wanted more than anyone. She acknowledged that the circumstances were challenging, as the Board considered addressing housing issues as a top priority in the community, and the project had been offering that while retaining the ability to price the units at the developer's discretion, which she clarified she was not requesting anything be changed in that regard.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Andriola asked Mr. Grant if he had any final comments, and he reiterated that the project could proceed with 200 units if the investors chose to do so. He

Pending Board Approval

explained that if the investors made that choice, it would result in approximately $300 more in rent per unit per month. He referred to Commissioner Hill and Chair Andriola's earlier comments about the untoward behavior of an individual who had previously been involved in the project. He emphasized that he was ruthless about matters impacting his reputation, and clarified that the individual involved with those interactions had been terminated, and that he had no personal involvement with that individual any longer. Chair Andriola thanked him for the clarification and stated that the Board appreciated it. She asked Mr. Grant not to mistakenly think that any of those previous comments were specifically directed at him or any of the investors, as that was not her intent.

Chair Andriola moved to not approve an easement purchase and sale agreement between Washoe County ("Grantor") and Dandini Spectrum Holdings, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation ("Grantee"), and Commissioner Hill seconded the motion. The motion failed by a vote of 2-1 with Commissioner Herman voting no, and Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent.

Chair Andriola noted that the motion did not carry, and sought advice for how to proceed from Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Jennifer Gustafson. DDA Gustafson explained that, under Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 241.0355, because the BCC was composed entirely of elected officials, a majority of the Board membership was required for any motion to carry. She noted that unanimous approval was required for any motion to carry because there were only three members of the Board present. She stated that it would be at Chair Andriola's discretion whether she would call for another motion.

Chair Andriola called for the motion and requested clarification on what would ultimately happen if that motion received the same result as the previous motion. DDA Gustafson clarified that if there was another motion to approve Agenda Item 10 that did not receive a unanimous vote, then it would also fail and no action would be taken on the item. Chair Andriola thanked DDA Gustafson, and expressed her intent to repeat her previous motion.

Chair Andriola moved to not approve an easement purchase and sale agreement between Washoe County ("Grantor") and Dandini Spectrum Holdings, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation ("Grantee"), and Commissioner Hill seconded the motion. The motion failed by a vote of 2-1 with Commissioner Herman voting no, and Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent.

Chair Andriola acknowledged that the vote had remained the same, and that the round would end. She thanked Mr. Grant and opined that the action might represent a great opportunity to research the previously mentioned construction cost impacts on the project. She thought those calculations could present an opportunity for the costs to somehow be more affordable for both Nevada and the US. She thanked him for his clarity, candor, and integrity.

26-0512 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the South

Pending Board Approval

Valleys Regional Park Expansion Project Phase 2, PWP-WA-2026-308, including Base Bid, Bid Alternate 1 (east parking area), Bid Alternate 2 (west parking area), and Bid Alternate 3 (electrical conduit) [staff recommends Facilities Management, Inc. in the amount of $3,782,319.50]; and (2) approve a separate project contingency fund in the amount of $100,000.00. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

This item was pulled.

<u>BLOCK VOTE – 15 THROUGH 21</u>

26-0513 **<u>AGENDA ITEM 15</u>** Recommendation to approve Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement for Professional Consulting Services between Washoe County and Savini Group, PLLC for the South Truckee Meadows Steamboat Lift Station and Force Main Project, to provide construction management services during construction, as described within Exhibit A, [in the amount of $89,430.00 for a total contract amount of $657,850.00]. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Chair Andriola, with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 15 be approved.

