

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

JULY 15, 2025

PRESENT:

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

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

ABSENT:

**Clara Andriola, 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:

**25-0526      AGENDA ITEM 3 Public Comment.**

County Treasurer Justin Taylor provided a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He disclosed that the prior day, he was informed that the recreation and beach facility fees for the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) were billed incorrectly on Fiscal Year (FY) 2026 tax bills. He noted that those bills had already been mailed and would reach property owners in the coming days. He described the process by which entities like IVGID requested the addition of their charges onto Washoe County tax bills. The County required a file that provided the parcel number, special assessment code, and charge amounts to be submitted to the Treasurer's Office. Mr. Taylor explained that the file provided for IVGID was incorrect. He described that the majority of the bills were correct, but the recreation and beach facility fees were reversed. He reported that roughly 540 of the affected parcels would see an increase in their tax bill when the errors were corrected. He said his office would work with everyone as well as they could, and the parcels with increased bills would be prioritized. He added that those owners would be given extra time to make payments. He advised that he was working with IVGID to get the correct file and begin the process of correcting all affected tax bills. He revealed that there was a General Ledger (GL) code that affected all properties in the Incline Village area, which meant that corrections had to be made to each tax bill. He theorized that correcting all 8,000 tax bills was the best way to move forward and keep the County in a good position for any potential audit. He disclosed that his office would be severely impacted by the need to correct and resend the tax bills. He said they were in the

preliminary stages of working with their software company to see if anything could be done to speed up the process, but he expressed his doubt that a faster resolution was possible. He expected the correction process to take months, and he added that he would likely attend a future Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting to address increased costs for postage, paper, and printing. He said he would ask IVGID to cover the costs, but he predicted that he would look to the BCC for funds in the interim. He shared that the IVGID District General Manager, Bob Harrison, passed along his apologies, as did IVGID Director of Administrative Services, Susan Herron. Mr. Taylor commented that he would not have time to fully explain everything during the three minutes allotted to each public commenter.

Chair Hill indicated that because Mr. Taylor was the elected County Treasurer, he was welcome to take more time to inform the BCC about the issue. He summarized that he approached the BCC because he wanted to inform everyone directly and be transparent. He noted that Ms. Herron was unable to attend the meeting because of a conflicting commitment. He directed attention to comments made by Ms. Herron in the letter he provided to the Board, which described that the billing problem was discovered by IVGID with assistance from the County. The letter outlined that the recreation and beach facility fees were reversed when the billing was submitted to the County. The letter specified that it was a human error and would be corrected by the end of the day. Mr. Taylor advised that although IVGID might be able to make corrections by the end of the day, the process for his office would be significantly more time-consuming. The letter stated that IVGID recognized that tax bills would need to be reissued due to the error. Mr. Taylor invited Board members to ask any questions they had.

Chair Hill pointed out that Ms. Herron was signed in virtually from Incline Village, and she hoped that Ms. Herron would be able to address the issue during public comment. Chair Hill wondered if cash flow issues would result from people being asked not to pay their tax bills. Mr. Taylor responded that everyone was being asked to pay their bill, and the Treasurer's Office would issue refunds as needed. He said the total on most bills was accurate because the only error was the transposition of the name of the fee, which did not result in an error on the total amount due. He mentioned that the bills still needed to be corrected, but the amount due would not change. He hoped that people would make their payments on time to avoid a penalty, and he reiterated that at that time, the Treasurer's Office would send any refunds that were due. Chair Hill asked if the County would work with IVGID on communication to affected property owners. She recalled hearing that there would be a press release. Mr. Taylor confirmed that he had reached out to IVGID and asked them to communicate with their constituents. He noted that IVGID had contact information for residents of the area, whereas the Treasurer's Office did not.

Commissioner Clark applauded Mr. Taylor for coming forward. He felt that Mr. Taylor's actions exemplified what was needed when something went awry. He appreciated that Mr. Taylor reached out to the interim County Manager (ICM), explained the problem, and brought it to everyone's attention. He acknowledged that people sometimes made mistakes, and he reasoned that when mistakes were caught, they should be brought forward and dealt with. He recalled a similar situation in a County department

where no action was taken. He commented that in that case, problems remained unaddressed for three years, and he mentioned that the situation would be discussed in Agenda Item 7C1.

Mr. Taylor remarked on the importance of being proactive and sharing accurate information. He said that he appreciated the Commissioners' time and disclosed that he tried to communicate with each of them individually about the issue. He acknowledged that they were busy, but he invited them to reach out to him anytime.

Chair Hill summarized that Incline Village property owners were being asked to pay their bills, and the County would refund them if there was a mistake on their bill. Mr. Taylor affirmed Chair Hill's understanding. Chair Hill offered that Washoe 311 would be ready to address questions, and Mr. Taylor added that a planned press release would include contact information for IVGID. He said his office was available to answer any questions. Chair Hill thanked Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Terry Brooks shared an original poem that highlighted multiple problems that were worsened by racial discrimination in educational settings.

Ms. Diane Becker commented that she was a full-time resident of Incline Village and attended the meeting to address Agenda Item 8. She asked the Commissioners to reject development code amendment proposals that would allow taller, denser buildings along Highway 28, which she referred to as the evacuation route for residents. She summarized that the proposal was to allow six-story buildings with little or no setbacks from roads, and much higher density and concentration. She expressed concern that there was no study of how the proposed development would impact public safety, especially in the event of wildfire evacuation. She noted that the community had voiced its concern throughout the process. She reported that area residents requested that the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) conduct a study on the impact the development would have on public safety, but no analysis was done. She pointed out that pages 4, 5, and 11 of the staff report outlined a number of safety requests proposed by staff, which she revealed were rejected by TRPA with minimal exceptions. She understood that TRPA mandated that their exact language be accepted. She was troubled that, as stated in the staff report, TRPA dismissed most of the safety concerns without a study. She surmised that the County could not study the concerns because they had been rejected. She was even more troubled that, in the process, TRPA told the County that it could not consider evacuation impacts when proposing the changes to the Tahoe Area Plan. Ms. Becker determined that critical concerns were never followed through on. She supposed that anyone who had been to Lake Tahoe on the weekends had seen the already-high volume of traffic. She wondered what would happen if six-story buildings full of residents replaced the single-story buildings currently on both sides of Tahoe Boulevard. She said that she and her colleague, Roxanna Dunn, presented evacuation concerns to the Commissioners based on the current population and did not consider any of the increases. She reported that TRPA Ordinance 12.6.3 allowed local jurisdictions to adopt alternative provisions if they met or exceeded thresholds, which she determined the County unsuccessfully tried to do. She said the County was told that they could not even try to show their evacuation concerns. Ms. Becker

determined that the planning process was not a collaboration; it was top-down planning from TRPA that ignored the unique vulnerabilities of smaller, isolated communities like Incline Village, which lacked the infrastructure found in places like South Lake Tahoe. She said Incline Village did not have the ability to handle the proposed developments, and residents felt increasingly unheard in a process dominated by political influence from larger California jurisdictions. She objected to California laws that mandated certain actions by counties to increase workforce housing. She understood that those laws were being implemented in Washoe County through Incline Village. She asked the Board to help protect the public safety of Incline and Crystal Bay residents, workers, and visitors.

Mr. Thomas Daly provided a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk and introduced himself as a resident of the County. Regarding the planned audit schedule in Agenda Item 7C2, he opined that an audit of the interlocal agreement between the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) and the City of Reno for forensic and crime lab services was missing. He thought that the agreement was last audited in 2014. He reported that the agreement was terminated by former BCC members after the 2014 audit. He described that BCC members at that time found the agreement to be a detriment to County taxpayers and determined that it enriched the City of Reno by several million dollars over a period of seven years. He stated that a subsequent agreement was reached in 2021, but there was no obligation for an audit. He said that no staff report or presentation was provided to the BCC, and the new agreement was approved in the consent agenda. He informed that the former Reno Police Chief, Jason Soto, provided testimony in 2021 before the Reno City Council in which he claimed that he would use \$1.6 million for forensic and crime lab services, but would only pay the County \$1 million. Mr. Daly questioned who paid the \$600,000 difference and speculated that the Commissioners could guess the answer. He believed that for the past five years, the multi-million-dollar agreement was not the subject of an audit by the County auditor or an external auditor. He contended that the Sheriff had not presented updated reports on the agreement to the BCC. Mr. Daly supposed that an appearance to brief the BCC on the economics of the agreement might be in the public interest. He encouraged the BCC to have the Sheriff give a presentation at an upcoming BCC meeting to update the Commissioners and the public. He also suggested that the County auditor be directed to audit the agreement.

Mr. Ilya Arbatman said he was at the meeting that day as a representative of Laundry to the People, which he described as a mutual aid project in the County that was entirely volunteer-driven and community-funded. He explained that the term *mutual aid*, which had recently become part of common parlance, had a long history. He shared that in 2025, the term conveyed a vision of how individuals could help anyone in their communities, like they might help a neighbor. He related that if someone had a neighbor who recently had a baby or was sick, they might take a meal to that neighbor. He commented that mutual aid took that model and applied it to everyone who lived nearby, including the broader community. He mentioned that just as neighbors did not need to be best friends to offer a helping hand, mutual aid sought to create a form of community solidarity that did not depend on institutions, assistance programs, or government initiatives. He revealed that District 2 offered a donation through Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality (RISE) to Laundry to the People in Agenda Item 7D. He said that because

there was not a lot of information in the staff report, he wanted to give a quick story of the background of Laundry to the People. He established that the organization started in 2021, which he saw as a low point for the availability of social services during the COVID-19 (C19) pandemic. He recalled that when there were a lot of people living on Commercial Row in January 2021, he identified an opportunity to do something very simple; specifically, to help people do their laundry. He theorized that his approach would reduce waste in the Truckee River and help people get cleaned up, feel better about themselves, and be more empowered. He disclosed that at the time when the organization started, it was unclear what would happen next. He said they had been around for about four and a half years and developed partnerships with a number of local laundromats. He described that every Friday from 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m., they brought supplies, spent time at the laundromat, and paid for people's laundry. He said there was no intake form and no obligation to do anything. He summarized that if people went, Laundry to the People would help them get their laundry done. He conveyed that they served a lot of people, and he divulged that Mr. DeAndre Burleson was one of the people they worked with. He related that they served people who were going through hard times, regardless of whether they lived in their cars, outdoors, or inside. He informed that his organization was almost entirely community-funded, was not a 501(c)(3) organization, and was primarily funded by donations. He expressed his appreciation for the County's partnership and thought it could be a model. He observed that it was not necessary to agree about everything politically in order to come together on specific issues, and he thought Laundry to the People was a great way for people to work together and help the community directly.