26-0514 **<u>AGENDA ITEM 16</u>** Request by the Community Services Department Director, through the Washoe County Clerk, and pursuant to Washoe County Code (WCC) 2.030, to initiate amendments to WCC Chapter 50 (Nuisance Code) and WCC Chapter 125 (Administrative Enforcement) to enhance the enforcement capability of Washoe County enforcement officials by increasing enforcement fines to match the fine schedule used by the cities of Reno and Sparks, eliminating the 50% discount for payment of fines after the third penalty notice, exploring options to create an abatement fund to finance county initiated abatement of nuisance properties, authorizing automatic and continuing fines for failing to obey an Administrative Hearing Order after all required due process has been provided, clarifying collection procedures, allowing notice to be posted on a property in a conspicuous location in addition to the front door of a residence, clarifying that discretionary approvals may be withheld on properties with unresolved violations, deleting incorrect citations and language inconsistent with state law, deleting vague hearing decision language such as “any other action deemed appropriate”, adding language to the definition of “obstruction” to include reference to public easements, declaring the storage of vehicles or materials as items that may not cause an obstruction, revising the definition of what is considered “screened” and declaring that residing in a recreational vehicle in an unauthorized manner

Pending Board Approval

is a public nuisance; and direct the County Clerk to submit the request to the District Attorney's Office for preparation of a proposed ordinance in accordance with WCC 2.040. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Commissioner Hill noted that she had been experiencing nuisance properties within her district. She commended the staff for researching ways to achieve parity with the Cities of Reno and Sparks regarding the nuisances. She hoped that Agenda Item 16 would make a difference when individuals did not manage their properties properly. She indicated that she could not wait to inform her constituents that the County was researching higher fees and fines for nuisances.

Chair Andriola agreed with Commissioner Hill. She believed that Vice Chair Garcia deserved recognition for all the work she did to address nuisance properties. She recalled meeting with Code Enforcement and opined that every district experienced nuisance properties and that strengthening the community was important. She reiterated her thanks to Vice Chair Garcia and the entire staff who worked on Agenda Item 16.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Chair Andriola, with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be initiated and directed.

26-0515 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the 1 South Sierra Street North Tower Boiler Replacement Project, PWP-WA-2026-430 [staff recommends Acco Engineered Systems for the base bid in the amount of $450,000]; and (2) approve a separate project contingency fund [in the amount of $45,000 for a total installation cost not to exceed $495,000]. The Project is located at 1 South Sierra Street, Reno, Nevada, and consists of replacing two condensing boilers and associated mechanical systems. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Chair Andriola, with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 17 be awarded and approved.

26-0516 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Recommendation to retroactively authorize the Comptroller's Department to renew Property, Auto Physical Damage, Boiler & Machinery, Mobile Equipment, Cyber Liability and Pollution Liability with the Public Entity Property Insurance Program (PEPIP) for a one-year term with an estimated annual cost of [$1,561,915], effective July 1, 2026, and authorize the Comptroller's Office to sign the applications and

Pending Board Approval

agreements necessary to bind coverage, funding from the Risk Management Fund source. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Chair Andriola, with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 18 be authorized.

26-0517 **AGENDA ITEM 19** Recommendation to retroactively approve an extension to a contract with NaphCare Nevada LLC, originally procured via Request for Proposals (RFP) #3196-23, for three additional years, from July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2029, in an amount not to exceed [$1,000,000] annually, and if approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the amendment and related documents. The contract will provide competency evaluations, mental health evaluations, risk assessments and other evaluations for the Second Judicial Court, the Public Defender's Office, the Alternate Public Defender's Office, Conflict Attorneys and the District Attorney upon Court Order, or at the request of one of the Departments. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Chair Andriola, with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 19 be approved and authorized.

26-0518 **AGENDA ITEM 20** Recommendation to approve the reimbursement of costs incurred by the City of Reno, the City of Sparks, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District, and Washoe County for expenses related to and in support of the Enhanced 911 Emergency Response System and portable event recording devices as recommended by the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee on June 18, 2026, and in an amount not to exceed [$600,870.27] as specified within the adopted Enhanced 911 Fund's operating budget. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Chair Andriola, with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 20 be approved.