Mr. Burleson shared that he used the services provided by Laundry to the People. He spoke about papers he submitted to the BCC earlier in the year and said he was on the waiting list for housing. He reported having heard updates about potential availability at three different properties, which he thought sounded like good news. Mr. Burleson displayed documents showing some of his medical appointments and various expenses. No copy was submitted for the public record. He communicated that he was currently homeless, which he disclosed he sometimes liked. He said the homeless community was fond of him and warned him that people were assaulting him and his belongings in his sleep. He understood there was a 30-day window for incident reports, and he expressed uncertainty about how to proceed, but he wanted to share the information and symbolically apply two incident reports that he felt represented the criminal activity he was subjected to.

Chair Hill asked ICM Kate Thomas to review the status of a subsidy that the County was looking into to assist Mr. Burleson. ICM Thomas responded that she would be sure to follow up.

County Clerk Jan Galassini informed that the remaining public commenters were all in Incline Village and would be heard virtually.

Ms. Herron introduced herself as the Director of Administrative Services for IVGID. She acknowledged the consideration Mr. Taylor gave to IVGID, and she stated her appreciation for his assistance with the error that was uncovered. She affirmed that the

recreation and beach facility fees were reversed when they were submitted to the County for billing on the FY 2026 tax bills. She advised that it was a human error and that IVGID would make all the corrections on their end by the close of the day. She apologized for the error and restated her appreciation for the help from the County team. She shared that IVGID recognized the need for the County to reissue all tax bills due to the error, and she expressed her hope that the adjustment could be accomplished by the County at no cost or at the cost billed initially, which was \$1,000. She voiced that IVGID appreciated and valued their collaborative working relationship with the County. Regarding Chair Hill's question about cash flow, she explained that she did not project any impact on County cash flow. She said the facility fees were pass-through fees. She informed that the fee reversal was an underbilling to owners who got the recreation fee without beach access, and roughly \$65 would be added to the bills of affected owners. She stated that no refunds should be issued. She offered to answer any questions Chair Hill had.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Herron for clarifying. She said she would ensure Ms. Herron's clarifications were included in the press release when it was prepared in collaboration with IVGID. She expressed her appreciation to Ms. Herron for attending the meeting and providing specific information and details.

Ms. Ann Nichols described the definition of insanity as doing the same thing repeatedly and expecting a different response. She viewed the actions of TRPA as a perfect example of that. She recalled that in 2012, the Regional Plan was changed to increase density, height, and coverage for the purpose of building more large developments. She reported that eight large developments were planned, none of which were completed. She noted that one of the projects, Boulder Bay, was in foreclosure, and she thought it was being sold that day. She understood that Phase 2 housing was underway and included more height, density, and coverage. She said Phase 2 housing had been built, and she remarked that the definition of affordable housing had been changed to remove any income cap, which affected financing for the projects. She felt that the definition Governor Joe Lombardo suggested for attainable housing made more sense than the TRPA definition. She explained that instead of no income cap, Governor Lombardo proposed using the benchmark of 150 percent of the average median income to describe attainable housing. She stated that TRPA had implemented Phase 3, which would further increase height, density, and coverage. She said that Phase 3 also increased the cap on development, which TRPA previously assured was firm and would not be exceeded. She thought the different definitions used for affordable housing were confusing and misleading.

**25-0527      AGENDA ITEM 4    Announcements/Reports.**

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas stated that Agenda Item 8 would allow for virtual public comment. She reminded the public that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would be on a summer break, with their next meeting being August 19, 2025. She announced that the Washoe County Checkbook Budget 101 discussion would be on July 22, 2025, at 5:30 p.m. She mentioned that the meeting would include an introductory review of funding sources and expenditures, with a focus on the new online Washoe County Checkbook, and she invited the public to attend.

Vice Chair Herman agreed with Commissioner Clark's prior comment about pulling Consent Agenda Item 7C1.

Commissioner Clark said he would reserve his comments for discussions on Agenda Items 7C1 and 8.

**25-0528**      **AGENDA ITEM 5A1**   University of Nevada, Reno Extension Annual Budget Presentation by Abbey Pike, Extension County Coordinator and Holly Gatzke, Northern Area Director. (All Commission Districts).

Holly Gatzke, Northern Area Director and Washoe County Extension Educator at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) Extension, and Abbey Pike, Washoe County Coordinator at the UNR Extension, greeted the Board and introduced themselves. Ms. Gatzke explained that she and Ms. Pike intended to engage in their annual discussion with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) concerning the proposed budget for the partnership between Washoe County and the UNR Extension to provide services throughout the County and fulfill the requirements of the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 549.020.

Ms. Gatzke summarized the information in the memorandum provided as backup documentation for Agenda Item 5A1. She referred to the *FY 2026 Projected Revenue* table on the memorandum's first page and explained that \$2.4 million in revenue from property taxes was expected to be collected during Fiscal Year (FY) 2026, which reflected an increase. She noted that the rise in collected property taxes corresponded with the amplified cost that the UNR Extension faced for the year. She expressed gratitude for the increased revenue, as it allowed the UNR Extension to maintain the operation of its activities. She explained that the value beneath the *Washoe County Special Revenue Account* row accounted for approximately \$600,000, which was expected to be sourced from State and federal funding.

Ms. Gatzke reported that the *Sponsored Projects & Other* row represented grants and had been listed with a projected revenue of \$2.1 million for FY 2026. She disclosed that the goal would sadly not be achieved, as the UNR Extension was recently notified that the organization lost its funding from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (SNAP-Ed) grant. She noted that the absence of SNAP-Ed funding would result in the loss of seven Washoe County positions, over \$700,000 in income for that program within her office, several UNR Campus positions associated with projects like *Rethink Your Drink*, and multiple subcontractors provided under that grant from the State. She opined that losing the grant would significantly impact and change Washoe County's educational efforts to teach the public about healthy living. She encouraged everyone to monitor what happened in the long-term following the loss of SNAP-Ed funding, as the UNR Extension had proven that for every dollar spent on education of that kind, approximately nine dollars were saved in future medical costs. She emphasized that while the impacts would take considerable time to show within society, they would ultimately be present. She reported that several other federal grants were of unknown and unfavorable status. She expected those contributions to decrease, though she noted that

staff at the UNR Extension were working hard to identify ways to proceed and consider what new opportunities were available to them.

Ms. Gatzke discussed the annual budget included in the memorandum. She referred to the table titled *Projected FY 2026 Budget Sources* on the second page of the memorandum. She described how funds within the *Projected Revenue* row would be used and why they were included separately from the opening balance, which was approximately \$2.7 million. She referred to the *Projected FY 2026 Budget Uses* table. She reported that \$2.25 million, or 93.6 percent of the organization's annual budget, would be used exclusively for personnel costs, reflecting most of the budget spent on staff educating the community and making a difference. She emphasized that while the organization would continue its core programs, it was also in the process of evaluating and focusing on what was needed. She assured the Board that the organization would continue regular conversations with the BCC to identify what they considered valuable for the County. She noted that the organization would also conduct those efforts for its other essential collaborators. She stated that she could review the rest of the budget in further detail, but opined that the other categories within that table operated in a very small portion of the remaining funds. Aside from personnel costs, she elaborated that the remaining categories accounted for maintaining the organization's overhead costs, minimal travel expenditures, and other similar expenses. She acknowledged a slight increase in personnel cost for FY 2026. She anticipated that the organization would hire more part-time student employees. She reported that Bob Potts, the former Deputy Director of the Nevada Governor's Office of Economic Development (GOED), had recently been hired at the UNR Extension. She was thrilled that Mr. Potts was a part of the organization's team investigating economic development. She reported that two staff members had recently announced their retirement from the organization, naming Professor Thomas Harris as one of them. She assured the Board that the UNR Extension was continuing its economic development programs and investigating workforce-related programs with Mr. Potts in collaboration with Clark County and other jurisdictions across the State. She reiterated her excitement to have Mr. Potts working at the UNR Extension due to his expertise and knowledge, which assisted the organization in developing excellent programs for the public.

Ms. Gatzke reported that many people were curious about the organization's use of contingency funds, which were listed on the last page of the memorandum. She explained that the total included within the *Contingency Funds* table reflected a significant amount of carryover for the UNR Extension to reduce its operations, if necessary, as those reductions would cost the organization approximately \$1 million in contracts and obligations with its personnel. She emphasized that while the UNR Extension did not want to take such action, staff wanted to ensure that the organization would not create a burden to society if such reductions became necessary. She reported that the organization's contingency funds also included the Building Fund. She recognized that due to the recent layoffs within the organization, there had been changes that indicated there might not be a shortage of building space. She opined that despite those factors, the organization still lacked things such as classroom space. She stated that the organization anticipated recovering from recent losses and moving forward in the future, indicating that UNR had put the UNR Extension on a list to receive funding for a building that was



expected in approximately seven years. She explained that the Building Fund represented the funds set aside for architectural costs and planning fees to ensure the construction of the new building. She acknowledged that while such events would occur many years in the future, the organization wanted to ensure that it had the capacity and capability to grow with and support the needs of the County. She noted that the organization's contingency funds included accounts that acted as backup for grant risks, as depicted in the table. She acknowledged that while the value listed for the new *Back-up for grant risk accounts* row was small, it was included to assist employees by accounting for their needs when funding from received grants was not yet available to the organization. She referred to the row titled *Bridge funding for grant losses* and reported that it represented a new use for the organization's contingency funds. She explained that the reserve accounted for just under \$500,000 and had been included because the organization anticipated additional impacts from the loss of grants on the UNR Extension's programs. She observed that those funds enabled the organization to keep key staff employed after losing grant funding while also overseeing new funding opportunities and identifying additional prospects for supporting existing staff members between periods with and without grant support. She noted that such actions would be taken to maintain the jobs of good people without any gaps in their employment. She acknowledged that the funds set aside for that purpose were minimal compared to the organization's total personnel reduction, and comprehensive losses were ultimately still expected. She emphasized that the UNR Extension was putting all its effort into supporting the community to the best of its ability and identifying opportunities to do so despite anticipated reductions. She asked the Board if they had any questions.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Gatzke and reported receiving an email about the SNAP-Ed benefit reduction. Chair Hill apologized for the funding loss and acknowledged that 35 employees at UNR could lose their jobs as a result, based on her understanding of the situation. She noted that the programs supported by the SNAP-Ed grant helped children with nutritional education and reduced sugar-sweetened beverage consumption. She explained that the UNR Extension seemed to serve 1,500 individuals throughout the County with the SNAP-Ed benefit alone. She opined that the loss of those programs would be felt throughout the community. She noted that the Board appreciated Ms. Gatzke for bringing that to the BCC's and the public's attention. She hoped people would want to support the UNR Extension's programs and consider how they could help provide for what was lost, as those programs were essential for the community.

Ms. Gatzke noted that the organization was grateful for the information being spread. She emphasized that helping people eat healthily on a limited budget and encouraging healthy diets prevented many problems for the lives of individuals, the community, and the world. Chair Hill thanked Ms. Gatzke.

Commissioner Garcia continued Chair Hill's remarks, as she believed it necessary to emphasize the loss that had been mentioned. She explained that SNAP-Ed was a 25-year nutritional and outreach program that had helped all 17 counties in Nevada. She acknowledged that funding cuts were devastating to the UNR Extension's staff, the programming, and all the proactive work the organization could have done with the funding. She opined that it was not the right time to take away such valuable programs

when America was battling against obesity and other diseases. She asked Ms. Gatzke to keep the Board informed about any ways the County could partner with the UNR Extension on opportunities to spread the word about the great work the organization was doing. She encouraged Ms. Gatzke to continue her efforts and acknowledged that it was a difficult time for many.

Chair Hill appreciated the updates from Ms. Gatzke and Ms. Pike and expressed that the Board was incredibly proud to partner with them in the work they did for the community. Chair Hill noted that she did not have any feedback on their presented budget. She anticipated seeing the UNR Extension programs that the organization could progress throughout the year. She urged Ms. Gatzke to invite the Board to the organization's public programs so Commissioners could attend and support them, as the BCC loved to meet the community served by the organization and show everyone that the Board was their partner. Ms. Gatzke thanked Chair Hill and expressed her appreciation for her comments.

**25-0529      AGENDA ITEM 5A2    Appearance by Washoe County Recorder, Kalie Work to provide an update on the Recorder's Office.**

Washoe County Recorder Kalie Work greeted the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and expressed excitement about providing them with her presentation. She introduced the Board to the new Chief Deputy Recorder of the Washoe County Recorder's Office (WCRO), Gail Spearman, who had been an employee of the WCRO for 29 years. Ms. Spearman stated that she was happy to be in her position and support Ms. Work. Ms. Work thanked the Board for inviting the WCRO to present during the meeting and noted that some time had passed since the WCRO conducted such a presentation. She wanted to inform the Board about the WCRO regarding what staff had been doing and what was planned for the future. She noted that the second half of her presentation would review what the public should be aware of concerning property fraud, though she did not intend to alarm anyone.

Ms. Work conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe County Recorder Update; About the WCRO; Current Org Chart; WCRO Budget Overview; Stats-at-a-Glance FY25; Real Property Transfer Tax; Citizen Satisfaction Surveys; Recent Initiatives; Understanding Property Scams; What's happening in our region?; Steps to Protect Your Property; Recording Notification Service; Looking Ahead at Future Initiatives; Resources; Thank You.

Ms. Work introduced the slide titled *About the WCRO* and acknowledged that the Board was likely aware she was serving in her second term as the Washoe County Recorder. She stated that she was the president of the Records Association of Nevada (RAN) and represented the County on the Nevada County Fiscal Officers Association (CFOA). She explained that despite being in her second term, the mission of the WCRO remained the same: to record, permanently preserve, and provide convenient access to public records for the community. She explained that staff at the WCRO wanted to achieve those goals with superior public service. She speculated that the Board might be curious

about the type of documents being recorded at the WCRO, which she explained could span from property records to financing documents, maps, marriage records, and more. She emphasized that her goal had always been to identify how to make it easy for the public to do business with the WCRO. She noted that when reviewing the projects, initiatives, and daily activities of the WCRO, her objective could be divided into four main categories. She listed the categories as security, innovation, accessibility and transparency, and public service.

Ms. Work displayed the *Current Org Chart* slide. She described the WCRO as a small but mighty team, noting that the department consisted of 24 employees when fully staffed. She explained that the WCRO currently had 22 employees and two vacancies. She referred to the chart on the slide and identified the two divisions of the WCRO, the Recording Services Division and the Communications Division. She explained that the Administrative Assistant position was part of the Communications Division. She noted that outside those divisions, the WCRO staff included a Business Technologist (BT) who reported directly to her and a Real Property Transfer Tax (RPTT) Compliance Auditor who oversaw the collection of all transfer taxes and their related exemptions.

Ms. Work showed the slide titled *WCRO Budget Overview*. She mentioned her earlier statement about the WCRO team being small but mighty, elaborating that staff completed all the WCRO's annual operations on a budget of approximately \$3 million across two different funds. She reported that the WCRO's budget included a General Fund and a Technology Fund. She recounted that the BCC had graciously approved the annually reviewed Technology Fund at the previous BCC meeting. She explained that the WCRO's Technology Fund accounted for software, disaster recovery, and historical book preservation costs.

Ms. Work introduced the *Stats-at-a-Glance FY25* slide. She thought reviewing what the WCRO did throughout Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 would be appropriate because she was conducting her presentation in July. She explained that the WCRO recorded approximately 100,000 documents in FY 2025, which increased from the 88,000 recordings conducted during the previous FY. She noted that 5,700 of those recordings were for marriage documents, reporting that the WCRO had seen the frequency of marriages declining in the community each year. She explained that Washoe County used to be one of the primary marriage destinations in the Nation, which was a fact she thought County Clerk Jan Galassini would be familiar with. She explained that in FY 2025, the WCRO collected \$3.2 million from the office's statutory recording fees and \$30.6 million in RPTT, which was gathered anytime a property was conveyed to a new buyer. She explained that RPTT was collected on behalf of the State of Nevada, went to taxation, and a portion was later reallocated for things like County consolidated tax (c-tax), low-income housing support, and other similar matters. She reported that the WCRO took the office's calls and questions from the public directly. She noted that the WCRO had the second most viewed website amongst the County's departments, second only to the Assessor's Office. She explained that 22,000 phone calls were managed by the WCRO's Communications Division in FY 2025, which resulted in almost 32,000 copy requests, primarily for marriage documents. She noted that the phone call rates in FY 2025 were relatively high, as the

WCRO took an average of 17,000 phone calls and 25,000 copy requests each year, representing an increase that she attributed to the new federal requirement for REAL ID. She stated that she had included resources for where additional statistics for the WCRO could be found at the end of her presentation. She explained that the WCRO website had a page dedicated to statistics where people could view the trends and complete history of the office.

Ms. Work displayed the slide titled *Real Property Transfer Tax* and acknowledged that she had previously mentioned RPTT briefly. She reported that the WCRO had collected approximately \$30 million on behalf of the State of Nevada during FY 2025. She noted that the County collected \$2.05 for every \$500 of a property's value.

Ms. Work showed the *Citizen Satisfaction Surveys* slide. She stated that the slide displayed the WCRO's citizen satisfaction survey, an effort she launched in 2019. She explained that the WCRO staff requested the public to take a comprehensive survey after completing their transaction at the office. She wanted to highlight the significant work done on the survey, as her team had received tremendous results due to the substantial activity at the WCRO during FY 2025. She hoped to draw attention to the WCRO staff because public service was one of the office's strengths. She expressed pride in her staff for helping to sustain the great numbers reflected by the results of the survey.

Ms. Work introduced the *Recent Initiatives* slide. She stated that she loved surveys because they could provide much information. She reported that several changes in the WCRO had been implemented due to the feedback provided by the public, and the survey results had been instrumental in determining the initiatives the WCRO wanted to pursue. She explained that the WCRO invested in a large-scale digitization project in recent years, which involved digitizing nine million of the office's property records with the assistance of a vendor. She said it ultimately took over a year to complete. She noted that the sub-bullet on the listed initiatives reflected the current effort of the WCRO's digitization project. She explained that the current project, which involved scanning and indexing more of the WCRO's marriage records dating back to the inception of the County, was being conducted in-house. She opined that digitizing those marriage records was a tremendous endeavor, and the WCRO would evaluate how much progress could be made while handling the project in-house before seeking budget for it. She noted that another of the significant initiatives of the WCRO she had focused on over the previous few years was business continuity. She explained that the WCRO had vital documents that needed to be maintained in perpetuity, which led to staff also spending significant time on disaster recovery initiatives. She remarked that the WCRO could invest in a software test environment due to the Board's support of the WCRO's Technology Fund update the year prior. She explained that the investment allowed the WCRO to test software before any significant changes or updates were implemented. She intended to discuss the WCRO's Recording Notification Service in further detail later in her presentation.

Ms. Work displayed the slide titled *Understanding Property Scams* and opined that everybody should be aware of property fraud, also called deed or document fraud. She explained that the WCRO monitored property fraud locally, across the State,

and throughout the Nation. She described the WCRO's membership within the Property Records Industry Association (PRIA). She explained that PRIA was an organization where recorders Nationwide surveilled the presence of new scams, developments, and ways to remain prepared for them. She emphasized that PRIA members always endeavored to improve in those efforts to instill best practices in their offices. She introduced the *What's happening in our region?* slide and reiterated that she did not want to alarm anyone. She stated that she contacted the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) the week prior to verify that there were no known property fraud cases in Washoe County at that time, although there had been attempts at fraudulent activity. She specified that the WCRO saw scammers target vacant land, which was the primary example of property fraud and was relatively common throughout the Country. She opined that the community was lucky that there had been no evidence that those fraudulent attempts had been successful, though she emphasized that criminals were still a threat. She wanted the public to remain aware of property fraud as the world evolved with artificial intelligence (AI) because criminals often leveraged data from public information.