26-0519 **AGENDA ITEM 21** Recommendation to approve an Agreement for Cloud Services for a five-year Cloud Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Human Capital Management (HCM) subscription agreement with SAP Public Services Inc., in an amount not to exceed [$5,638,056.07]; and a

Pending Board Approval

separate Business Technology Platform (BTP) Enterprise Agreement for cloud usage in an amount not to exceed [$57,830.00]. These agreements cover a five-year term beginning August 28, 2026 and ending August 27, 2031. The transition to SAP Cloud represents a strategic modernization initiative to migrate County financial, procurement, human resources, payroll, and related administrative functions to a cloud-hosted environment. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Chair Andriola, with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 21 be approved.

26-0520 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Update, discussion and direction to staff regarding potential Bill Draft Requests (BDRs) for the 84th (2027) Session of the Nevada Legislature. The subject(s) of potential BDRs to be considered include a measure requiring that a local government reimburse a county for any costs incurred by that county as a result of errors in a local government billing file remitted to its county treasurer; amending NRS 244A.7645 to allow not more than three percent of the surcharge collected for enhancement of the telephone system used for reporting emergencies and purchase and maintenance of event recording devices to be used to pay the expenses associated with administration of the surcharge revenues; recounts of votes in elections; expansion of the types of documents that may be filed in the Nevada Lockbox; and abatement of nuisances on public and/or private property. The Board may direct staff to pursue BDRs on one or more of these subjects and/or to bring back other possible BDR concepts on subjects the Board identifies as being in the best interests of the county for approval at a future meeting. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Government Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevich conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Bill Draft Request (BDR) Process for 2027 Legislative Session; Update, Discussion and Direction: Bill Draft Requests for the 84th Session (2027) of the Nevada Legislature; BDR Authority; Washoe County Bill Draft Request (BDR) Process for 2027 Legislative Session; BDR Considerations; 3/17/2026-Proposal #1; 3/17/2026 Proposal #2; 3/17/2026 Proposal #3; Additional Board Direction and Discussion regarding BDRs; Staff Recommendation; Thank you.

Ms. Matijevich indicated that her discussion would be the second discussion regarding Bill Draft Requests (BDRs) for the current legislative interim. She recalled that she had provided a presentation in March to receive direction from the Board regarding BDR preferences. She said the BDR submission deadline was approaching quickly and that she would need further direction from the Board. She pointed out that the statutory authority regarding BDRs was located on the *BDR Authority* slide. She referred to the

Pending Board Approval

Washoe County Bill Draft Request (BDR) Process for 2027 Legislative Session slide, which indicated the step in the BDR process she was presenting outlined in green. She said there were about six weeks left before the BDR submission deadline and that each entity authorized to submit BDRs had different deadlines. She clarified that this discussion was the final opportunity to provide direction regarding the September submission deadline. She referenced the slide titled *BDR Considerations* and recalled that the BDR considerations were discussed earlier in the year.

Ms. Matijevich read from the *3/17/2026-Proposal #1* slide and recalled that the proposal was presented to the Board in March and would require local governments that submitted an erroneous billing file to a county treasurer to reimburse the county for any expenses that the county incurred as a result of the errors contained in the billing file. She said that the Board directed her to submit the proposal to the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) Legislative Committee for consideration as an NACO BDR. She reported that the County was awaiting NACO's determination on whether it would submit the item. She explained that the NACO Legislative Committee had convened and considered several proposals, for which they were authorized to submit up to five BDRs. She noted that NACO had eight concepts under consideration with the expectation that its Board of Directors would act at the July 31, 2026, NACO meeting. She said she would provide an update to the Board on August 25, 2026, regarding NACO's decision. She recommended that the Board leave the BDR filed with NACO and, if NACO did not approve it, submit the proposal as one of the County's BDRs.

Ms. Matijevich referenced the slide titled *3/17/2026 Proposal #2* and noted that the second proposal related to allowing a maximum of 3 percent of revenues from the surcharge imposed by a county for the enhancement of the telephone system used for reporting emergencies and the purchase and maintenance of event recording devices - known as the 911 telephone surcharge - to be used by the county to pay for the costs associated with administration of the surcharge. She said that the Board had directed her to seek sponsorship from an individual legislator or potentially submit the BDR as a Washoe County BDR. She explained that following the Board's direction, she spoke with potential sponsors and other stakeholders. She said that, based on feedback from those sponsors, several other regional issues were under consideration regarding dispatch and other aspects that might affect how services were provided in the community. She relayed that the potential sponsors felt the BDR was premature and that some of the other efforts would yield efficiencies that might help reduce the administrative burden. She recommended that the Board no longer pursue the second proposed BDR and rescind the prior direction.