Ms. Work acknowledged that she had reached the end of her allotted time for her presentation. Chair Hill invited Ms. Work to continue. Ms. Work assured Chair Hill that she would be brief in conducting the remainder of her presentation. Chair Hill insisted that Ms. Work should not worry and urged her to continue, as the Board wanted to ensure they understood all the elements of the WCRO. Ms. Work thanked Chair Hill.

Ms. Work displayed the slide titled *Steps to Protect Your Property*. She referred to her previous mention of the RAN, noting that the organization had an area of its website titled *About Property Fraud*. She explained that there were ways an individual could protect themselves if they had ever been a victim of fraud, and described what could be done to reduce the likelihood of that. She stated that she had seen people set up Google Alerts and had heard about individuals subscribing to private entity groups like Home Title Lock. She introduced the *Recording Notification Service* slide and notified the Board and the public that the WCRO had a free service called the Recording Notification Service. She explained that homeowners could create an account for the service, log in, and list their Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) or different variations of their first, middle, or last name to receive an automated email alert from the WCRO any time a record was put on the public record through the WCRO that was related to the name on their property. She suggested that homeowners register for the service for free, as it took less than three minutes and was a gold standard for recorder's offices across the Nation.

Ms. Work showed the *Looking Ahead at Future Initiatives* slide and explained that she would discuss what the Board could expect from her over the following 12 to 18 months. She acknowledged that she would soon appear before the Board again to discuss a bulk copy request fee, which she wanted them to be aware of. She explained that the fee was related to the WCRO witnessing new companies and AI title firms wanting access to historical records. She opined that it was likely time for the WCRO to refresh the office's bulk copy request fee. She reported that she was also looking to update the WCRO's software agreement with its vendor, with whom they had partnered since 1998 or 1999. She explained that there had only been a few refreshable agreements since that

time, and there was a desire to standardize and use more modern language related to maintenance and support. She noted that the WCRO was actively working with its software vendor to update the related content. She emphasized that book and record preservation was always a priority for the WCRO staff, as they considered it necessary. She noted that the WCRO was assessing the potential impacts of AI on deed fraud prevention, including how to prepare, monitor related opportunities, and be more advanced. She stated that the WCRO would ensure that integrity and information security would remain a primary consideration of the office. She concluded her presentation and noted that she was open to any questions from the Board.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Work and opined that the County was very lucky to have a recorder who embraced technology, had expertise, and emphasized customer service. Chair Hill appreciated Ms. Work for ensuring that the County served the public well and opined that the statistics Ms. Work provided during the presentation were amazing.

Vice Chair Herman thanked Ms. Work for her thorough job and the wonderful service the WCRO provided the public, which she felt very confident about. Ms. Work thanked Vice Chair Herman.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Ms. Work for taking the time to inform the BCC about the good work that she was doing. Commissioner Garcia commended the WCRO staff for improving customer service while experiencing many increases in recordings and phone calls. She was excited to hear that the WCRO used surveys to launch its new initiatives. She noted that it was very easy for individuals to visit the WCRO website to download forms and look at fees. She explained that she frequently received questions from people curious about how the WCRO's fees were established, who decided the costs, and how often they changed. She acknowledged that other boards or agencies sometimes considered redoing their fees. She referred to the WCRO's website, noting that it displayed the various agencies and departments the office's fees went through. She asked whether Ms. Work could clarify how the WCRO's fees worked.

Ms. Work explained that there was a substantial initiative in the 2017 Nevada Legislative Session to standardize recording fees and implement a flat rate recording fee for the majority of documents. She noted that general recordings typically cost \$43, which was statutory. She explained that fees for Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) recordings would cost much more, as outlined on the WCRO website. She reported that taxes were also involved in the cost of the WCRO's fees, which the Board voted on and approved. She supposed that the WCRO's fees could be subject to change, though she would have to verify whether or not the Legislature had set any of the fees in question.

Commissioner Garcia acknowledged that the County was moving towards more language acquisition initiatives and noted that the downloadable forms on the WCRO's website included separate columns for the documents to be accessed in English and Spanish. She asked Ms. Work if anything had changed in the WCRO regarding the availability of Spanish documents. Ms. Work explained that the WCRO worked with the

County's Communications Team near the end of the previous calendar year to implement a migration that translated the WCRO's documents into Spanish. She stated that all publicly available documents from the WCRO should be accessible in Spanish as a result.

Commissioner Clark thanked Ms. Work for her report and opined that she did an excellent job for the County. He acknowledged that while she served as the Washoe County Recorder, she handled everything related to recordings for the jurisdictions in Reno and Sparks. He emphasized his belief that she was doing a great job in her role and opined that the Board was lucky to have two great examples of elected officials doing so at the BCC meeting that day. He noted that she worked closely with the Assessor and Treasurer, and thought she likely also collaborated with the Clerk, who all represented departments he believed were performing well. He suggested that the WCRO was earning money based on the office's budget and its generated profits, representing a good return on investment. He expressed that it was pleasant to have the WCRO doing a good job while being involved in little to no controversy. He acknowledged that Ms. Spearman was standing beside Ms. Work and noted that she had 29 years in service with the County, which was nearly 30. He noted that Ms. Spearman's retirement could be a challenge in the future. He congratulated Ms. Spearman on her appointment as Chief Deputy Recorder and her good work at the WCRO. He urged Ms. Work and Ms. Spearman to keep up their excellent work.

Chair Hill noted that she had a question for Ms. Work regarding RPTT. She recounted that constituents had reached out to her to express their uncertainty about whether their neighbor was reporting when someone had passed away, and they had subsequently taken over a property. She asked whether there was a way to check that the correct process had been done or if there was a way to report when it was conducted. She noted that she was only curious about how the process worked and did not intend to seem negative by assuming ill intent by those concerned.

Ms. Work explained that the WCRO collected RPTT each time a property was conveyed to a new owner. She noted that there were exemptions to RPTT listed through taxation, such as for adding a spouse. She described that there had previously been 14 exemptions, with another being added that year, which were outlined in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) as reasons why an individual might not need to pay RPTT when conveying property to another person. She reiterated that specific examples, such as adding a spouse, would exempt an individual. However, she emphasized that people would otherwise be subject to the required RPTT when buying or selling a property.

Chair Hill noted that she would direct constituents to the NRS and Washoe 311 if they wanted to follow up. Ms. Work assured Chair Hill that the WCRO staffed an RPTT Compliance Auditor responsible for auditing RPTT and ensuring that the office collected what was required on behalf of the State of Nevada. She noted that the WCRO cleanly managed those efforts. Chair Hill thanked Ms. Work for doing an excellent job and emphasized that the Board looked forward to continuing collaboration with her and the WCRO.

## **DONATIONS**

- 25-0530**      **6A1** Recommendation to accept cash donations totaling \$43,379.05: [\$22,068.50 Lazy 5 Summer Music Series, Come In From The Cold, general donations for North Valleys Regional Park, Bowers Regional Park, and Lazy 5 Park]; [\$33.05 from the donation drop box at the May Museum]; [\$17,660.00 May Foundation reimbursements for Past Perfect Software, Manpower purchase order, and advertising]; [\$1,992.50 closure of an old Museum Gift Store account]; [\$1,625.00 to the Arboretum for bricks, general maintenance and support] for Regional Parks and Open Space programs and facilities; and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Andriola absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 6A1 be accepted.

## **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 7A1 THROUGH 7E2, EXCLUDING PULLED AGENDA ITEM 7C1 HEARD SEPARATELY**

- 25-0531**      **7A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of June 10, 2025, June 17, 2025, and June 24, 2025; the special meeting of June 25, 2025; and the workshop of June 25, 2025. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0532**      **7B1** Recommendation to approve the Second Amendment to Joint Funding Agreement between Washoe County, Truckee Meadows Water Authority, and Cities of Reno, Sparks, and Fernley, for the sharing of a portion of the administrative fees for the Truckee River Operating Agreement, retroactive to June 30, 2025, and extending the Joint Funding Agreement to September 30, 2030 [in the amount of \$74,092.64 for fiscal year 2025, with estimated increases to \$77,500.00 for fiscal year 2026 and \$80,000.00 for fiscal year 2027], pending Federal Water Master determination. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0533**      **7C2** Recommendation to approve the annual schedule of audits, reviews, and work plan for the Internal Audit Division, which is required to be presented to the Board of County Commissioners for their approval pursuant to Washoe County Code 15.560. Finance. (All Commission Districts.).
- 25-0534**      **7D1** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$2,500.00] for Fiscal Year 2025-2026; District 2 Commissioner Mike Clark recommends a



[\$2,500.00] grant to Reno Initiative for Shelter & Equality (RISE) – a nonprofit organization created for charitable, religious, or educational purposes - to support partner organization Laundry to the People and its mission of aiding unhoused individuals with laundry service; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct Finance to make the necessary disbursement of funds. Manager's Office. (Commission District 2.).

**25-0535**      **7E1** Recommendation to approve an Interlocal Agreement between Washoe County, the City of Reno, and the City of Sparks to establish a board to study regional fire and emergency services options pursuant to Senate Bill 319 of the 83rd Session of the Nevada Legislature. [Total estimated fiscal impact of \$974] Manager. (All Commission Districts.).

**25-0536**      **7E2** Recommendation to approve a Letter of Intent for the FFY 2025 Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG). Letter of Intent is stating the State of Nevada, Division of Emergency Management (NDEM) is awarding [\$86,272.17, \$86,272.17 County match required] for FFY 2025 including funds to be used for travel; retroactive from October 1, 2024, through September 30, 2026; If approved authorize the County Manager or designee to sign the grant award documents when received; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Manager. (All Commission Districts.).

Commissioner Clark pulled Agenda Item 7C1 from the Consent Agenda.

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

On motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Andriola absent, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7E2, with the exclusion of Item 7C1, be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7E2, with the exclusion of Item 7C1, are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**25-0537**      **7C1** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the completed review for the Department of Alternative Sentencing from the Internal Audit Division. The purpose of this review was to assess DAS's processes and procedures for operational efficiency and identify opportunities for improvement; help streamline activities, eliminate any inefficiencies, and enhance overall effectiveness; and provide recommendations to improve the control environment. Finance. (All Commission Districts.).