Ms. Matijevich referred to the *3/17/2026 Proposal #3* slide and said that the third proposal pertained to equity and authority for and distribution of transient taxes and surcharge revenues collected in the Washoe County portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin (Basin) for the purpose of establishing a dedicated funding source for public transit to, from, and within the County's portion of the Basin. She recalled that the Board had directed her to submit the item to the Legislative Committee for Review and Oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and the Marlette Lake Water System (MLWS). She said there was extensive discussion with the chair of the Legislative Committee and other

Pending Board Approval

stakeholders, and that the proposal was submitted to the committee. She reported that the Legislative Committee would meet on August 20, 2026, to consider BDRs and that they may approve the BDR, but with different requirements. She said she had requested that the Board agree not to be specific about the dollar amount or percentage of the surcharge, to allow stakeholders and the Legislative Committee for Review and Oversight of the TRPA and MLWS to have more discretion. She asserted that she looked forward to providing the Board with an update at the August 25, 2026, meeting.

Ms. Matijevich referenced the *Additional Board Direction and Discussion regarding the BDRs* slide and noted a comment from the Board that the Commissioners requested to see continued funding for permanent supportive housing. She explained that the Board wished her to inquire whether a bill on automatic election recounts, such as Assembly Bill (AB) 287 of the 2025 Legislative Session, was likely to return in the 2027 Legislative Session. She reported that she was not aware of any intent by a BDR to pursue automatic recounts of elections by either the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections or any individual legislator.

Ms. Matijevich recalled that on April 21, 2026, during a strategic planning workshop, a presentation by Public Administrator Nicole Klitzke was given, with discussion regarding the functionality and access to the Nevada Lockbox expansion, including a State document, such as a last will and testament. Subsequently, she and Ms. Klitzke had a discussion with the Secretary of State's (SOSs) Office, which she said seemed receptive to the topic. She reported that the SOS Office was entitled to BDRs and could potentially incorporate the discussion into one of their BDRs. She relayed that discussions were still ongoing and that the Board would be updated when the recommendation was either approved or denied. She pointed out an error on the *Additional Board Direction and Discussion regarding BDRs* slide and said that *6/26/2027* should be *6/23/2027.* She noted that the Board had expressed interest in exploring legislative remedies to allow the County to act more expeditiously to remediate pervasive public nuisances, particularly on properties where known owners could be identified. She asserted that Assemblymember Heather Goulding indicated a willingness and desire to carry a BDR related to the previously stated topic. She said that she had been working with the District Attorneys' (DAs) Office and the Community Services Department (CSD) to prepare recommendations for her that could form the substance of the BDR. She believed that the County was dealing with public nuisance situations in Sun Valley, which happened to be Assemblymember Goulding's legislative district. She opined that there was an opportunity for Assemblymember Goulding to carry the BDR on behalf of her constituents.

Ms. Matijevich indicated that Commissioner Hill had inquired when the Board was considering declaring a state of emergency following the Hidden Valley Flood and had asked whether there was a possible legislative remedy for some of the concerns raised regarding insurance policies. She said that she had researched, and while it was not her legal opinion, her research led her to believe that, at the State level, it was unlikely much could be done to address insurance issues legislatively. She noted that most flood policies issued in the Country and County were through the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Pending Board Approval

She said that an individual may purchase insurance through local carriers or other homeowners' insurance policies, but because the program was largely structured at the federal level, oversight at the State level was limited. She mentioned that other types of policies, or surplus policies, were available and could fall within the State's jurisdiction, but given their nature, oversight was also limited. She believed that there was likely nothing substantial or significant that the Board could request to remedy the concerns at the State level.

Ms. Matijevich referred to the *Staff Recommendation* slide and requested that the Board provide its input and direction on any other topics. She said the first direction was contingent on whether NACO chose to submit the first proposed BDR as their own, regarding local governments repaying counties for any costs incurred due to erroneous billing files, and whether the Board would like to submit the BDR as their own if NACO denied it. The second was that the Board rescinded its prior direction to seek a sponsor to submit, or to submit as a Washoe BDR, a request for up to 3 percent of the 911 telephone surcharge revenues. The third was to direct staff to continue discussions with the SOS Office regarding the types of documents eligible for filing in the Nevada Lockbox and the entities authorized to access them, and to return in August to provide an update on those discussions. The fourth was to continue working with Assemblymember Goulding on a BDR to allow local governments to expedite the abatement of public nuisances under certain circumstances. She concluded her presentation and said she was happy to answer any questions about the information provided.

On the call for public comment, Andy Chapman noted that he was the President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of Travel North Tahoe Nevada. He said that Travel North Tahoe, Nevada, was the official destination management organization for the Washoe Tahoe portion of the Basin, which the Board oversaw. He mentioned that Travel North Tahoe Nevada received a percentage of the Transient Occupancy Taxes (TOTs) collected in the region. He explained that how Travel North Tahoe Nevada managed the Basin was critical and had changed over time. He said that Travel North Tahoe Nevada knew the current collection of funds was reinvested in the community, environment, and the business economy, but it was not enough. He felt that the area had changed since the pandemic, that many people traveled to Lake Tahoe, which created demand on the lake, and that there was recognition that Travel North Tahoe Nevada needed to manage Lake Tahoe differently. He applauded the Board for researching BDRs and for partaking in discussions with staff and stakeholders. He said that Travel North Tahoe Nevada was interested in discussions and that another option was a Business Improvement District (BID) being proposed in the 2027 Legislative Session. He asserted that investing in transit enhancements, user mitigation, downtown beautification, and economic vitality was important, but could not be done with the current funding sources. He thanked the Board for their time and commitment.

Chair Andriola thanked Ms. Matijevich for organizing the presentation. She said that she served as the chair of the NACO Legislative Committee, and as Ms. Matijevich had mentioned, on July 10, 2026, a meeting was held for the committee to discuss priorities. She noted that the committee was considering eight BDRs and only five

Pending Board Approval

would be presented to the full NACO Board. She believed the submission deadline was approaching and that, although there was a lot of work, there might be surprises. She asserted that planning and research were appreciated and commended the hard work of staff.

Commissioner Hill echoed Chair Andriola's feelings. She believed that Ms. Matijevich had been amazing to work with regarding the Basin's issues. She recalled that Ms. Matijevich was attempting to work with partners on the BID. She said that as soon as coordinated efforts were in place and the BDRs were successful, the County could ensure sufficient revenues to care for Lake Tahoe. She noted that Ms. Matijevich had done a wonderful job vetting ideas and questions both inside and outside meetings. She said that although the Legislature met only every two years, Ms. Matijevich was a great advocate. She stated that she had no additional concerns requiring immediate attention, but was excited for the 2027 Legislative Session to start. She reiterated her thanks to Ms. Matijevich. She asserted that she was willing to support Ms. Matijevich's recommendations.

Commissioner Herman thanked Ms. Matijevich for her work. She said that she had enjoyed working with Ms. Matijevich for many years and believed that she was good at organizing information and distributing it when necessary. Chair Andriola indicated that the respect Ms. Matijevich had at the Legislature and NACO should not be ignored. She asserted that she would support Ms. Matijevich's recommendation.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 11 be updated, discussed, directed, and amended.

1:25 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

1:44 p.m. **The Board reconvened with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent and with Commissioner Herman appearing by phone.**

26-0521 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 approving a development agreement between Washoe County and WVC Commercial, LLC, for Woodland Village Town Center, a residential subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM20-005).