Commissioner Clark recalled that *This Is Reno* published an article regarding the Department of Alternative Sentencing's (DASs) internal audit, and he wondered how the concerns had persisted for so long. He pointed out that he expressed

concern two years prior regarding the former DAS department head allegedly spending much of his time in Las Vegas assisting with his wife's business. He felt chastised for discussing his concerns and asked how the County could prevent further issues with the DAS. He explained that other department heads complained about the DAS's excessive yearly budget overage and unavailability. He reported that a federal agency had never closed a County facility before. He expressed concern regarding the former County Manager's bonus and salary increase when DAS errors and concerns were not reported.

Internal Auditor Manager Katelyn Kleidosty did not know why DAS concerns were not addressed three years ago. She explained that the DAS was added to the Internal Audit Division's (IADs) schedule the previous year, per the Audit Committee and the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) approval. She reported that the IAD investigated DAS efficiencies and performed an internal control assessment. Chair Hill expressed pride in the IAD staff because they found problems within departments while providing recommendations. She indicated that the County would not necessarily catch all errors without the IAD.

Chair Hill asked Ms. Kleidosty to expand on the role of an internal auditor. Ms. Kleidosty noted that the IAD reviewed the DAS and provided a report that included recommendations while working with the management team to create a response and implementation plan. She explained that once the recommendations were given, it was up to the department to implement the changes. She said that the IAD followed up one year after the audit to see how the recommended changes affected the department.

Commissioner Clark believed that staff were not to blame when errors occurred; however, he wanted management to be addressed. He thought that the IAD did a great job and wondered why someone had not requested the IAD to perform a DAS review three years ago. He thought that the DAS's errors were an embarrassment to the County and noted that they had led to a federal investigation. He asked Ms. Kleidosty which federal agency closed the DAS facility. Ms. Kleidosty reported that the United States Secret Service (USSS) was the federal agency involved. Commissioner Clark wished to know why the errors were not caught before the USSS got involved.

Chair Hill asserted that local government made mistakes and that corruption could exist; however, she was proud that the County supported a two-person IAD. She recalled that many local agencies laid off their audit staff and outsourced services. She thought that having the IAD was valuable and that they created reports that the public could review. She indicated that the County needed to perform better and believed that the IAD was assisting with that progress.

Vice Chair Herman noted that she was a member of the Audit Committee. Chair Hill thanked Vice Chair Herman for her work on the Audit Committee.

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas expressed that the DAS's oversight and ownership of errors fell on the executive staff. She indicated that she had direct oversight of the DAS and acknowledged that the department was not performing

well, but she was glad that issues were identified and recommendations were made. She assured the Commissioners that the County took audit recommendations into consideration to strengthen the organization. She said that the Board would likely see proposed suggestions regarding the improvement of DAS processes and procedures. She thanked the BCC and the IAD for their assistance and support. Chair Hill noted that it would take time to structurally investigate the recommendations from the Raftelis report; however, she believed that distributing the departmental workload between the Assistant County Managers (ACMs) was important and needed improvement.

Commissioner Clark appreciated ICM Thomas's comments and her work to correct concerns. He wanted to know if there were other departments with large concerns that could be addressed. He opined that it was important to hear the public's opinion and that the individuals the DAS provided services to were fragile and not treated fairly. Chair Hill commended Commissioner Clark for addressing concerns and indicated that Human Resources (HR) created new processes based on his concerns.

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

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Andriola absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 7C1 be approved.

**25-0538**      **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to introduce and conduct a first reading of an ordinance amending the Washoe County Code at Chapter 110 (Development Code) to update Articles 220 Tahoe Area and 220.1 Tahoe Area Design Standards. These updates include adding a section to establish standards for affordable, moderate, and achievable housing in multifamily areas. These updates also include amending various sections to: amend references to the prior Washoe County master plan and update organizational names; clarify application requirements for amendments to Articles 220 and 220.1; update references to the TRPA's code of ordinances related to land coverage; update maximum height and minimum residential density in town centers; add standards for height, parking, density and coverage for affordable, moderate, and achievable housing in town centers; update standards for bicycle storage; provide for reductions in parking minimums for affordable, moderate, and achievable housing, and add standards for the submittal and review of the required parking analysis; modify minimum lot width and setbacks for residential and mixed use developments in preferred affordable areas; modify requirements for encroachment into front yard setbacks on corner and sloped lots; modify standards for accessory dwelling units; modify standards for temporary uses; require development within avalanche hazard areas to record a hold harmless agreement; modify explanation of use tables to clarify the meaning of "A" and add administrative review permit; modify permitting requirements for multiple family dwellings in Crystal Bay Tourist, Incline

Village Tourist, and Incline Village Commercial; add Schools-Kindergarten through Secondary Schools as a special use in Incline Village Tourist; add multiple family dwellings and employee housing as allowed uses and update special policies in the Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone; allow single family dwellings by right in the Incline Village 5, Crystal Bay, and East Shore regulatory zones, and require a hold harmless agreement for development in the Incline Village 5 and Crystal Bay regulatory zones; and update special policies for Crystal Bay; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. And if supported, set a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for August 26, 2025. Community Services. (Commission District 1.).

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1934.

Senior Planner, Dr. Eric Young conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: 2025 Tahoe Area Plan Update; Background; Focus of 2025 TAP update; Scheduled Amendments; TRPA Phase 2 Housing Amendments; Parking Analysis; Workforce Housing Amendments; Accessory Dwelling Units; Code Improvements (2 slides); Changes Since Planning Commission Public Hearing; Public Outreach (2 slides); Response to Public Input; Recommendations; Thank You; Growth Management; Accessory Dwelling Units.

Dr. Young reviewed the slide titled *Background* and said that the Tahoe Area Plan (TAP) and Tahoe Development Code (TDC) were adopted together in 2021. He clarified that TAP functioned as the Master Plan, while the TDC served as the regulatory document. He noted that Articles 220 and 220.1 were oftentimes known as the Tahoe modifiers. He reviewed the slide titled *Focus of 2025 TAP Update* and said that the update focused on two broad areas. He noted that the first area was the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) mandated changes, which included two types of changes. He stated that the first mandated change had recently been adopted by TRPA, known as Phase 2 Housing Amendments. He mentioned that the second was known as the Scheduled Amendments, which both regional planning agencies followed. He explained that when a plan was adopted, the agencies provided a list of items to be revised when future amendments were introduced. He said that both the Phase 2 Housing Amendments and Scheduled Amendments were TRPA-mandated changes but were brought forward independently by Washoe County. He noted that staff identified areas for improvement and responded to the Board's Strategic Plan priorities and to a Lake Tahoe Basinwide request for added workforce housing opportunities.

Dr. Young reviewed the slide titled *Scheduled Amendments* and stated that, at the time the plan was adopted in 2021, staff were notified that they needed to identify which regulatory zones could receive transferred development rights (TDRs) and to replace the rules that had been removed related to Ponderosa Ranch. He reviewed the slide titled *TRPA Phase 2 Housing Amendments* and said that Phase 2 Housing Amendments represented the most significant area of community interest and received the most community response. He explained that when TRPA reviewed the amendments before the

mandated adoption process, Washoe County residents were the most represented, participated in the discussion, and provided comments. He indicated that many comments focused on parking, coverage, height, and density. He added that changes to parking, height, and density standards were made to both the town centers and areas zoned multifamily. He mentioned that the impacted areas were Incline Village and Crystal Bay, along Tahoe Boulevard, near the town centers. He offered to provide additional detailed information if the Board desired. He emphasized that TRPA's mandates applied to all jurisdictions within its region, not only Washoe County.

Dr. Young reviewed the slide titled *Parking Analysis* and said that there were frequent concerns heard from the community in response to the mandated changes, specifically the new parking requirements. He mentioned that TRPA suggested that the parking analysis should allow zero parking requirements. He noted that parking was a big issue that had been discussed consistently for decades. He believed that the idea of eliminating parking requirements was very difficult for residents to accept. He explained that TRPA rules stated simply *a parking analysis*, without a framework of what a parking analysis meant. He believed that implied anyone could submit anything. He said that Washoe County staff worked to develop parameters that outlined a parking analysis, what it should include, and how it could be used to determine whether a parking reduction would be appropriate. He stated that Washoe County staff added those parameters in response to public input.

Dr. Young reviewed the slide titled *Workforce Housing Amendments* regarding initiatives that Washoe County did independently. He stated the initiatives included workforce housing amendments and a variety of amendments throughout the Area Plan to allow the possibility for additional deed-restricted housing. He noted that the biggest changes were to the Ponderosa Ranch regulatory zone to allow multi-family and deed-restricted multifamily housing.

Dr. Young reviewed the slide titled *Accessory Dwelling Units* and said Washoe County viewed accessory dwelling units (ADUs) as a potential place for workforce and deed-restricted housing. He indicated that currently, ADUs intended for workforce housing were restricted to one-acre parcels. He noted that throughout the basin, the restriction had been changed, although Washoe County had not yet changed. He mentioned that staff were continuing with a proposal to allow ADUs up to 1,200 square feet (SF) in size on parcels smaller than one acre. He said that the restriction limited the size but allowed for less than one acre. He stated that staff had received feedback regarding ADUs from the community with concerns about overall growth, infrastructure, and fire evacuation.

Dr. Young reviewed the slide titled *Code Improvements* and said that the Staff Report described detailed code improvements. He noted that several simple clarifications were made throughout the plan. He mentioned that one area in the plan required a special use permit (SUP) for a single-family home, which would be removed. He explained that a variety of things that were found in the last several years of implementation would be removed. He reviewed the second slide titled *Code*

*Improvements* and emphasized the importance of aligning Washoe County's processes with TRPA's for temporary uses. He stated that long and short-term bike parking were something that the community felt would be useful, so those requirements were updated.

Dr. Young reviewed the slide titled *Changes since Planning Commission Public Hearing* and said that there were revisions since the recent Planning Commission (PC) public hearing. He explained that the original proposal included zoning changes for the Tyrolian Village Special Area, which had been removed and were no longer part of the package. He stated that the PC heard the concerns, and relevant changes had been removed. He mentioned that language was added to clarify that TRPA had a separate plan process from Washoe County. He said that TRPA referred to the County's Master Plan and Development Code as TAP, which was one document. He indicated that language was added to clarify that even though TRPA administered them as one document, Washoe County would continue to administer them as two separate documents, the TAP being the Master Plan and the Washoe County Development Code (WCDC).