The purpose of the development agreement is to extend the deadline for recording the next final map from May 20, 2026, to May 20, 2028. The project is located at 18400 Village Center Drive. The project encompasses a total of approximately ±9.8 acres, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 111 attached residential lots. The final map for 42 lots has been recorded, and additional time is sought for the presentation of subsequent final maps for the remaining 69 lots. The

Pending Board Approval

parcels (APNs: 556-390-05 & 556-721-01) are located within the Cold Springs Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 5.

And, if approved, schedule a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for August 25, 2026. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1956.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1956 was introduced by Commissioner Hill, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

26-0522 **<u>AGENDA ITEM 13</u>** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 approving a development agreement between Washoe County and Hunter Creek Reno Owner, LLC, for Ridges at Hunter Creek, a residential subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-005).

The purpose of the development agreement is to extend the deadline for recording the next final map from June 28, 2026, to June 28, 2028. The project is located off Hunter Falls Circle. The project encompasses a total of approximately ±155.01 acres. The total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 53 lots, with 21 lots recorded and 32 lots remaining to be recorded. The parcel (APN: 041-671-04) is located within the Southwest Truckee Meadows Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 1.

And, if approved, schedule a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for August 25, 2026. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1957.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1957 was introduced by Commissioner Hill, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

<u>PUBLIC HEARING</u>

26-0523 **<u>AGENDA ITEM 22</u>** Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Four, Article 408, Common Open Space Development to require the findings that reference site specific characteristics, including but not

Pending Board Approval

limited to the preservation of steep slopes and heavily treed areas and protection of natural and scenic resources including ridgelines and waterways, only when those characteristics are present on the parcels in question, in order to ensure the design flexibility and associated public benefits inherent to common open space developments is potentially available to all subdividable parcels; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1764, Bill No. 1955.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 3-0 vote, with Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Garcia absent, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1764, Bill No. 1955, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

26-0524 **<u>AGENDA ITEM 23</u>** Public Comment.

Diana Christensen recalled that after the recent Spanish Springs Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) meeting, she was inspired to address the Board about 200 acres of agriculturally zoned properties in Spanish Springs on Pyramid Highway between Calle de la Plata and Alamosa Drive. She said that after the master plan change a few years earlier, she noted interest in changing the zoning of a portion of the properties to industrial. She explained that even though the master plan designated 22 acres for warehousing, the developer was seeking 80 to 90 acres for industrial use. She relayed that the developer's first proposal listed all properties as adjacent, and said she did not see anyone else wanting to use the acreage for anything other than industrial zoning once it was approved. She relayed that the properties bordering the proposed site were approved by the previous Board and built over the past 20 years. She said that 25 years ago, industrial zoning was limited to the west side of Pyramid Highway in the business center before most of the housing was approved. She mentioned that many members of the community felt the zoning would remain on the west side of Pyramid Highway, and that decisions about purchasing homes were made based on that belief. She expressed concern that the developers were seeking properties on the east side of the highway as prime locations, which would place the industrial development against many homeowners' fences, greatly impacting 2,000 homeowners. She speculated that if the zoning change was approved, similar businesses would move to the east side of the highway. She understood that the zoning would create more jobs and revenue but urged the Board to review the current industrial zoning code to impose more stringent noise, light, and hours-of-operation restrictions. She said that since there were existing homes adjacent to the proposed rezoning acreage, there would be a significant difference between donkey noise and factory

Pending Board Approval

noise running all day, every day. She asserted that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) required backup beepers that would run in the middle of the night and that warehouses were allowed to operate in three shifts. She reiterated that she was only asking for the zoning to be more compatible with current residents. She said the previous Board believed businesses and homes could coexist, which she agreed with, but thought that compromises were needed. She also recommended that the Board widen the notification area for residents past the current 500 feet (ft) requirement.

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

26-0525 **AGENDA ITEM 24** Announcements/Reports.

There were no announcements or reports.

* * * * * * * * * * *

1:52 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

____
CLARA ANDRIOLA, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

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

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

Pending Board Approval