Dr. Young reviewed the slide titled *Public Outreach* and said that extensive public outreach began in early 2025 and included kickoff meetings, pop-up events, and a series of draft reviews and surveys. He thanked Saint Francis of Assisi Catholic Church for assisting with a Spanish-language survey. He noted that staff conducted a webinar and multiple workshops. He mentioned that most of the public comments focused on Phase 2 Housing Amendments, particularly concerns about mandated changes related to parking, density, and height issues, which, regrettably, staff were required to implement. He said some of the community's issues were concerns about growth and not promoting additional growth, even if it was income-restricted. He indicated that there were concerns around trust in TRPA and whether it was an appropriate system. He explained that TRPA's view of deed-restricted housing was extremely broad, and one of their tiers for affordable deed-restricted housing did not reference income but referenced whether someone lived and worked in the basin. He noted that the community's concerns had been raised frequently.

Dr. Young reviewed the second slide, titled *Public Outreach*, and said some of the persistent and common points of input received related to fire evacuation and parking. He added that concerns with the environment were something that staff found in all Tahoe-related amendments. He mentioned that the community supported workforce housing and the process to create opportunities. He stated that there were concerns regarding the impacts on infrastructure and fire evacuation. He noted that there was a lack of belief in the TRPA approach to affordable housing.

Dr. Young reviewed the slide titled *Response to Public Input* and said that Washoe County staff worked extensively with TRPA to find alternatives to their approach to parking, height, and density, but were unable to develop language that TRPA supported. He mentioned that Washoe County added clear language to the parking modifications to ensure that parking studies were not open-ended and were required to include specific information. He stated that there was code included that supported workforce housing, especially in the Ponderosa Ranch area.

Dr. Young said staff recommended introducing and conducting a first reading for the WCDC amendment, setting a public hearing for the second reading, and possibly adopting the ordinance on August 26, 2025.

Chair Hill recalled working with Dr. Young in 2021 on the initial changes to the TAP. Since she was immersed in the project and served on various boards and committees, she asked for clarification on TRPA's role in relation to the County's. She felt it was important for the Board to understand the difference in the roles.

Dr. Young said TRPA was a regional planning agency, similar to Washoe County's Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA), except that at Lake Tahoe, TRPA had more significant authority over current planning and development. He explained that TMRPA was a high-level view that reviewed only the Master Plan to ensure it was in conformance. He noted that the WCDC was never reviewed by TMRPA. He mentioned that at Lake Tahoe, TRPA had the authority to review all forms of development and levels of planning. He indicated that TRPA, through a variety of interlocal agreements and memorandums of understanding (MOUs), delegated some authority to various jurisdictions, including Washoe County. He said that, overall, the authority that TRPA had been given by Congress allowed them to review the WCDC as well as the Master Plan for conformance with TRPA's codes. He believed that was the significant difference between Lake Tahoe and other places. He noted that the process had evolved over time and had been that way for a while. He stated that there was always an opportunity to rethink that and added that TRPA was more open for discussion than it appeared. He said that currently, TRPA had the full land use planning authority unless it delegated that to Washoe County through an MOU.

Chair Hill noted that some of the written public comments received by the Board suggested that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) did not necessarily have to follow TRPA's direction. She said her understanding was that TRPA could respond by taking over the planning function in Washoe County and could mandate the changes regardless.

Dr. Young indicated that other jurisdictions had not followed the same process as the County. He mentioned that Washoe County chose to go through the process and to include TRPA in a County-sponsored process to provide the community with an opportunity for input and to try and work with TRPA staff to develop alternative language. He explained that if the County had not done that, TRPA would have adopted the amendments on the County's behalf, as it had done in several other jurisdictions. He noted that Washoe County chose to follow the process to allow the community opportunities to provide input, to discuss alternative language, and to allow for a more comprehensive package. He said that without including the mandated amendments, they would have been implemented regardless.

Chair Hill commended the team for their impressive public outreach efforts, including providing a Spanish translation and conducting a workshop. She felt that the staff

had done a great deal to ensure public input was received. She noted the community learned a lot from the Washoe County Code (WCC) amendments related to affordable housing.

Vice Chair Herman believed that Dr. Young and staff had a difficult job. She agreed that the community's concerns were serious, and she felt that both the public and staff faced difficult decisions. She noted that Dr. Young put a lot of thought into the project and believed he had done a good job. She appreciated the hard work but expressed concern about the outcome. She mentioned that the public had shared concerns with her regarding six-story buildings and believed that there were issues when thinking about how to evacuate the people who lived there currently. She wondered, as the population increased, how those residents would be evacuated. She said there were many things to consider.

Dr. Young said that he was not the lead for the project, and it was a team effort. He noted that Washoe County had smart, dedicated staff who spent time with the community to find a solution. He realized that the concerns about fire were persistent and said that he could only share information from the fire experts and emergency management personnel. He mentioned that an evacuation study would be conducted to evaluate any potential changes, including the proposed amendments. He indicated that, as concerning as it sounded, having people concentrated was preferable for evacuation purposes. He explained that one of the new mitigations to fire that was being promoted was the hardening of existing structures. He noted that overall, one of the preferred approaches was not necessarily full evacuation, but to have people in a place where they could be protected. He said that information would be discussed and explained in the upcoming evacuation study, where various scenarios would be reviewed. He stated that he was unsure how people who put together a study would respond and approach those scenarios. He thought it would be regrettable to conduct a study without the previously mentioned proposals because TRPA would proceed either way. He felt that any study should include the changes. He said the topic was complex and he respected the fears and concerns of the community. He noted that Washoe County would look to its emergency management professionals for their opinion. He indicated that it had not been communicated to staff that the project should not move forward.

Commissioner Garcia noted that it was uncommon for the Board to receive messages of appreciation regarding staff efforts on complex processes. She said they had received such an email, which highlighted the time and diligence staff dedicated to spreading the word, engaging the community, listening, and, most importantly, trying to help negotiate solutions. She asked Dr. Young to describe the top issues where staff felt they needed to voice concerns or push back, particularly on matters where the County was not successful, but which the Commissioners should be aware of.

Dr. Young pointed out that parking, height, density, and coverage were the four things in the mandated Phase 2 Amendments. He believed that height and density were issues that staff tried to provide information and data on. He stated that there was a serious growth cap throughout the basin, and there had not been discussions about raising the cap. He felt that there should be a discussion on how to distribute what land was left, and



whether the majority could be used for affordable housing or workforce housing rather than high-income housing. He believed that every community would have the same tools for the developers to use for height, density, and parking. He said staff tried to discuss how height and density would not result in extra growth, but growth was limited, including in Washoe County. He noted that the County received a small number of residential allocations, likely a couple of hundred. He said that the parking issue was much broader than just growth and that the community had struggled with it for decades. He explained that there was cynicism surrounding the lack of transit and how the community felt that decisions were made for tourists and not the residents. He explained that there were concerns that the momentum in the basin was to eliminate parking requirements. He said that Washoe County residents felt that was ridiculous and expressed their frustrations that eliminating parking would never work. He mentioned that when staff saw the mandated changes stating the County had to allow zero parking requirements, staff felt that was something to push back on. He noted that Washoe County staff had spent a lot of time with TRPA staff discussing the history of parking in Incline Village and identifying issues. He said that the community had a valid point; low-income people needed cars. He believed that the community was right about many things, so the staff tried to communicate the reasons why things occurred. He stated that staff tried very hard to push back on the issues with parking, but felt they had failed.

Commissioner Clark felt that the public adored Lake Tahoe. He said he often thought about the harm that had been done and what was to come once the last remnants of land were distributed. He recalled many past missteps that allowed harmful actions to occur. He mentioned that he had visited Lake Tahoe recently, and he described the difficulty of navigating traffic and parking. He believed that there was no room for additional vehicles or motorized equipment on the streets. He said that with the population of the community, if there were a fire, there would be widespread panic. He noted that visitors were likely unfamiliar with Lake Tahoe roads and how to access the various streets. He feared that it would be difficult to evacuate the area when unfamiliar with the surroundings in an emergency where time was limited. He referenced a recent emergency in Los Angeles, where people abandoned their vehicles. He wondered how the least amount of harm could be done to Lake Tahoe. He indicated that there were activities going on year-round in Lake Tahoe, and he was concerned with height, density, and parking. He felt that a bigger issue surrounded the development of the last available land. He believed that there were alternative ways to handle workforce housing. He thought that various mines and Tesla shuttled their employees to work. He felt that was an option that should be explored, as opposed to building high-rise units that would ultimately sell for \$2 or \$3 million, which would be unaffordable for most.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Doug Flaherty believed that the TRPA did not have the right to mandate code amendments. He speculated that the WDCD amendment would create unsafe wildfire evacuations and violate citizens' rights to safety under Article 1, Section 1 of the Nevada State Constitution. He opined that the residents would take legal action if the BCC did not correct the WDCD. He noted that there were substantial concerns and evidence since the 2021 TAP revision regarding traffic congestion and wildfire risk within the Incline Village town center and surrounding neighborhoods.

He felt that any reasonable person could conclude that the amendments were likely to exacerbate unacceptable six-hour public evacuation times. He indicated that the PC and Agenda Item 8's Staff Report provided no substantial evidence that the proposed amendments aligned with WCDCA Article 918, to ensure no adverse impact on public health, safety, or welfare. He said the proposed increase in height, density, and coverage for ADUs was inconsistent with WCDCA Article 918 because the amendment would worsen Incline Village's critical evacuation times. He asserted that the BCC had to ensure compliance with WCDCA Article 918 and provide substantial evidence to support all findings; otherwise, the amendments were arbitrary, capricious, and constituted an act of prejudiced abuse of discretion without evidence. He was saddened and disgusted that the BCC would approve an amendment that impacted the safety of residents. He looked forward to future discussions related to the amendment and hoped the BCC would table or reject Agenda Item 8.

Ms. Trista Gomez expressed sympathy towards Incline Village residents because she believed the North Valleys and Spanish Springs residents dealt with poor development planning. She speculated that development was approved because the developers donated to the Commissioners' campaign funds, which she thought was concerning. She felt that WCDCA amendments overshadowed residents' concerns for safety, water, and infrastructure. She indicated that basic issues impacted residents and that the only Commissioners who advocated for constituents were Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Clark.

County Clerk Jan Galassini informed that the remaining public commenters were all in Incline Village and would be heard virtually.

Ms. Kristina Hill noted that she was a planning consultant, worked for TRPA in the past, and had been a member of the Washoe County Board of Adjustment (BOA). She said that the proposed TAP amendments were abominable and would not create affordable housing. She believed that increased density, height, and lack of parking did not make sense and was unrealistically dangerous. She felt that the BCC should represent the residents of Incline Village and Crystal Bay instead of the TRPA and wished to know why the BCC considered the amendment if TRPA would proceed regardless of approval. She mentioned that Incline Village and Crystal Bay residents were adamantly opposed to the proposal and asked the BCC to vote against the growth-inducing amendment.

Ms. Helen Neff mentioned that Agenda Item 8's Staff Report, Exhibit E, was 163 pages and included public comment, which she believed displayed how deeply the residents cared about the concerns related to the TRPA Phase 2 Amendments. She pointed out that page 15 of Agenda Item 8's Staff Report highlighted communal concerns regarding the impact of wildfire evacuation, changes to the community's character, and reduced parking standards. She said that when parking was reduced, it showed a lack of consideration for house cleaners, landscapers, and plumbers who relied on their vehicles. She noted that achievable housing with no income-based requirement allowed for projects that were not truly affordable. She believed that deed restriction enforcement was

inadequate and lacked transparency. She indicated that concerns were expressed repeatedly in 2023 when TRPA passed Phase 2 and that many of the residents' voices were dismissed in favor of development-driven proposals. She speculated that most residents supported affordable housing; however, amendments that allowed taller buildings with less parking and no income restriction would not provide homes for the workforce. She recalled that the County told residents that they must support the amendment because TRPA had the ultimate authority during the June 3, 2025, PC meeting. She appreciated Dr. Young's explanation of TRPA's role and his statement regarding South Lake Tahoe's increased success with change implementation without Washoe County's mandated policies. She thought that collaboration between the County, residents, and TRPA was needed and asked the BCC to support the Incline Village residents by advocating for a housing strategy that reflected regional goals, safety needs, and values.

Ms. Rhonda Tyner opined that residents had provided the BCC with reasons why the proposed amendments were detrimental to the Incline Village community. She believed that the planner made fallacious justifications for the amendments and that the evidence of a health justification for increased housing density in a small community was omitted. She speculated that the increased density along the area's evacuation route would harm the residents' psychology and lead to physical harm or death for those who would not escape a fast-moving wildfire. She said that the PC and the BCC ignored residents but supported developers, and she hoped that the BCC knew that she would hold those who supported the amendment accountable. She explained that long-term liability when disastrous events occurred was missing in public administration and asserted that it was the BCC's decision to listen to the concerns of Incline Village constituents.

Mr. Aaron Vanderpool noted he had a bachelor's degree in environmental science and sustainability. He expressed opposition to the amendments and felt that there was inequality and discrimination. He believed that ADUs caused increased parcel values that wealthier individuals would purchase, leaving others unable to afford the area. He felt that there were other affordable housing possibilities and that the amendment was a step towards turning the United States (US) into a third-world country. He encouraged the BCC to resist TRPA and be proud of Nevada. He wanted the BCC to reject the amendment because he believed that TRPA was not abiding by its own mandates. He said that he had many friends and family who felt like they were slaves to the economy and could not afford to live in Incline Village.

Mr. Richard Miner indicated that he was the previous Incline Village and Crystal Bay Historical Society Chair and was grateful for the BCC's effort to receive public comment. He asserted that the BCC should not succumb to TRPA's imposed changes. He believed that most of the Commissioners continued to subvert the will of the citizens and that an increased population in the basin would cause a disaster. He felt that the BCC must vote to reject the amendment without substantial revisions and thanked Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Herman for their understanding and opposition. He pointed out that Chair Hill was a bright woman and had a wonderful future in politics. He opined that the amendment was Chair Hill's chance to add her voice to the opposition. He speculated that rejecting the amendment was the County's last opportunity to support the citizens of Incline

Village and Crystal Bay through the preservation, protection, and defense of the basin's natural beauty.

Ms. Pamela Tsigdinos recalled that Kerr County residents asked their county management to address a fast-moving natural disaster but were ignored. She asked the BCC to oppose the amendment because she believed it was fundamentally flawed and would adversely impact safe and timely wildfire evacuations defined by constrained geography, limited infrastructure, and a mass influx of visitors. She noted that TRPA introduced the WCDC amendment and was met with widespread public concerns, disapproval, and a lawsuit. She indicated that changes would cause elevated costs and liabilities and that increased height and density created higher demand for public resources. She asked how the County could enforce developer compliance and code restrictions and wondered if the proposed building could withstand wildfires or if the residents would be able to buy insurance. She mentioned that previous Commissioners erred by amending WCDC to allow transient lodging in the area because it prioritized the needs of tourists over local workers. She said the short-term rental (STR) ordinances cost the County to administer.

Ms. Ann Nichols noted that she had worked with developers and believed that the County was being manipulated. She indicated that there was no visitor growth cap and speculated that the approval of the amendment would lead to further proposed phases because she thought that there would never be enough amendments for the developers. She speculated that TRPA did not consider surrounding growth in their data and wondered what evidence supported the development's success. She asserted that TRPA and the County did not have the right to make residents feel unsafe.

Ms. Roxanna Dunn indicated that local housing was needed for service workers. She said there was very little land in the Incline Village area and that the County needed to prioritize housing for locals. She explained that workers could commute; however, it would impose expenses and dangers. She believed that the community were stewards of Lake Tahoe, and she felt there were already too many people and cars in the area. She believed that there was little effect on the population if workers moved into housing around Lake Tahoe because the evacuation times would be the same. She expressed concern regarding the high-end condominiums being built due to the high cost of land and explained that many of the local service workers were young, mobile, and needed affordable rentals instead of luxury units for purchase. She mentioned that providing inexpensive land could create financial feasibility for affordable housing creation. She opined that it was not a great time to ask for government-backed housing, but she did not want policies that consumed existing land and limited future options.

Ms. Judith Simon urged the BCC to reject the ill-advised proposal and associated herself with the remarks made by her fellow residents. She indicated that the wildfire danger was real and that officials were not held accountable. She noted that she raised issues while on the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission, the Incline Village Crystal Bay Citizens Advisory Board (CAB), and various housing committees. She asked the BCC to reject Agenda Item 8.

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

Chair Hill appreciated the public comments and recalled that there were many hours of discussion when TRPA adopted the Phase 2 Amendment. She understood the evacuation concerns and recalled that the BCC accepted a donation to perform an evacuation study. She said that she was the closest Commissioner to the issue and indicated that the BCC previously accepted the Washoe Tahoe Housing Partnership Roadmap because there were individuals who needed to live in Incline Village. She recalled speaking to a senior who moved out of the Incline Village area due to cost. She said that the individual could have lived in an ADU; however, the one-acre standard would not have allowed for an ADU. She knew that affordable housing was an issue for the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) employees and librarians stationed in Incline Village. She noted that the County paid stipends for librarians to drive and work in Incline Village. She reported that there was a shortage of Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) employees and indicated that local schools and the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District (NLTFPD) wanted more affordable housing. She believed that the BCC needed to find a way to make the developments happen because the County would not be able to create affordable housing in Incline Village or Crystal Bay. She understood the trepidation and concerns of her fellow Commissioners, but pointed out that there was a cap in the basin's development, with limited housing units allowed in the area. She commended staff for researching ways to make the WCDC more specific to Incline Village and Crystal Bay. She understood that TRPA did not move forward with the staff's recommendations, but it showed how thoughtful the County staff were. She reminded the BCC that there were many changes needed before the second reading.

Commissioner Clark believed that the County liked to perform surveys. He said that there were many Incline Village public commenters who did not support the WCDC amendment. He understood that Agenda Item 8 was a first reading and that there would be further discussion in the future. He explained that there were a lot of areas that people would like to live in and said that he would like a home in Jackson Hole, Wyoming; however, no one was going to buy him a house so that he could move. He wanted to know why the County burdened the citizens of Incline Village and Crystal Bay with more traffic that caused community discomfort. He opined that a fire marshal would close Incline Village if it were a building or venue because there were too many people living there. He asserted that the BCC should not be involved in adding more congestion to the area.

Chair Hill asked Dr. Young when the Washoe Tahoe Housing Partnership Roadmap occurred. Dr. Young believed it was created in 2007. Chair Hill asked if the same concerns were expressed then. Dr. Young indicated that the question of whether service workers should live in the Incline Village area was long-standing and ongoing. Chair Hill noted that governing bodies performed different roles. She did not want people to think the BCC had done nothing since 2007. She mentioned that she was an environmentalist, knew that new buildings were better for the environment, and that reducing miles traveled was beneficial.

Bill No. 1934 was introduced by Chair Hill, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

### **BLOCK VOTE – ITEM 9**

**25-0539**      **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to approve amendment #4 to contract with Allied Universal Security Services for armed and unarmed professional security services, retroactive from July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026. Expected expenditures are not to exceed [\$5,375,445]. If approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the agreement. Managers. (All Commission Districts.).

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**25-0540**      **AGENDA ITEM 10** Public Hearing: Subject to a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by the regional planning authorities, recommendation to approve a resolution initiating an amendment to the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan Map 3 - Regional Utility Corridors & Sites to include a 250MW photovoltaic generation facility and a 200MW battery energy storage system, which is an energy production, renewable use; and a 345 kV substation to connect to a previously approved 345 kV generation tie line (WSUP23-0003 - “Praana Transmission Line”), which is a utility services use, on APNs 074-462-19, -18, -15, 14, -05, -03, -02, 074-461-24, -18, -17, -15, -13, -11, -07, -04, -03, -02, 074-432-01, 074-431-08, 074-161-14 and 074-162-06. Community Services. (Commission District 4.).

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

Community Services Department (CSD) Planning & Development Senior Planner Courtney Weiche conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Special Use Permit WSUP25-0006; 4 miles north of Fish Springs Road on Rainbow Way; Vicinity Map; Requests; Uses: Energy Production, Renewable (two slides); Uses: Utility Services; Site Plan; Article 812 – Projects of Regional Significance; 2040 Master Plan Consistency; Neighborhood Meeting; Reviewing Agencies; Public Notice; Findings; Additional findings per 110.810.35; Possible Motion; Thank you.

Ms. Weiche explained that the Special Use Permit (SUP) was requested by Sunseeker Solar. She showed the *4 miles north of Fish Springs Road on Rainbow Way* slide and described that the proposed project was located on 23 undeveloped, privately owned

parcels, approximately 43 miles north of Reno in the Honey Lake Valley. She displayed the *Vicinity Map* slide and reported that all 23 parcels planned for project use had a regulatory zone of general rural (gr), a Master Plan designation of rural, and were located within the High Desert Planning Area. She reviewed the *Requests* slide and described that the applicant sought to construct a photovoltaic solar energy system with up to 250 megawatts (MW) of power generation, a battery electrical storage system with up to 200 MW, and an on-site project substation proposed to be connected to a previously approved 345 kilowatt (kV) generation tie line, known as the Rainbow Way Transmission Corridor, to the NV Energy Fort Sage Substation located on 1,128 acres of privately owned land.

Ms. Weiche showed the first of her two *Uses: Energy Production, Renewable* slides, which depicted a schematic of the design of the solar arrays. She displayed the second of her two *Uses: Energy Production, Renewable* slides, and said the battery electrical storage system would encompass approximately six acres. She indicated the site plan for that area on her slide. She reviewed the *Uses: Utility Services* slide and advised that the proposed substation was classified as a Utility Services use type. She informed that the substation would be co-located with the battery energy storage system in the eastern corner of the project area and would connect to the previously approved tie line, also known as permit WSUP23-0003, Praana Transmission Line, which ran approximately five miles south to the NV Energy Fort Sage Substation along the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) designated Rainbow Way Regional Utility Corridor. She showed her *Site Plan* slide, which depicted the overall site plan. She reported that the project met all required design standards and setbacks. She displayed her *Article 812 – Projects of Regional Significance* slide and outlined that, as a project of regional significance, the application required a conformance review by the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission. She explained that the proposed substation required a regional plan amendment to add the utility use and site, and she added that the amendment needed to be sponsored by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). She stipulated that the permit would not go into effect until after the regional planning authorities took final action. She showed the *2040 Master Plan Consistency* slide and conveyed that staff believed that the proposed amendment and SUP were consistent with the High Desert Planning Area vision statement in the Envision Washoe 2040 Master Plan.

Ms. Weiche displayed the *Neighborhood Meeting* slide and described that a neighborhood meeting was held on January 20, 2025. She said meeting notices were mailed to 81 property owners. She noted that four members of the public attended the meeting, and all neighborhood meeting materials were included as Attachment E to the Planning Commission staff report. She showed the *Reviewing Agencies* slide and informed that the application was sent to all agencies and County departments for comment, and no comments of concern were received. She reviewed the *Public Notice* slide and shared that a notice was sent to approximately 77 unique property owners. She advised that two public comments were received in support of the project. She showed the *Findings* slide and described that the Planning Commission held a public hearing and was able to make all of the required findings, unanimously passed a motion to approve the SUP, and made a recommendation to the BCC. She displayed the *Additional findings per 110.810.35* slide and explained that additional findings were required for projects of regional significance

per Article 810 of the Washoe County Code (WCC), all of which were made. She showed the *Possible Motion* slide and said she was available for questions.

Vice Chair Herman surmised that the project was the same as one the BCC had heard before. She expressed her concern that it still overlooked the community of Herlong. She believed the company was still owned by a Chinese company. She recalled discussing related matters over the past few years and asked if the ownership was still the same.

Ms. Weiche responded that she was not aware of the specifics of the ownership but offered that the matter before the Board was a new proposal that tied into a previously approved transmission line, which was known as the Praana Transmission Line. She recalled a change in ownership of the Praana Transmission Line but clarified that the Sunseeker Solar proposal was a new application that had not been heard before. She wondered if the applicant was present in Chambers, but confirmed they were not.

Vice Chair Herman said the project sounded familiar. Chair Hill affirmed that the BCC had previously considered a transmission line in the same area. Vice Chair Herman elaborated on her previous and current concerns about foreign ownership.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Scott Finley read from and displayed documents, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Chair Hill asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large to provide an initial opinion regarding Mr. Finley's comments and documents. She acknowledged that CDDA Large had just received the documents, but she wondered what his thoughts were on business registration with the Nevada Secretary of State and land use implications.

CDDA Large responded that the role of the BCC in the matter was to decide whether the subject could find conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. He clarified that the BCC did not have oversight of the Nevada Secretary of State's role in determining business licensing, operations, and ownership. He added that the status of a Washoe County business license was outside the purview of Agenda Item 10. He noted that the applicant would need to come into conformance with the State to operate their business. He said the BCC should determine whether to approve the regional map modifications as proposed.

Chair Hill thanked CDDA Large for the clarification he provided. She concluded that the task at hand for the BCC was to determine conformance with the Regional Plan. She invited any other comments or questions from the Board.

Commissioner Clark said he was glad Chair Hill asked for an opinion from CDDA Large. He thought CDDA Large's perspective clarified the point. He reasoned that if somebody had issues with the company's licensing status, they should take their concerns to the State of Nevada and let the State pursue them if needed. He asked if his understanding



of the path forward was correct.

CDDA Large summarized that if a person or company was conducting business in the State without a business license, it should be reported to the Nevada Secretary of State's office.

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

**25-0541**      **AGENDA ITEM 11**   Public Hearing: For possible action to conduct a Public Hearing under the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act ("TEFRA") and adopt a resolution approving the issuance by the National Finance Authority (New Hampshire) of not to exceed \$33,000,000 of Lease Revenue Bonds on behalf of NCCS-UNR Fieldhouse Properties LLC (the "Borrower") for purposes of, and as required by, Internal Revenue Code of 1986 Section 147(f), as amended. The bonds or a portion thereof will be "private activity bonds" and "qualified 501(c)(3) bonds" for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. The revenue from the bond issuance will be used (a) finance the cost of the design, development, construction and equipping of (i) an approximately 73,700 square foot indoor all sport fieldhouse and related amenities, (ii) an approximately 85,796 square foot outdoor turf football practice field, and (iii) an approximately 106,078 square foot turf intermural field to be located on the campus of the University of Nevada, Reno (collectively, including related site development, utility, equipment and other improvements, the "Project"); and (b) pay expenses incurred in connection with the issuance of the Bonds, including the costs of bond insurance or other credit enhancement, if requested by the Borrower. The Project (a) will be owned and operated by the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education, on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno (the "University") or its designee; (b) will be located on land owned by the University and leased to the Borrower, and (c) will be subleased by the Borrower to the University. The bonds are not a debt or obligation of the County; the County is not a party to the financing and bears no risk in this transaction, either financial or reputational, and has received a letter of indemnification from the Nevada System of Higher Education. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.).

Interim County Manager (ICM) Kate Thomas noted that the Lease Revenue Bonds were not the County's debt or obligation. She said that the County was not a party in the financing and did not bear any risk with the transaction. She mentioned that the County received a letter of indemnification from the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE).

Chair Hill stated that the Board had approved a similar item for Renown.

Commissioner Garcia disclosed that she was employed by the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). She said that the item did not impact her role at UNR, and that she did not have a pecuniary interest.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

**25-0542      AGENDA ITEM 12 Public Comment.**

Ms. Trista Gomez stated that she had several questions and intended to submit them in a formal email. She questioned the \$21 million budget for the Cares Campus and whether it included employee costs. She inquired about the number of individuals directly employed by the Cares Campus, as well as those indirectly involved with the agency. She noted that she was unable to attend the July Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) meeting but had reviewed the meeting content to gather information about the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). She believed that the RTC had initially overseen the current project in Spanish Springs before transferring it to the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). She assumed NDOT was working based on the Washoe County Development Code (WCDC) and Master Plan discussed during the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meetings. She thought there were many unanswered questions regarding how the various roads would interact. She felt the reason for those unanswered questions was that nobody was specifically responsible for the entirety of the project. She said that because the project was split amongst different entities, no one claimed responsibility for safety and traffic concerns, fatal accidents, or flooding. She indicated that those issues affected not only Spanish Springs but also the North Valleys, where she believed residents dealt with compromised water, sewage issues, and problems with flood insurance. She said no one understood who was responsible, but she assumed the BCC should be. She questioned why Ms. Kate Thomas was being referred to as Manager Thomas, rather than interim County Manager (ICM), and believed that interim was more appropriate until she was hired as the County Manager. She inquired if there would be a survey regarding ICM Thomas's position and the employees she worked with previously. She said she was interested in the social relationships between ICM Thomas and the Board members. She indicated that she had additional questions that she hoped to have answered after submitting a formal email.

Mr. Doug Flaherty, a resident of Incline Village, revisited the idea that individuals who worked in Lake Tahoe should also be able to live there. He mentioned that he heard Dr. Eric Young espouse the equity concept at the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and Advisory Planning Commission (APC) meetings. He believed that equity contradicted the Constitution of the United States (US), and equality was part of the Constitution. He thought that equity was being used Nationwide to change zoning and to allow the current approach, in Agenda Item 8, which he believed would fail. He said the effects of the market on Tahoe properties would never change. He alleged that it was a

socialist and feel-good idea. He said he supported workforce housing, but thought it was absurd that if someone worked in Tahoe, they should be able to live there. He thought the bigger issue was increased height, density, and coverage, which reduced evacuation times, with no notice, during fast-moving wildfires. He felt that Dr. Young and others continued to share misleading information that there was a growth cap in Tahoe. He believed that the issues were density and the ability to evacuate under constrained roadway conditions in Incline Village.

**25-0543      AGENDA ITEM 13 Announcements/Reports.**

There were no announcements or reports.

\* \* \* \* \*

**12:45 p.m.** There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

---

**ALEXIS HILL**, Chair  
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

---

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

*Minutes Prepared by:*  
*Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Lizzie Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk*  
*Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk*