

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

MAY 12, 2026

PRESENT:

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

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

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners convened at 10:02 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, Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland called roll and the Board conducted the following business:

26-0275 **AGENDA ITEM 3** Public Comment.

Tammy Holt-Still displayed a sample voting ballot, no copy was submitted for the public record. She noted that she lived in unincorporated Washoe County and expressed concern that her sample ballot included contests for the Cities of Reno and Sparks, as well as her expected contests. She felt that would be confusing to the public. She mentioned that she was uncertain why Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald would allow that confusion to occur. She said she was a candidate running for office in Washoe County. She explained that the ROV position in both Clark and Washoe Counties had changed from being subject to a vote. She believed that the ROV took an oath of office to ensure election accuracy. She suggested that other counties elect their ROV's and hoped that Washoe County would choose to elect rather than appoint the ROV. She shared that whether or not she was elected as County Commissioner, she would work to change legislation to ensure the people of the County could vote for the next ROV. She felt that the ballots used to be more descriptive and included political party affiliations, which she suggested had been removed from the sample ballots, making them more difficult to read. She alleged that there had been reported issues with Washoe County elections, and surmised that the sample ballot she received confirmed those concerns. She questioned why the Commissioners allowed election issues to occur and why the staff were not held accountable.

Terry Brooks shared an original poem about discrimination against people who were blind.

Heidi Soper, Chair of the Sun Valley Citizens Advisory Board (CAB), spoke as a 38-year resident of Sun Valley regarding Agenda Item 13. She said she believed the Board was familiar with the issues Sun Valley faced involving unauthorized occupants and illegal dumping on vacant lots owned by absent, uninterested, or deceased property owners. She shared that Washoe County Code Enforcement had issued complaints regarding conditions on several parcels on Fifth Avenue, Quartz Lane, and Gerdes Drive. She described some of the parcels as being in terrible condition, creating public nuisances and health hazards, and posing major fire hazards. She added that there had recently been a fire on Quartz Lane, although she was unsure whether it was related to the parcels she referenced. She felt the hazardous lots were significantly affecting the quality of life in the surrounding neighborhoods and said the issues had generated numerous public complaints during the Sun Valley CAB meetings. She noted that Quartz Lane and Gerdes Drive were located in District 5, while Fifth Avenue was located in District 3. Speaking on behalf of Sun Valley residents, she asked the Board to acknowledge the complaints and approve a hearing date so photographs could be presented and complaints could be heard by Washoe County Code Enforcement and any affected property owners. She hoped that the meeting date would be publicly announced so interested residents could attend and voice their opinions and concerns. She speculated that the residents were working hard to eliminate unauthorized occupants and the illegal dumping of trash, tires, and vehicles throughout Sun Valley, and added that the issues involving the referenced parcels needed to be addressed. In reference to Agenda Item 8B1, she shared that she was thankful the County now owned 520 Carnes Drive, that the unauthorized occupants would soon be removed, and that the property would be cleaned up. She acknowledged the time and cooperation of the many entities involved and noted that, although more work remained, she believed the agenda item represented a good start. She thanked the Board for its help and cooperation.

Steve Leddy, Vice President of the Fieldcreek Homeowners Association (HOA), spoke on behalf of homeowners and the tens of thousands of residents affected by the failure of the Arrowcreek sound wall. He thanked the Commissioners for approving the repair of what he described as an eyesore that had been ignored for 20 years by previous Commissioners. He acknowledged Commissioner Clark, who initially raised the issue and began taking action. He thought Commissioner Clark listened to his constituents, understood the facts, and represented them well. He opined that Commissioner Clark embodied what constituents expected from their elected officials and thanked him for his efforts on the sound wall. He expressed appreciation for the Director of Engineering and Capital Projects, Dwayne Smith, for conducting research, presenting facts, holding meetings, and participating in numerous discussions regarding the sound wall over the past four years. He suggested that the sound wall project had been completed under budget. He shared that he had worked with public officials across multiple jurisdictions, cities, counties, and states during his 50 years in construction, and said that Mr. Smith was among the finest professionals he had worked with. He added that Mr. Smith was an invaluable asset to Washoe County. He acknowledged Media and Communications Program Manager Candee Ramos for initiating the collaboration and maintaining consistent communication that kept all parties informed. He believed the project would not have happened without Ms. Ramos' involvement.

Cynthia Cooper, a Reno resident, read from a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She opined that investing in libraries was an excellent investment in the community's public health. She contrasted the benefits libraries provided for brain health with the effects of data centers and artificial intelligence (AI). She thought that reading books helped improve focus, which she believed was important in slowing or preventing dementia, and added that more people were reportedly having difficulty concentrating. She indicated that browsing the internet developed bad habits in the brain because people only spent a few moments on any piece of content before moving on. She mentioned that, for relationships and socializing, the library offered events such as chess, book clubs, craft workshops, games, and activities for teens, which provided face-to-face interactions. She suggested that people who were more social were less likely to commit suicide. She stated that social media mediates relationships through a screen, distorting them, and she added that its business model reinforces unhealthy concerns about image and attention-seeking. She explained that the library had vast stores of authoritative books and access to vetted research databases. She speculated that search engines tracked a person's time spent on websites and learned what kept someone engaged, which she felt was a similar technique to how casinos kept gamblers playing. She surmised that the business model led the internet to amplify extreme, outrageous, vitriolic, and divisive content. She shared her concern about how those business models affected children's developing minds. She noted that the Fiscal Year (FY) 2026 library budget was \$17.6 million, and the expansion fund being considered in Agenda Item 11 was less than \$500,000. She compared the tax abatements that each data center received in Nevada, which she alleged averaged \$5 million. She felt that the loss in tax revenue did not adequately account for future societal impacts.

Cliff Nellis, a 52-year resident of Washoe County, said that he agreed with the previous public commenter regarding AI and data centers but disagreed that libraries needed additional funding. He noted that voters had rejected additional library funding, which he viewed as an extension of a tax increase. He suggested that the libraries were being operated by individuals aligned with lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender advocacy and Marxist ideologies, and he criticized library and school officials for not removing what he described as inappropriate books. He believed that if those materials were not removed, the libraries should be closed. He described homeless people as derelict and vagabond brigands. He shared that a vagabond was someone who did not want to live in one place, and a brigand was a thief. He thought that the homeless robbed neighborhoods and businesses because they refused to work. He suggested that, rather than spending \$5 million under Agenda Item 12, the homeless individuals should be arrested, placed in a work program to clean up the river and the city, and chained and monitored by security. He felt that requiring homeless individuals to work would help them become sober. He believed his suggestions were Christian behavior and that people acted on kindness and emotions. He stated that enabling bad behavior was not beneficial and that discipline and chastisement were needed, similar to correcting a spoiled child's behavior. He pointed out that teaching homeless people lessons would help make them productive citizens. He indicated that he had received an incorrect ballot. He questioned the ROV's actions and noted that he lived in Washoe County, yet the ballot included contests for the City of Reno. He agreed with Ms. Holt-Still that the ROV should be an elected position. He suggested

that paper ballots should be hand-counted. He indicated that he had spoken with Washoe County Sheriff Darin Balaam about his concerns. He stated that Riverside County Sheriff Chad Bianco had ordered paper ballots in Riverside County to be hand-counted. He said he was uncertain about the results but believed they differed from machine-counted vote totals. He said that in 2024, he requested that the Washoe County Commissioners require hand-counting of ballots, but they refused, which he felt showed a lack of transparency. He speculated that voting machines could not be trusted and that they created a fraudulent voting system.

Maureen McElroy stated that Agenda Item 11 was a recommendation to approve an augmentation of the FY 2026 Library Expansion Fund budget in the amount of \$457,956. She pointed out that the funding would increase the library system's spending authority for the purchase of materials, including both physical and electronic titles. She commended the County for the recommendation and urged the Board to approve the budget. She commented that over the past several years, and particularly in recent months, the Board and the Library Board of Trustees (LBT) had heard many public comments emphasizing the value of the library system and its resources to the community. She explained that the additional funding would provide the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) Collection Development Department with a needed infusion of resources, allowing it to continue purchasing materials to meet the needs of a diverse and growing community. She shared that there were two upcoming LBT vacancies to be filled by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) in June. She urged the Board to select candidates who understood the mission and impact of a vital library system. She believed that even with the Library Expansion Fund, the public library system was well below the 10 to 15 percent materials' budget threshold suggested by the American Library Association (ALA). She indicated that some of the current trustees did not understand or refused to understand that threshold. She opined that the community deserved an LBT committed to supporting a thriving, diverse, and responsive public library system. She hoped the Board would make the appropriate LBT selections in June.

Oscar Williams displayed a document, no copy was submitted for the public record. He lodged a complaint against Mr. McDonald, alleging that Mr. McDonald had broken three laws. He noted that Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 293.2546(7) was the right to an accurate sample ballot, which he felt was very important and had been mentioned by public commenters Ms. Holt-Still and Mr. Nellis. He displayed his 2022 sample ballot booklet and explained that the pullout appeared to be the same size and shape as an actual ballot, except it had a watermark that read *sample* across the ballot and a small notch on the side. He said that although his residence was located in Assembly District 25, his ballot also included Assembly District 40. He stated that his ballot included two Assembly districts and two County Commissioner districts, which he felt created confusion for voters. He emphasized the importance of accurate elections. He believed he had presented sufficient evidence to warrant the termination and arrest of Mr. McDonald. He alleged that the new voting process was illegal and violated NRS 293.365, which required the Counting Board to count paper ballots before all ballots were accounted for. He noted that there must be paper ballots to comply with that law, not digitized ballots that voters scanned and tabulated before the polls closed. He mentioned that the current voting process violated

NRS 293.365 and the Voters' Bill of Rights, NRS 293.2546(10), in failing to meet a uniform Statewide standard. He shared that mail and provisional ballots were placed in a ballot box but must first go through a scanner. He thought that was an inconsistent process from the uniform Statewide standard of counting votes. He suggested that three laws were broken and that the individuals involved should be taken to jail.

Laura Wetherington, a Washoe County resident, urged the Board to vote in favor of augmenting the FY 2026 Library Expansion Budget. She said she valued fiscal responsibility and recognized the budgetary cliff in the coming years, which was why she supported bolstering the collections budget. She compared the increase to a squirrel who stored nuts in preparation for lean years ahead.

Eithne Barton shared that her home library was Sierra View Library. She expressed her support for Resolution R2600009 to augment the FY 2026 Library Expansion Fund budget, pursuant to provisions in the NRS and the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC), in the amount of \$457,956.43 to support library services in the community by June 30, 2026. She explained that it would be a wonderful way to welcome the new Library Director, Lisa McClure, and to assure her that support for the library system in Washoe County was strong. She mentioned that, according to a library staff report from November 2025, Nevada's minimum public library standards for collection spending required each library board to annually select one of three options for budgeting acquisitions and library collections. She indicated that in August 2015, the LBT selected the third option as a long-term goal for the library system, with an aim to reach the 10 percent minimum standard, meaning the library system would meet or exceed 10 percent of the adjusted total operating budget spent on library materials for collection funding by FY 2017/2018. She said that, nearly 10 years later, approaching FY 2026/2027, Washoe County had yet to meet the standard under the current FY 2025/2026 budget. She noted that the allocation for materials of \$760,750 fell short of the 10 percent goal and was currently at 4.51 percent. She thought that with the Board's approval of the resolution, the gap would close and the goal laid out by the LBTs in 2015 would be achieved. She suggested that the Board's approval would send a strong message and would reflect the community's broad support for the WCLS.

Marie Rodriguez displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She shared that she was an author whose books were available at Barnes and Noble. She mentioned that she had supported and promoted the literary arts in Northern Nevada through the Sierra Arts Foundation. She explained that the Sierra Arts Literary Community would hold its second annual free book fest in Sparks, which was open to the public and would feature many local authors and poets. She stated that the event would include family activities and a raffle, and she invited the public to attend in support of the area's literary arts community.

Penny Brock displayed a document, no copy was submitted for the public record. She said she agreed with the concerns expressed about the sample ballot. She mentioned that on her sample ballot, Assemblyman Rich DeLong was omitted, even though he was the only Republican running in the primary. She suggested that other

candidates who were the only representatives of their party appeared on the ballot and questioned why Mr. DeLong had been left off. She expressed concern about Agenda Item 14 and stated that she was unclear why Mr. McDonald was presenting on data transparency while the public was not allowed to comment. She noted that no attachment was available for public review prior to the presentation on data transparency. She felt that, based on the 2020 elections, there had been insufficient transparency in data and expressed concern that the issue would continue in the 2026 election. She mentioned that since her last comments about the ballot drop box at the Cares Campus, she had learned that 23 voters from that area voted in 2024. She said that she was unclear why the Cares Campus would have its own ballot drop box if it was not a polling location. She noted that voters in the area could return their ballots using the prepaid mail envelope. She questioned the cost of maintaining a ballot drop box at the Cares Campus, noting it would cost thousands of dollars. She wondered who would monitor the ballot drop box at the Cares Campus and whether the voters were registered. She said that Mr. McDonald would likely ensure they were registered. She expressed further concerns about the Cares Campus ballot drop box, noting that the campus was fenced and used by homeless individuals. She suggested that the location was not secure and referenced legal requirements that ballot drop boxes be placed in accessible and convenient locations at or near polling places within the County and should remain open while polling places were open. She noted that the Cares Campus was not accessible due to its fenced perimeter. She stated that identification was required to enter the Cares Campus, but not to vote. She explained that although the Cares Campus was open all day, there would not be a dedicated camera to monitor the ballot drop box.

Dora Martinez said she wanted to make a public comment but was unable to access the Agenda. She explained that when she clicked on the Agenda, the image was not accessible on her phone and was also not readable by screen readers for individuals who were blind. She noted that in 2022, she worked with staff to ensure the agendas were accessible, but they no longer appeared to be accessible to blind users. She shared that during the 81st Legislative Session, she advocated for Nevada's Effective Absentee System for Elections (EASE) for people who were blind and disabled. She said she believed it helped some senior citizens who were able to vote online after the legislation passed. She expressed gratitude that in America, people should be able to vote securely and independently. She added that she did not want to go to a polling location and have someone overhear her voting because of inadequate equipment. She expressed her appreciation for Scott Youngs and his work with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities (NCED). She felt that, thanks to him and Washoe County staff, voting would be more accessible. She noted that individuals who used American Sign Language (ASL) could vote independently and securely. She explained that she had tested Washoe County's voting equipment and observed that it had a distinct tactile design that helped users identify and operate it more easily. She thanked Public Information Officer (PIO) George Guthrie and Mr. McDonald for their cooperation in making the ADA-compliant voting machines available. She said that although others had expressed their concerns regarding voting security, she appreciated that she and others with disabilities would have the opportunity to vote securely and independently.

Chair Andriola said that staff would follow up with Ms. Martinez regarding her agenda accessibility concerns.

Jill O'Leary, a Washoe County resident, expressed concern about voter transparency. She mentioned that she was unsure why a voter could not submit a public records request (PRR) to access their own voting history. She stated that, given the incorrect ballots and changes to the voting machines, the ROV should be required to provide individuals with their voting history through a PRR.

26-0276 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas announced openings on the Board of Equalization (BOE) and the Washoe County Deferred Compensation Committee (WCDCC). She mentioned that the BOE was seeking two regular members to fill vacancies beginning in January 2027 and ending on December 31, 2030, and one alternate member with a term from January 2027 to December 31, 2027. She noted that Board of Equalization hearings would occur annually in February and for one day in January and April. She said members were required to appear in person, as virtual participation was not permitted. She added that the deadline to apply for the three open positions was 5:00 p.m. on Friday, June 5, 2026. She shared that an opening on the WCDCC would become available in June, which she felt was a specific appointment. She noted that the appointee must be a retiree who participated in the Washoe County Deferred Compensation Program, also known as the 457(b) plan or the Washoe County 401(a) plan. She mentioned that the appointment term was two years and would begin on the date of the appointment. She said the WCDCC met quarterly and the meetings were open to the public. She stated that the deadline to apply was 11:59 p.m. on Tuesday, June 30, 2026, and encouraged the public to contact Washoe 311 with any questions.

Commissioner Hill acknowledged May as National Foster Care Month and recognized the Washoe County team for organizing the foster parent appreciation evening, expressing her gratitude for their efforts. She thought many people perceived foster care as difficult or intimidating. She said that Washoe County staff helped guide prospective foster parents through the process to make it more manageable. She believed that children deserved loving families and that many people had room in their homes and capacity in their lives to help. She asked the public to consider supporting a child, whether as a mentor or a foster parent, and noted the significant need for foster care throughout the County and State. She felt that Washoe County had worked hard to support foster parents. She acknowledged CM Thomas for ensuring that individuals in the County's foster system were recognized. She expressed her appreciation for all foster families and said she valued the opportunity to meet many inspirational foster parents at the event. She mentioned that many foster families lacked substantial financial resources, yet still chose to help children in need. She encouraged anyone who was considering fostering to contact Washoe County.

Vice Chair Garcia said that she agreed with Commissioner Hill's remarks regarding fostering. She wished everyone a happy Mother's Day, including foster mothers, adoptive mothers, and mothers who had informally taken children into their homes. She

thanked Washoe County Code Enforcement, the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), the Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team, Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large, and CM Thomas for their work related to Agenda Item 8B1, the forcible detainer on Carnes Drive, and Agenda Item 13 concerning public nuisances and various parcels. She explained that the issues were complex because some of the property owners were deceased. She clarified that Washoe County cared about the issues and was not turning its back on them. She shared that the parcels had multiple complaints and warnings issued against them. She noted that significant intervention had already occurred in many cases, including vehicle removals and property cleanups, and that those efforts were often difficult and went unnoticed. She publicly acknowledged the hard work required to address the cleanups. She said that a few months earlier, the City of Sparks had adopted changes to Sparks Municipal Code (SMC) Chapter 5.65 regarding massage parlors and services. She explained that the changes strengthened the City's ability to revoke licenses, conduct inspections, and address living or sleeping quarters. She believed that Washoe County Code (WCC) Chapter 25.239 was already robust because it prohibited living and sleeping quarters and outlined grounds for revoking or denying massage-parlor business licenses. She hoped to strengthen the grounds for denial and revocation for those who had found loopholes in the system. She indicated that the City of Sparks had identified cases in which individuals whose licenses had been revoked used spouses, partners, or stockholders to apply for new business licenses at the same physical address or complex, often using the same ownership names and lease agreements despite prior violations. She suggested denying licenses to individuals previously employed by those operators, stating that such measures would help create continuity across jurisdictions. She requested that WCC Chapter 25.239 be opened for further review.

Chair Andriola thanked Vice Chair Garcia for her work on addressing issues related to the Sun Valley parcels and noted that it appeared to be the same matter discussed by Heidi Soper during public comment.

Commissioner Herman expressed her appreciation for the Sun Valley cleanup efforts over many years and thanked all those who assisted, including the WCSO and the Board.

Chair Andriola asked CM Thomas to address the comments regarding the sample ballot.

CM Thomas mentioned that the sample ballot booklet was not unique to each precinct, by design. She explained that residents of unincorporated Washoe County received sample ballots that included all contests for their party. She shared that voters could preview their sample ballot and the contests online and provided the website. She apologized for any confusion and reiterated that the information was available online. She said that Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald would provide additional information later in the meeting to address concerns.

Chair Andriola said that May 15, 2026, was the deadline to submit feedback on the Citizens Advisory Boards (CAB) bylaws. She thanked staff in advance for their

extensive work and added that the bylaws had not been reviewed since 2021. She emphasized the importance of addressing, recalibrating, and prioritizing the bylaws to ensure all citizens had a voice, and she encouraged the public to submit feedback online.

CDDA Large mentioned he was working to address legal issues during public comment and clarified the ongoing confusion about the location of ballot drop boxes and whether they must be at polling locations. He noted that, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 293.269921(3), while each polling place must have a ballot drop box, the ROV may establish a ballot drop box at any other location in the County, where mail ballots may be delivered by hand and collected during early voting and on Election Day. He mentioned that there was no requirement that the other places be ballot locations.

PROCLAMATIONS

26-0277 **5A1** Proclamation for the week of May 10 - 16, 2026 as Police Week. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Herman commended the member of staff who wrote the proclamation for Agenda Item 5A1 because she believed it was well written. She read the proclamation. Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Sheriff Darin Balaam thanked the Board for the proclamation and noted that he appreciated the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for their continued support. He expressed appreciation to those who made the ultimate sacrifice and the Board for acknowledging the family members of law enforcement. He reported that the WCSO would travel to Washington, D.C., to recognize all the men and women across the Nation who serve in law enforcement.

Sheriff Balaam informed that there had been a tragic incident at one of the local schools that the WCSO needed to attend to, and while there was no threat to other children, it was important that they got to the scene quickly. He said that the WCSO would release more information later. Chair Andriola expressed gratitude for the WCSO's remembrance celebration the previous week and recalled that it was beautiful seeing all law enforcement families and the handmade candles.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5A1 be adopted.

26-0278 **5A2** Proclamation for the month of May as Treatment Court Month. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Hill read the proclamation. Judge Kendra Bertschy indicated that she had the privilege of presiding over the Treatment Court, the Court Assistance Program (CAP) Court, and the newly formed Support in Treatment, Accountability, and Recovery (STAR) Program. She recalled that *WashoeLife* had several podcasts that explained much about the treatment courts to which she urged those in attendance to listen to. She thanked the Board for working diligently to implement the Treatment Court, specifically one with the Sequential Intercept Model (SIM). She expressed excitement that

2026 would be the first year that every treatment court in the County could join the proclamation. She asserted that the courts were engaged in a coordinated effort within the County, and she was grateful for the members of different agencies and courts who were able to attend. She reported that there were other judges who, unfortunately, were in Treatment Court or had other courts to attend to, but she relayed their thanks to the County for ensuring that the courts' needs were met so they could actively work to address substance use, mental health issues, and protect victims' rights. Chair Andriola thanked Judge Bertschy for her work.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5A2 be adopted.

26-0279 **5A3** Proclamation for the month of May as Educator Appreciation Month. (All Commission Districts.)

Vice Chair Garcia expressed appreciation to Washoe County School District (WCSD) Board of Trustees (BOT) District A Trustee Christine Hull and former County Manager (CM) Katy Simon Holland. Vice Chair Garcia and Ms. Hull read the proclamation. Ms. Hull indicated that she was an educator and had wanted to be an educator since she was five years old. She recalled that she was blessed to have her own kindergarten teacher swear her in as a WCSD Trustee, which she felt underscored the importance of a teacher to every student, educator, and WCSD employee. She thanked the Board for its support of the schools and teachers in the community, especially the Commissioners who served on committees that assisted the WCSD in fulfilling its duties and improving student outcomes. She said that May was a very intense month for schools, and that a great way to return kindness to the community was to thank a teacher. She asserted that if anyone had an educator in their family, they should let that person know they were thought of and appreciated for their work. She thanked the Board for the proclamation.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 5A3 be adopted.

* * * * *

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large asked that Agenda Items 5A1 through 5A3, Minute Item Numbers 26-0277 through 26-0279 be reopened for public comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment for Agenda Items 5A1 through 5A3.

* * * * *

26-0280 **AGENDA ITEM 6A1** Presentation and Update on FY 26 Third Quarter Status Report for the Washoe County Regional Detention Facility to include security of the jail, conditions of confinement, staffing and medical care of inmates housed at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Detention Services Captain John Stewart conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Jail Status Report; Medical Information; NaphCare Medical Data; Screenings and General Data; ADP; Total Bookings; Average Length of Stay; FY 25/26 2nd Quarter Jail Data; Inmate Assistance Program.

Captain Stewart displayed the slide titled *Jail Status Report*. He explained that he would provide the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) with a Washoe County Regional Detention Facility (WCRDF) status report for the third quarter of fiscal year (FY) 2026. He showed the slide titled *Medical Information* and reported that there had been 56 medical refusals, 71 grievances, 111 complaints, and 134 Emergency Room (ER) referrals at the jail. He introduced the *NaphCare Medical Data* slide and explained that as spring turned to summer, the WCRDF expected a higher inmate population in the jail's care and custody. He explained that such a trend tended to occur with changes in weather and increased public activity. He reiterated that WCRDF staff often witnessed an increase in the inmate population during the spring and summer, which resulted in additional patients on medications and a slight increase in grievances, which subsequently decreased again in the fall and winter.

Captain Stewart introduced the *Screenings and General Data* slide by explaining that the chart listed statistics on dental visits. He reported that nothing in the slide's data was unusual, and he assured the Board that, should anything unexpected occur, he would bring it to their attention and begin investigating whether an anomalous event had occurred or should the number of reports be greater than expected. He displayed the *ADP* slide, noting that a substantial number of acronyms had been included in the presentation, including one for the WCRDF's average daily population (ADP). He stated that the ADP decreased in the third quarter of FY 2026 compared to the second quarter. He reported that the total average length of stay (ALS) for the third quarter of FY 2026 was 15.91 days per inmate housed at the WCRDF. He reported that the WCRDF currently housed 1,217 inmates as of that morning, who would spend an average of 15.91 days in the facility. He explained that the total ALS of 15.91 for the third quarter of FY 2026 was calculated by averaging the monthly ALS data for the three months in the quarter. He noted that the chart also listed the total ADP for each month of the third quarter.

Captain Stewart displayed the slide titled *Total Bookings*. He explained that the slide's chart showed data on bookings and releases at the WCRDF. He reported that bookings had increased since the second quarter of FY 2026, which had comparable monthly totals of 1,327, 1,192, and 1,287. He reiterated that the increase in third-quarter bookings during the spring and summer months was anticipated due to the weather. He noted that the number of releases was trending similarly to those of the WCRDF's total

bookings. He recalled having commended Reno Justice Court (RJC) Judge Kendra Bertschy and Court Administrator Alicia Lerud from the Second Judicial District Court (SJDC), as he believed the courts were working more diligently to process additional cases, which he attributed to the increase in bookings and the decrease in the ALS. He showed the *Average Length of Stay* slide. He explained that the data on the slide were divided into ALS statistics for each quarter of FY 2025 and FY 2026. He reported that the ALS during the second quarter of FY 2026 was 16.3, and in quarter three of FY 2026, it had decreased to 15.91. He explained that those statistics ultimately correlated with how many inmates the jail could house, so it was ideal for the ALS to be lower.

Captain Stewart displayed the *FY 25/26 2nd Quarter Jail Data* slide. He reported that incidents of battery by inmates had increased to 32 from 21 since the second quarter of FY 2026. He acknowledged that spacing typically decreased as more inmates were housed at the WCRDF and noted that staff set a goal to reduce stress levels in the jail through efforts such as transferring as many inmates as possible to other programs, offering opportunities for them to utilize kiosks to speak with their families, and providing them with the ability to watch movies. He recalled having seen Commissioners at program events to learn more about those operations. He opined that no one enjoyed being incarcerated at the jail, despite the good food provided at the WCRDF, which he acknowledged Commissioner Clark had discussed in the past. He reiterated that inmates did not enjoy being in the jail, which he attributed to the reason staff tried to offer opportunities for them to get out as much as possible. He explained that the issues caused by the limited space in the WCRDF were worsened by the growing population of the region, particularly during the spring and summer, which often created more stress and occasionally resulted in additional fights. He stated that there had been an increase in inmate-on-inmate fights during the third quarter of FY 2026, noting that the number of inmate-on-staff fights had remained consistent with the second quarter, and that the number of averted fights had decreased to 60 incidents during the third quarter from 65 in the second quarter. He noted that 204 inmates had been placed on suicide watch, with 21 of those occurrences involving interventions where staff needed to interact with an inmate prior to them being able to carry out that action. He stated that a suicide watch could be placed on an inmate following their verbalizing an intent to harm themselves, which allowed staff to ensure the inmate would receive the medical needs required to counteract that intent.

Captain Stewart showed the *Inmate Assistance Program* slide. He reported that, through the Inmate Assistant Program (IAP), 5,355 days that inmates would have otherwise spent in the WCRDF were saved during the third quarter of FY 2026, totaling \$867,000 in savings. He explained that the IAP involved collaborative efforts with the courts to provide various resources and programs for inmates, including those from the Salvation Army. He stated that while he could not remember whether he had mentioned such matters to the BCC in the past, he reported that staff of the WCRDF had noticed that if an inmate were to be released directly into the community from the jail after being informed that they needed to report to a program they were accepted into, there was a failure rate of approximately 70 percent for them attending that approved program following their release. He explained that the IAP had begun physically transporting

recently released inmates to their approved programs to ensure they arrived at the facility they were expected to report to. He reported that the IAP had conducted approximately 600 transports the previous year. He concluded his presentation and stated that he was willing to answer any questions.

Commissioner Herman noted that she had no questions for Captain Stewart and thanked him for his work and for the report.

Commissioner Hill thanked Captain Stewart for his presentation and work at the WCRDF. She noted that he had a passion for helping inmates and commended him for the leadership she had seen him display when she visited the WCRDF, in the care and understanding he showed toward the inmates as neighbors to everyone in the community through mutual respect. She acknowledged his work in helping everyone at the WCRDF succeed in whatever they chose to do after their release, as it ensured they were ready to be productive members of the community. She noted that the use of Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) buses for the WCRDF had been deliberated in the past, resulting in an established system that provided a hotline that could be used when inmates were eligible for release, which would send a micro transit bus to the jail once called. She stated that she had stopped hearing complaints from people who lived or owned property near the WCRDF about released inmates walking around, looking lost, and appearing cold in the middle of the night, which she recalled having received in the past. She expressed intent to ensure the RTC system was still working and to learn whether there was anything she or Vice Chair Garcia could do to continue supporting Captain Stewart in those efforts, as they both served on the RTC's governing board.

Captain Stewart stated that the RTC system appeared to be working well. He explained that officers would call the hotline for the RTC's FlexRIDE On-Demand Service when staff conducted a release party, which would result in a bus coming to the WCRDF for inmates should they need transportation elsewhere. He reiterated that the WCRDF was still working with the RTC for that program. Commissioner Hill requested that Captain Stewart keep the Board updated on whether he encountered any issues with the system. She noted that she was still awaiting the additional information she had requested when Captain Stewart last presented to the BCC regarding United States (US) Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) detainees, the related costs and reimbursements the County received, and the cost to residents of Washoe County.

Captain Stewart explained that he, Acting Chief of the Reno Police Department (RPD) Corey Solferino, and Sheriff Darin Balaam had reviewed the figures within the very intricate US Marshals Service contract, as requested by Commissioner Hill. He explained that the contract accounted for costs such as wages across all ranks of WCRDF employees, noting that those figures had been included because a portion of those expenses was attributed to potential costs associated with ICE detainees for the jail. He stated that himself, Acting Chief Solferino, and Sheriff Balaam could not identify a more accurate way to estimate those potential costs than the method used to calculate the figure in the federal US Marshals Service contract. He reported that they had attempted that calculation by taking some budget line items and dividing them by the number of inmates,

the number of days they would be in the facility, and every other factor they had considered for that research, but he opined that the resulting figure from those calculations did not provide a true and accurate estimate. He explained that the number they ultimately used with the federal government was obtained through the services of the Summerill Law Group, which generated daily inmate housing cost estimates for many jails across the Country due to the many factors that needed to be accounted for to determine such costs. He stated that staff could continue to try to identify a better way to estimate those costs, but he opined that the number they had arrived at in the contract was the most accurate estimate of the cost per inmate per day.

Commissioner Hill stated that she was just seeking information, as she had received no response to the request she made in January. She requested that Captain Stewart provide any details he had on the matter, as she believed it would be helpful for him to do so. She acknowledged that there were concerned constituents and wanted to be responsive to them and ensure that the Board remained transparent with taxpayers.

Commissioner Clark thanked Captain Stewart for his report. He stated that it was good to hear that the food at the WCRDF was still good. He thanked Captain Stewart for his work at the jail.

Chair Andriola noted that she had a single question. She recalled that when Captain Stewart discussed the IAP, he mentioned a 70 percent rate for the actions released inmates would take before the RTC transportation program was implemented. She asked what that percentage was currently. Captain Stewart stated that he would need to get that information from his detention services unit sergeant. He noted that the 70 percent failure rate he had referred to was for inmates who had not reached programs after their release from the WCRDF, with only approximately 30 percent of those released actually attending them. Chair Andriola suspected that it might be interesting and helpful to learn whether that failure rate had actually improved after the jail began offering that RTC FlexRide service or other means provided by the WCRDF. She thanked Captain Stewart for the helpful presentation and expressed appreciation for his proactivity in providing the reasons for the increase in certain statistics, as she had initially intended to ask for those details. She thanked Captain Stewart, Judge Bertschy, the community, Washoe County, the Cares Campus, and Our Place for implementing the Sequential Intercept Model (SIM). She stated that the success of those efforts was visible, and everyone was making things better in an integral way.

DONATIONS

- 26-0281** **7A1** Recommendation to accept cash donation [\$18,500.00] from the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada on behalf of the Paul and Gwen Leonard Charitable Foundation as a legacy bequest for support of Rancho San Rafael Regional Park; and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

26-0282 **7B1** Recommendation to accept monetary donations from various donors in the amount of [\$25,520.53] and donations of dog/cat food and treats from the SPCA with an estimated value of [\$22,561.96], and recognize numerous citizens and businesses who donated animal food and various goods with an estimated value of [\$6,811.87] (see attached donor lists) to Washoe County Regional Animal Services (“WCRAS”) retroactive for the period of October 1, 2025 through December 31, 2025, to be used for the humane care and treatment of sick and/or injured, stray, abandoned, or at-risk animals; express appreciation for these thoughtful contributions; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Regional Animal Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Items 7A1 through 7B1 be accepted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 8A1 THROUGH 8I1

26-0283 **8A1** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the Interim Financial Report for Washoe County Governmental Funds for the Nine Months Ended March 31, 2026 recognizing a total funds balance increase of \$63 million year-to-date and \$17 million year over year. This unaudited interim financial report is provided quarterly, in addition to the audited annual comprehensive financial report, to provide information on Washoe County’s primary operating fund and accounts and identify significant variances between the years. - Unaudited Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0284 **8B1** Recommendation to authorize the Washoe County District Attorney's Office to initiate a forcible detainer action pursuant to NRS 40.240 and NRS 40.414 to remove unauthorized occupants from County-owned real property located at 520 Carnes Drive, Sun Valley, Nevada (APN 035-091-04), and to authorize all related legal proceedings, service of notices, and coordination with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office for execution of any court-ordered removal. District Attorney. (Commission District 3.)

26-0285 **8C1** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the fiscal year 2026 petty cash and change fund count and cash control audit for Washoe County Regional Animal Services from the Internal Audit Division. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0286 **8C2** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the fiscal year 2026 petty cash and change fund count and cash control audit for Washoe County

Community Services Department - Building Services from the Internal Audit Division. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0287** **8C3** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the fiscal year 2026 petty cash and change fund count and cash control audit for Washoe County Juvenile Services from the Internal Audit Division. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0288** **8C4** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the fiscal year 2026 petty cash and change fund count and cash control audit for Washoe County Recorder's Office from the Internal Audit Division. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0289** **8C5** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the fiscal year 2026 petty cash and change fund count and cash control audit for Washoe County Registrar of Voters from the Internal Audit Division. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0290** **8C6** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the fiscal year 2026 petty cash and change fund count for Washoe County Treasurer's Office from the Internal Audit Division. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0291** **8C7** Recommendation to certify charges, levy and direct the Treasurer to collect \$118,645.53 in special assessments for fiscal year 2026/2027 as requested by the State Engineer of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, for Black Rock Desert Groundwater Basin (\$68.91), Honey Lake Valley Groundwater Basin (\$3,264.44), Hualapai Flat Water District (\$6,470.00), San Emidio Desert District (\$2,853.05), Warm Springs Valley Groundwater Basin (\$9,192.87), Washoe Valley Groundwater Basin (\$4,296.26), Warm Springs/Winnemucca Creek Basin (\$3,000.00), Cold Springs Valley Groundwater Basin (\$5,000.00), Lake Tahoe Groundwater Basin (\$6,500.00), Lemmon Valley Water District (\$10,000.00), Pleasant Valley Groundwater Basin (\$6,000.00), Spanish Springs Valley Groundwater Basin (\$5,000.00), Tracy Segment Groundwater Basin (\$2,000.00), Truckee Canyon Segment Groundwater Basin (\$5,000.00) and Truckee Meadows/Sun Valley Groundwater Basin (\$50,000.00). Authorize the Treasurer to remove uncollectible assessments and/or correct assessments on the tax roll as requested by the Division of Water Resources; direct the Clerk to execute the State of Nevada Division of Water Resources certification letters and send them back to the Division pursuant to NRS 533.285; and direct the Comptroller to pay to the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources the requested funds. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0292** **8D1** Recommendation to accept a supplemental FY26 Homemaker subgrant award from the State of Nevada, Aging and Disability Services

Division (ADSD) in the amount of [\$37,309.80; \$5,597.00 county match] retroactive from July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026 to provide Homemaker services to seniors aged 60 or older in Washoe County; authorize the Director of Finance & Administration of the Human Services Agency to execute the grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0293** **8F1** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$49,421.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY26 Hospital Acquired Infections - Sharp 1 Grant, retroactive to January 1, 2026, through July 31, 2026, for Northern Nevada Public Health to enhance hospital acquired infections in Washoe County, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0294** **8F2** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$47,923.00; no county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY26 Hospital Acquired Infections - Sharp 2 Grant, retroactive to January 1, 2026, through July 31, 2027, for Northern Nevada Public Health to establish hospital acquired infections in Washoe County, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0295** **8G1** Recommendation to approve Washoe County Regional Animal Services (WCRAS) volunteers, who have successfully completed the established training process to drive County vehicles to support WCRAS programming. Regional Animal Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0296** **8H1** Recommendation to approve registration and other costs associated for Reno Justice Court's non-county personnel, contracted Clinical Director's, attendance at the national 2026 All Rise Conference. Total estimated cost \$2,100, to be funded by the Court's existing budget. [Net Fiscal Impact \$0]. Reno Justice Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0297** **8H2** Recommendation to approve registration and other costs associated for Reno Justice Court's non-county personnel, contracted clinician's attendance at the All Rise Impaired Driving Solutions Foundational DUI Training. Total estimated cost \$1,830 to be funded by the Court's existing budget. [Net Fiscal Impact \$0]. Reno Justice Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0298** **8I1** Recommendation to approve the appointment of Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District Fire Chief Richard Edwards to fill an unexpired term on the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee following the

retirement of Chris Ketring from the Committee, with a term expiring June 30, 2027. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Andriola commended Vice Chair Garcia, Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large, and everyone involved in organizing Agenda Item 8B1.

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

Regarding Agenda Item 8B1, Commissioner Clark asked CDDA Large to provide his opinion on how long it would take to initiate the forcible detainer action and evict whoever might be occupying the property. CDDA Large recalled that before he left the office that morning, he requested that his staff begin drafting the forcible detainer notices to be given and served by Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) deputies to all squatters on 520 Carnes Drive. He indicated that after the notice was served, the squatters would have five days to initiate a judicial proceeding; if they did not, the County would take the next steps to remove them from the property. He hoped that all the squatters would vacate the property upon notice, and said that if they did not, a judicial proceeding would take a few weeks to a month to complete due to expedited review. Commissioner Clark asked when CDDA Large believed his office would have the paperwork filed and served. CDDA Large noted that the paperwork would be complete by the next day, with the WCSO serving the notices either the next or following day. Commissioner Clark asked if the Board had any connections with the WCSO to expedite the service. CDDA Large mentioned that the County would utilize the Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team, which had been instrumental regarding public nuisances throughout the entire process. He opined that Agenda Item 8B1 would not have been possible without the cooperation of the HOPE Team and Vice Chair Garcia. He said the process had many moving parts and that he was hopeful for an expeditious outcome. Commissioner Clark saluted everyone involved in the process.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8I1 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8I1 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

BLOCK VOTE – 11 THROUGH 13

26-0299

AGENDA ITEM 11 Recommendation to approve attached Resolution #R26-000029 to augment the Fiscal Year 2026 Library Expansion Fund budget, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005 and Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 354.410, in the amount of [\$457,956.43] to appropriate an opening fund balance which is larger than anticipated, to fully expense 1994 WC-1 Library Expansion tax override funds in support of library services in our community by June 30, 2026. The augmentation will increase expenditure authority for the purpose of purchasing physical and electronic collection materials; and direct Finance to make the

appropriate budget amendments (no General Fund impact). Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Andriola asked County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas to clarify information regarding Agenda Item 11, as she believed it was an accounting function rather than a library expansion. CM Thomas indicated that Agenda Item 11 was an augmentation that reallocated funds to the appropriate locations, allowing the County to allocate resources. Chair Andriola thanked CM Thomas and noted that the funds were not new but existing money that was augmented to the budget as an accounting function.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 11 be approved and directed.

26-0300 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to award a contract resulting from Request For Proposal (RFP) 3287-25 for Safe Camp and Resource Center Operations to the most responsive and responsible bidder, The Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality (RISE). The Nevada Cares Campus Safe Camp Shelter and Resource Center Day Use Center programs provide housing-focused environments that promote engagement in housing stability planning and wrap-around services including case management, job and housing placement and assistance with applications for public assistance. Under this contract, RISE will provide staffing, program management and administrative oversight for the Nevada Cares Campus Safe Camp Shelter and the Resource Center Day Use Center, which may include the use of Washoe County vehicles to conduct County HSA business activities. The contract will be awarded for the initial term of twenty-four (24) months plus two weeks, commencing June 16, 2026 to June 30, 2028 in an amount not to exceed [\$38,750] for the period of June 16, 2026 to June 30, 2026, [\$2,010,417] for the period of July 1, 2026 to June 30, 2027, and [\$2,080,782] for the period of July 1, 2027 to June 30, 2028, with the provision for up to three (3), one (1) year renewals; and if approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the Agreement and any subsequent amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Andriola requested that CM Thomas clarify the bidding guidelines for Agenda Item 12. CM Thomas indicated that, according to State law, the County was required to issue a request for proposal (RFP) when contracts ended, unless there was an extenuating circumstance. She recalled that the County issued an RFP for the operations of the Safe Camp and, through a competitive bidding process, RISE was awarded the contract. She said that RISE was deeply involved in the County and had run the Crossroads Program

and Our Place. She mentioned that the County had a long-time affiliation with RISE and hoped her clarification helped. Chair Andriola thanked CM Thomas.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be awarded, approved, and authorized.

26-0301 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to acknowledge complaint from Washoe County Code Enforcement regarding conditions on Assessor's Parcel Numbers 085-330-11, 085-330-19, 085-330-23, 085-330-20, 085-830-24, 506-021-21, 085-090-19, 085-090-51, 085-090-52, 085-090-53, and 085-090-54 located in Sun Valley; and approve the fixing of a date for a hearing of the Board of County Commissioners to hear the proof of the complainant and the property owner and to order publication of notice of the hearing at least once a week for 2 weeks next preceding the date of the hearing in a newspaper of general circulation published in the county. Manager's office. (All Commission Districts.)

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large indicated that, pursuant to Washoe County Code (WCC), the Board needed to set a date for the hearing under Agenda Item 13. He believed that, under the notice requirements, which included two publications, the County needed to publish a personal notice to all owners regarding the public hearing scheduled for June 16, 2026. He said that with Clerk Jan Galassini and Chair Andriola's approval, he would like the public hearing date to be June 16, 2026. Chair Andriola requested that the motion be amended to include the public hearing date of June 16, 2026, if Commissioner Herman and Vice Chair Garcia were amenable.

During the call for public comment, Penny Brock expressed confusion about why the Board placed Agenda Items 11, 12, and 13 in the Block Agenda. She said that she filled out a public comment card to address both Agenda Items 11 and 13, and asked if she had to provide both comments only once. Chair Andriola confirmed that she would provide her comments only once if the items were on the Block Agenda. Ms. Brock requested that her time be restarted to clarify the agenda. She noted that she strongly objected to Agenda Item 11 being in the Block Agenda. She said that it was not right for the Board to fund the library when Washoe County Question 1 (WC-1) was defeated by the voters. She expressed shock that Agenda Item 12 was in the Block Agenda because it pertained to the Safe Camp contract, which was controlled by the Reno Initiative for Shelter and Equality (RISE). She assumed there would be no presentation from RISE since the item was placed on the Block Agenda. She said she had an issue with the County giving Safe Camp \$4,693,132 in 2023 because she speculated that taxpayers had concerns about the funding being depleted and that it would become a burden on taxpayers. She did not understand why the Volunteers of America (VOA) was not overseeing Safe Camp and the Resource Center. She opined that RISE was a front for Karma Box Executive Director Grant Denton, as she believed he had entered into contracts with the Cities of Sparks and Reno. She said that there was a problem with Safe Camp in 2024 and reported that there were nine women who accused Mr. Denton of abuse. She recalled that there were other

problems involving the Safe Camp staff, and that some homeless shelters were under investigation for fraud. She asserted that, as a taxpayer, she had requested an independent audit of the Cares Campus and homelessness funding. She said that there were supposedly only 1,400 homeless individuals in the County while the taxpayers spent millions on the population. She felt that the homelessness population was increasing and that the priorities the Board set for the homelessness issues were not going away or getting better. She requested information on how the County believed Safe Camp addressed the issue, why the individuals were living in individual pods, whether they paid rent, and whether they ate food at the Cares Campus.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 13 be acknowledged, approved, and ordered.

26-0302 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Article 336 Housing Incentives to add small unit density standards allowing increased density for dwelling units with a maximum unit size of 1,200 square feet and establishing requirements for utilizing the increased density; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. This ordinance is part of a group of amendments the Board has identified as a top priority for implementation of the master plan. And if supported, set a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for June 16, 2026 Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Bill No. 1948.

Planning Manager Kat Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Small Unit Density Incentive; Background; Future Trends; Article 336 Housing Incentives; Traffic Generation Estimates; Behind the Numbers – Traffic; Behind the Numbers: Building Bulk; Findings; Motion – Approval; Thank You; Model Neighborhoods; Traffic Generation Methods.

Ms. Oakley introduced herself and stated that she would be discussing one of the last items in a series of housing amendments to the Washoe County Development Code (WCDC). She stated that the amendment under deliberation focused on density incentives for small units. She displayed the slide titled *Background* and expressed her intent to provide background on why the topic of unit size and incentivizing units of a smaller size was being discussed. She noted that she would share information with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on household and housing trends, acknowledging that she had previously discussed such topics with the Board. She reported that the trends in housing supply indicated that the units entering the market and household sizes had been diverging for some time. She noted that housing unit sizes had increased consistently from 1970 to 2022. She reported that, within that timeframe, medium-density suburban (mds) median home sizes had grown from 1,266 square feet (sq ft) to 2,231 sq ft, which

represented an increase of nearly 1,000 sq ft. She explained that the mean household size in the United States (US) had decreased from 3.13 people to 2.25 within that same period. She explained that smaller households now needed to move into or try to afford larger houses, which demonstrated a discrepancy. She stated that 63 percent of the households in Washoe County were comprised of one or two people. She explained that people were required to pay for more than they actually needed in some cases, which was why the County was investigating the need for a wider variety of housing types.

Ms. Oakley showed the *Future Trends* slide and stated that the issue of unit size was expected to continue. She explained that the graphic on the right of the slide included figures associated with the different types of household structures in the US. She reported that the traditional nuclear family, defined as a household of two parents and one or more children, accounted for only 20 percent of the Nation's households. She stated that the three largest demographics in the US were single people living alone, couples, and adults sharing homes with other adults, which could include multi-generational family living arrangements or roommates. She noted that single-parent families were another listed household demographic. She acknowledged that there was a wide variety of household types, but less variety in the types of housing units available to serve them. She explained that the Washoe County consensus forecast expected the number of seniors to increase from 19 percent of the County's population in 2024 to approximately 21 percent by 2044, representing an additional 30,000 seniors in the County's population. She noted that, beyond a certain age, the average household size would decrease, which was expected to contribute to the ongoing trend of smaller households. She emphasized the need to ensure there would be housing units available on the market to serve those individuals, both in the present and in the future. She explained that such a necessity demonstrated why the development of a small unit density incentive was proposed to create more of those homes affordable by design, rather than by deed restrictions or other mechanisms on the market.

Ms. Oakley displayed the slide titled *Article 336 Housing Incentives*. She reported that Article 336 on housing incentives in the Washoe County Code (WCC) had recently been activated, with the plan for the current item being to add a new section to establish the incentive, which was now under deliberation. She noted that the new incentive would specify a 25 percent density increase for units under 1,200 sq ft. She explained that a unit of that size was representative of a traditional starter home with three bedrooms and two bathrooms, which were not currently being built. She explained that the incentive was available for homes in suburban, urban, and commercial zones outside the Lake Tahoe Basin (Basin) and would not apply to those in rural zoning districts, as those areas of the County had more large-lot development patterns. She stated that staff were establishing the needed regulations around the use of the incentive for suburban and urban areas within the County by specifying that the maximum unit size must be met at the time of the initial certificate of occupancy, that any approved tentative maps or specific plans intending to use the incentive would need a new approval to ensure that it could be assessed for the potential impacts of the change, and that no variance could be requested to the section. She noted that such specifications were necessary to ensure that requests for a variance could not be made to allow a maximum unit size of 1,400 sq ft, rather than the permitted 1,200

sq ft. She stated that there were other provisions she would be happy to describe in more detail if the Board requested it.

Ms. Oakley showed the *Traffic Generation Estimates* slide and explained that staff had calculated the incentive estimates based on the proposal's goal of increasing affordability and continuing to consider the market. She noted that the incentive was intended to create more affordable-by-design units, but staff wanted to ensure they were appropriately accounting for the incentive's impacts by researching some of its key effects, including traffic. She noted that the Staff Report included additional details on the matter. She explained that staff researched three types of model neighborhoods, with one model being a 100-unit standard Washoe County neighborhood included to reflect the County's average household size, and the other two examples representing small-unit neighborhoods that would qualify for the 25 percent density-increase incentive. She elaborated that in each of those two neighborhood models, there would be 125 units, and because of the unit sizes, different types of census data had been used to estimate the average household size for those units, which enabled them to estimate each model's total resident count. She stated that staff had used two different traffic generation techniques to assess potential traffic impacts for each model, including the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) resident-based traffic generation estimate and data from the RTC (Regional Transportation Commission) 2024 Household Travel Survey, which could be used as a source for local data as a comparison metric. She reported that staff had found that, in all cases, a small-unit neighborhood was expected to have a lower traffic impact, even with a higher number of units.

Ms. Oakley introduced the *Behind the Numbers – Traffic* slide by reiterating that the incentive's intent was to achieve greater affordability while being mindful of potential impacts. She explained that proposing a 25 percent density incentive was more conservative than the most moderate traffic estimation, which staff believed would ensure that the incentive's impact would be negligible. She stated that it was worth noting that any proposed development, whether using or not using the incentive, would be required to conduct traffic impact analyses in accordance with Washoe County standard practices. She noted that such was the case currently and would continue to occur for proposed developments to ensure that the County was requiring appropriate mitigations for traffic impacts.

Ms. Oakley displayed the slide titled *Behind the Numbers: Building Bulk*. She explained that staff wanted to consider building bulk as a potential impact of allowing additional units, which had been analyzed based on total square footage. She reported that, because small-unit neighborhoods had a maximum home size of 1,200 sq ft, it was assumed that the average neighborhood of that type would include 125 units, resulting in a total building bulk of 150,000 sq ft. She compared those figures to those of average mds neighborhoods, noting that the average home size for houses within a 100-unit mds neighborhood built between 1970 and 2024 was 1,865 sq ft, which would not qualify for the 25 percent incentive and would result in approximately 186,500 sq ft of building bulk. She explained that those statistics were similar to those for newer homes in mds neighborhoods constructed more recently. She noted that such homes were typically much

larger, averaging 2,261 sq ft. She noted that such a neighborhood comprised of 100 units, would represent over 200,000 sq ft of building bulk. She reported that staff had determined that a small-unit neighborhood would have a much more limited impact on building bulk, resulting in more homes per neighborhood and less visual impact due to the reduced building. She reiterated that the methods she had described represented how staff had considered potential impacts while researching the incentive.

Ms. Oakley showed the *Findings* slide. She recalled that staff had presented the proposal to the Planning Commission (PC) in April of 2026. She reported that the PC had voted unanimously to recommend approval of the incentive after determining they could meet all four listed findings, despite being required to meet only one. She stated that staff had held several public outreach meetings on the incentive prior to presenting the matter to the PC. She reported that approximately eight people attended the outreach meetings, all of whom expressed support for the proposed incentive. She displayed the *Motion – Approval* slide and explained that the PC’s recommendation was to introduce and conduct a first reading of the ordinance. She concluded her presentation by showing the *Thank you* slide and stating that she would be happy to answer any questions from the Board.

Commissioner Hill thanked Ms. Oakley and noted that she was uncertain which number the ordinance for Agenda Item 9 represented in the series of related amendments that had come before the BCC thus far. Ms. Oakley reported that the amendment under deliberation was the eighth amendment to be proposed. Commissioner Hill remarked that she believed those efforts had begun three years prior and thanked Ms. Oakley for continuing to make progress on the issue. She inquired whether her work on the density bonus had been inspired by actions from other communities and asked whether the Cities of Reno and Sparks were taking similar action. Ms. Oakley confirmed that the City of Reno had a similar incentive specifically intended for multi-family housing with a focus on average unit size. She explained that focusing on the average unit size metric for a multifamily housing incentive worked well for that type of housing, but she opined that such an approach would not be as applicable to a single-family development incentive. She opined that the County was taking a relatively unique approach to the issue, based on her research. She noted that the City of Reno was the only entity she was aware of using a similar method. She explained that the reason staff thought the incentive was worth pursuing was the fundamental disconnect between current local trends and residents' needs. She stated that the incentive represented a way to directly approach the issue staff had witnessed. She acknowledged that the approach was unique, but that staff was optimistic those efforts could yield some positive results.

Commissioner Hill acknowledged that Ms. Oakley had worked with a small group of developers who would give her advice on those efforts. She asked whether those developers had indicated to Ms. Oakley that the proposed incentive approach would make it easier for them to determine whether the projected returns of development would justify the cost of participating. Ms. Oakley explained that discussions on that topic had begun with developers several years prior, and she confirmed that those developers were interested in the incentive, partially because the lack of the deed restriction element would

mean less administrative overhead. She noted that the incentive was associated with a market-rate environment, which appealed to more developers. She confirmed that staff had heard there was some interest from developers in the incentive, but it would only become clear whether the incentive would be used once a piece of land had been identified for development. She reported that, based on conversations with developers, she had the impression that they were optimistic about their ability to use the incentive.

Commissioner Hill recalled a report she had heard at the Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) meeting the day prior about a City of Sparks permanent supportive housing project nearing completion. She explained that completing the project required it to go through the Master Plan amendment process and the Reno Housing Authority (RHA), which had delayed its completion and represented a substantial expense. She clarified that she was not implying that Ms. Oakley needed to be the one to fix those processes, but rather to emphasize that it was a priority for herself and the Board as a whole to consider identifying ways to reduce barriers for the completion of housing matters that were necessary to ensure those with special needs were housed. She noted that the issue extended to addressing the affordable housing lapse, as requiring the development community to navigate complex processes took additional time. She opined that the proposal was a very creative way to avoid those regulatory requirements in a sustainable and thoughtful manner. She expressed hope that the Board would be supportive of the amendment and that Ms. Oakley would continue to keep them informed throughout the process should she encounter any barriers that the BCC could help reduce. Ms. Oakley noted that one more package would be brought before the Board at an upcoming BCC meeting and stated that it would address the issue Commissioner Hill had mentioned.

Vice Chair Garcia stated that all the amendments related to housing brought forward over the years had been very inspiring. She commended Ms. Oakley for her creative thinking, noting her appreciation for her basing the ideas and suggestions in the presentations on population growth projections. She acknowledged that Ms. Oakley considered current trends in American households. She opined that it was very important that there were codes and regulations that reflected the reality their constituents faced every day. She noted that she was always very excited when Ms. Oakley came before the Board. She acknowledged that Ms. Oakley had made substantial progress on the proposal. She echoed Commissioner Hill's previous comments regarding Ms. Oakley's work over the years to address senior housing, missing affordable housing, small lots, and infill accessory dwelling units (ADUs), as well as the current work she was doing on small-unit density incentives. She stated that Ms. Oakley had done a tremendous amount of work. She acknowledged that Ms. Oakley had said that there would be one last package brought before the Board, which would end the series of housing amendments. She requested that, six months to a year after the implementation of all those efforts, the Board be given an update on the status and results. She noted that she would be very curious about how those measures the Board had passed were progressing and how they were helping address the issue. She reiterated her belief that an update from Ms. Oakley's team would be welcome in the future.

Chair Andriola thanked Ms. Oakley. She explained that Ms. Oakley's efforts addressed Governor Joe Lombardo's initiative with Assembly Bill (AB) 540. She stated that the proposed amendment was intended to identify what the County could do to address the housing crisis, not only in Washoe County but throughout Nevada. She explained that the proposal also provided an opportunity to streamline a solution to the issue. She noted that she was aware of Ms. Oakley's efforts to meet with different groups to solicit feedback and ideas, as well as her work to consider creative solutions, which were reflected in the proposal. She stated that she often mentioned the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) in housing discussions, as that topic and the associated housing crisis were frequently discussed during those meetings. She noted that the housing issue was being experienced everywhere. She explained that she had lived in Nevada for almost 40 years and expressed surprise that communities like Elko were experiencing the same issue, which had not occurred since the mining industry began rapidly expanding in that area, necessitating the shipment of mobile housing units so workers could remain there. She acknowledged that the proposal under deliberation was not about those historical events in Elko, but rather to implement a permanent solution to a current crisis in the area. She thanked Ms. Oakley and her team for their continued efforts to incorporate feedback on how to modify the process, particularly regarding streamlining. She referred to Vice Chair Garcia's previous comments and suspected that the Board would learn much more about the incentive as it was implemented, as they had discussed Ms. Oakley returning before the BCC to assist the County in acting swiftly. She thanked Ms. Oakley for doing so, as governmental entities did not often act nimbly.

On the call for public comment, Pat Davison greeted the Board. Chair Andriola thanked her for her hard work and for always helping the County become the best it possibly could be. Pat Davison introduced herself as a resident of District 5 and stated that she was happy to see the new incentive for small units come before the Board. She indicated that the small-unit neighborhoods envisioned by the incentive seemed suitable for first-time home buyers or seniors whose children had permanently moved out. She said that the demographic background provided by staff had revealed that houses were getting larger while households were becoming smaller. She stated that such a trend meant more units were needed to adequately house the same number of people compared to the past. She commended staff for the traffic and building bulk analyses, as they were not only brilliant for informing the public and decision-makers, but also for proactively addressing some of the major concerns often voiced by those living near the project sites. She reminded that any project receiving the increased density would still have to analyze impacts, as there were no exemptions associated with the incentive. She stated that the incentive was another item in a series designed to be as flexible as possible, taking a partial free-market approach without compromising quality of life. She said that the County's residents received what they needed while a developer would get the necessary return on investment (ROI). She stated that she had expected a deed restriction to be included in the proposal to limit occupant income or size, but noted that she could support the proposed change without one. She opined that the flexibility was worthwhile if more cottages, duplexes, or other units were available for buyers or renters, as it was better than nothing. She stated that the small-unit incentive could be the measure that captured the attention of

developers that would ultimately result in some units being built. She explained that with that goal in mind, she strongly urged the Board to support the amendment.

Chair Andriola thanked Pat Davison for her education on those topics, as there was substantial misinformation about them.

Bill No. 1948 was introduced by Commissioner Hill, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

26-0303 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to: 1) acknowledge the Business Impact Statement findings pursuant to NRS 237; and 2) introduce and conduct first reading of an ordinance amending the Regional Road Impact Fee (RRIF) General Administrative Manual (GAM) and the RRIF Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with revised fees. The RRIF is a NRS chapter 278B impact fee designed to generate revenue for the construction of regional roads and associated improvements in the community that was first passed in 1996 and has since been periodically amended upon the adoption by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Washoe County, Nevada. The amount of the fees is based on the most recent version of the CIP in effect and is calculated according to the formula set forth in the GAM. The current amendments to the GAM consist of the 8th Edition RRIF GAM that has been approved by RTC for recommendation to governing bodies of the county and cities, as well as associated updates to the CIP and fees. Overall, the revised fee schedule reflects an average decrease of approximately 2.3%, although individual land use categories may vary; and for other matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto; 3) and set a public hearing for possible adoption of the ordinance for May 26, 2026. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Bill No. 1949.

Commissioner Herman asked what constituted a first reading and whether there was a specific law the Board had to follow. Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large indicated that the Board instructed staff to open the Washoe County Code (WCC) and to set a hearing date. He said that once the Board designated the item with an ordinance number, it would be introduced and then scheduled for first and second readings. He recalled that the Board sometimes performed an introduction and a first reading simultaneously, bypassing a step; however, when the item pertained to a topic such as housing, the Board performed an introduction followed by a first reading, with a second reading at a later meeting. Commissioner Herman asked CDDA Large to provide her with the law the Board had to follow. CDDA Large said that he would send her the information.

Bill No. 1949 was introduced by Commissioner Hill, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

Chair Andriola requested that the Engineering and Capital Projects Division Director, Dwayne Smith, offer comments related to Agenda Item 10. Mr. Smith indicated that Agenda Item 10 was a standard item presented to the Board and the Cities of Reno and Sparks. He believed the item was last brought before the Board in 2021. He said that, periodically, the County and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) updated the General Administrative Manual and the program of projects for the regional roadway projects led by the RTC through an interlocal agreement. He noted that the projects were funded and paid through Regional Road Impact Fees (RRIF). He explained that Agenda Item 10 was a little different because staff had requested a business impact statement process. He said that during the last legislative session, an additional requirement was placed on the County to prepare a business impact statement under Assembly Bill (AB) 444, which provided the community with insight and transparency into the processes for selecting roadways and allocating funding. He expressed appreciation for the Board's support of Agenda Item 10.

Vice Chair Garcia requested that the motion be amended to include a public hearing for possible adoption on May 26, 2026. Chair Andriola indicated that the motion had been amended.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

11:51 a.m. **The Board recessed.**

01:00 p.m. **The Board reconvened with Commissioner Hill absent.**

26-0304 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Presentation by Registrar of Voters, Andrew McDonald to discuss the Data Transparency Project. (All Commission Districts.)

Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Project Plain Sight; The Question; Three Project Pillars; Project Portal Components; Data Snapshot; ROV Process; Six Steps; Generating the Hash Locally; Match the Values; What to do with the Result; Center for Internet Security; About CIS; CIS and Elections; SHA-256; Thank you.

Chair Andriola issued opening remarks, thanking everyone for the hard work put into the project. She felt that everyone knew that recent national polls showed Americans had decreasing confidence in how elections were conducted, and that everyone could agree that nobody wanted that to happen. She stated that it had to change for the sake of their civil society and its continued existence. She explained that she wanted everyone to feel comfortable knowing the election system worked as it should, but that, with each election, they saw claims of fraud and unfairness, court challenges to election results, and technical malfunctions, tampering, or malicious interference with the devices that produce election data. She thought the problem was that the election industry had not provided a reliable way to judge whether the many components of the election system were performing as they should. She noted that she did not say voting machines. She felt the

issue was more than that. She stated that there was now a complex system of electronic components coming from dozens of vendors who were performing a number of unrelated tasks, working all year long, and there had been no reliable way to monitor and prove what they were doing, or to further prove there had been no tampering, fraud, or irregularities. She expressed that with her statement in mind, she was anxious, as she felt everyone was, to hear what the ROV, under the leadership of Mr. McDonald, was doing. She stated that Mr. McDonald had been leading the development of an election security pilot project called Project Plain Sight, which was ready to launch that week. She expressed her excitement about the project. She added that it had been worked on for about a year and a half, and would begin to address the problems she had just explained. She declared that it would lay the groundwork for greater confidence in future Washoe County elections.

Mr. McDonald shared the slide titled *Project Plain Sight* and introduced himself. He noted that he was joined by Ira Victor, President of Discovery Technician, a Nevada digital forensics firm, and also a Nevada ambassador for the Center of Internet Security (CIS). Mr. McDonald stated he was also joined by Justin Warren, the ROV Business Technologist, and Josh Franklin, Senior Cybersecurity Engineer with CIS.

Mr. McDonald explained that, in partnership with the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS) Division, Washoe County Technology Services (TS), and the CIS, their team had developed a public-facing voter data transparency pilot tool, otherwise known as Project Plain Sight. He felt that, with Washoe County's voter registration now centralized under the State's top-down system, the question was now how to ensure continued public confidence that Washoe County's voter rolls remained accurate, complete, and free from errors and unintended additions. He stated that the tool was designed to directly address that question, and enhance transparency, enforce election integrity, and strengthen public trust by enabling independent public validation of voter data. He added that before turning the presentation over to Mr. Victor, he wanted to acknowledge Chair Andriola for first encouraging the project concept, which he noted his office took seriously and worked to develop.

Mr. Victor shared the slide titled *The Question*, and stated that, due to time constraints, he would be reading his statement. He thanked Chair Andriola for having him before the Board. He stated that he had been in the field of data security for over 31 years, and even a few years ago, he would not have believed that a County government would launch such a pilot program. He offered compliments to Mr. McDonald and his team, and added that moving forward, the CIS would be there to help them. He explained that he was the Nevada ambassador for the CIS and wanted to emphasize that it was a 100 percent volunteer position. He described himself as the local helping hand and noted that he was acting in that role because he had experience with CIS controls and believed in them. He knew there were questions that would not be fully answered in the presentation, but added that if anyone wanted to know more, they could follow the speakers into the hallway after the presentation, and they would stay as long as they could to answer questions. He acknowledged that Chair Andriola had studied the election problem, found people who could help her understand it, and took the initiative to push for the pilot program. He hoped she received the credit she deserved.

Mr. Warren shared the slide titled *Three Project Pillars* and introduced himself, then stated that when they began designing Project Plain Sight, they anchored the work in three pillars. He added that everything shown in the next slides was built to serve those three pillars, the first of which was accountability. He attested that they were publicly committing to a verifiable record of what voter rolls look like from one day to the next. He felt that was meaningful and the kind of commitment to which the public could hold them accountable. He stated that the second pillar was data integrity and explained that they were providing the public a mathematically sound way to confirm that the record of a vote had not been altered by anyone at any point. He declared that the third pillar was public trust and that there was an old principle in security work, phrased as *trust, but verify*. He felt it was not a cynical phrase, but a recognition that durable trust was not simply about asking the public to take an institution's word as proof, but about giving the public the means to confirm the information for themselves. He expressed that the first two pillars existed to support accountability by showing what had been published and that the data had integrity and had not been changed. He felt that together they turned trust from something the ROV had to ask for into something the public could independently verify.

Mr. Warren shared the slide titled *Project Portal Components* and stated that when someone visited the Project Plain Sight web page, they could see three core components within the records section. He listed the first component as the Date of Record, which showed when the snapshot of the voter roll was captured. He noted that every snapshot was date-stamped, so there was no ambiguity about the date the data reflected. He listed the second component as the SHA-256 hash and suggested thinking of it as a digital fingerprint, which was a string of characters that uniquely identified the snapshot. He listed the third component as a download, explaining that it meant downloading the snapshot. He added that the actual data file was available for anyone to download on demand. He explained that the snapshot contained one's Voter Identification (ID), full name, political party code, County ID, status, zip code, and jurisdiction, which he said was one's precinct. He noted that specific data was intentionally omitted, such as addresses, Social Security numbers, and driver's license numbers. He stated they had deliberately scoped the snapshot to keep public voter information secure.

Mr. Warren shared the slide titled *ROV Process* and stated that the ROV Office captured a snapshot of a point-in-time export of those 10 fields of data from their voter registration system. Then they generated a SHA-256 hash of the exact file, which became the file's fingerprint. Finally, he noted, they published both the file and the hash on the Project Plain Sight page, along with the record date. These, he stated, were the components the public would use to verify the snapshot.

Mr. Warren shared the slide titled *Six Steps* and suggested looking at how the public might verify that snapshot. He explained that, to start, one would access the ROV's page, where one would find all the content and instructions. Next, he added, one would locate the records, the snapshot file, and the published hash for the date of interest. Then, they would download the record, which meant the snapshot itself. After that, he elaborated, one would open a Command Prompt or the Terminal on their computer. He

clarified that every modern operating system had that tool available; therefore, anyone should be able to use it on Windows, macOS, or Linux. He stated that once the program was opened, one would generate the hash themselves by running the hash command on the downloaded file and comparing the resulting values. He clarified that one would take the hash they had just generated locally and compare it to the hash generated by the ROV, and if the files matched, it would confirm the file was genuine. He added that if the hashes did not match, it would tell you something was wrong.

Mr. Warren shared the slide titled *Generating the Hash Locally* and explained that to create a hash on Windows, you would use the Certutil function, which allowed one to use the SHA-256 hash on the downloaded snapshot. He noted that on macOS or Linux, the Shasum would be used. He mentioned that if one preferred a graphical solution, gtkhash.org could be used; they had tested and verified that it worked well and was reliable.

Mr. Warren shared the slide titled *Match the Values* and stated that it showed what the hash looked like. He mentioned there was a small difference between the shown values, with a 0X on the published value, which indicated that it was a hexadecimal value. He pointed out that after the X, the Commissioners could see 0, E, C, C, and so on. He stated that the last five characters of the hash were A, B, B, 3, and 2. He asserted that he had checked that the strings matched exactly, which he explained was the goal of the project: to ensure that the user-derived number matched what the ROV had published and that the record had not been altered.

Mr. Warren shared the slide titled *What to do with the Result* and stated that there were two possible outcomes to be found in the results. The first was that there would be a match, which confirmed the integrity of every character in the file on their computer, meaning it was identical to the file the ROV published. He reiterated that the individual would have a genuine, unaltered copy of the official record. The second outcome, he noted, was that the results did not match, indicating that something had been changed between the file the ROV published and the file the individual had, which further suggested modification, corruption, or simply that the download did not complete. He stated that, no matter the cause, it was no longer a valid copy of the official record, and individuals should report it to the ROV by phone or by using a phone number they would add to their website. He mentioned that the form had not been completed yet, but that the ROV would place it near the bottom of their page, where someone could submit it to the ROV to have the office check the discrepancy. He suggested the ROV could then try to verify where the issue occurred and communicate that back to the submitter. He stated that what he had just discussed was the part of the project that delivered across all three of their pillars simultaneously. He explained that the public could independently verify the record, and if anything seemed inaccurate, there was a clear path where they could bring it to the attention of the ROV.

Mr. Franklin shared the slides titled *Center for Internet Security* and *About CIS*, introduced himself, and expressed that it had been wonderful to be part of the project and that he appreciated being allowed to participate. He explained that the CIS was a

nonprofit based out of Albany, New York. He noted that they owned and operated the CIS Controls, which were a list of best practices that organizations around the world could use to make themselves safer and more secure. He mentioned that their framework was typically among the top three most popular and was used by hospitals, schools, nations, and so on. He explained that essentially, they had been applying the CIS Controls to Project Plain Sight,

Mr. Franklin shared the slide titled *CIS and Elections* and explained that they had been focusing on areas such as device hardening and vulnerability scanning. He added that, as they had been involved since the project's inception, they were also making sound cybersecurity and network architecture decisions. He stated that for some of the decisions they were working on, such as the types of information they were pulling or not pulling from the voter registration system, they realized the need for a double storage system for the information that would be posted to the website. Then, he continued, there was the cryptographic need, which was the SHA-256 hash that had been mentioned. He explained that his team had been on site to assess the system and documentation, though not hands-on hacking.

Mr. Franklin shared the slide titled *SHA-256* and noted that he had been asked to speak about the SHA-256 hash. He stated that it was just a mathematical equation, and that users entered data and received a digital fingerprint. He added that it was standardized by the United States (US) government and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), which were the same people who did voting standards, Kevlar vests, the toilets on the International Space Station (ISS), and more. He stated that there were no known attacks against the SHA-256 algorithm and that it performed well, was widely recognized as secure, and was built into most modern operating systems. He added that it was free and readily available. He felt it was exciting that Washoe County was building security from the outset rather than simply adding it on afterward.

Chair Andriola thanked Mr. Franklin for traveling to give the presentation. She suggested it must have been great to meet everyone in person whom he had been working with online for months.

Vice Chair Garcia thanked Chair Andriola for bringing the project forward. She stated that the Board was always looking for innovative ways to improve the services, transparency, and communication they delivered to the public. She reiterated her thanks for thinking innovatively, and for the team for convening and traveling long distances to appear before the Board. She felt that CIS represented a world-renowned best practices hub and asked if Washoe County was the first County ROV to partner with CIS.

Mr. Franklin confirmed that on that type of project, they were the first to partner. He noted they had the Elections Infrastructure Information Sharing and Analysis Center (EI-ISAC), which he defined as a group of election offices that worked together to disseminate election best practices, but that they had never done anything like the current project, and felt that it was novel.

Vice Chair Garcia was reminded of the Washoe County Checkbook, in that it was uploaded every day and was easily accessible and public-facing. She expressed regret at not having asked about the costs associated with the County Checkbook when it was implemented, as there were inevitable time and staffing costs that were required. She noted that the maintenance of the new infrastructure for the current project added more items to Mr. McDonald's responsibilities. She asked, regarding the CIS website, whether they generated revenue from people purchasing and subscribing to the services they provided.

Mr. Franklin agreed they did.

Vice Chair Garcia asked if their services would cost the County something.

Mr. McDonald responded that there was no cost to the County. He noted there were some servers being used, but that it was mostly staff time that was required to get the project started. He added that the CIS representatives paid for their own flights, that Washoe County did not pay for them, nor had it paid anything for any of the work the CIS had done on the project, nor would it pay in the future if the CIS needed to consult with Washoe County.

Vice Chair Garcia wondered if the project would be hosted on the ROV website, possibly in a separate tab.

Mr. Warren explained that it was currently live on the ROV website and could be accessed via the data transparency tab. Mr. McDonald apologized for not doing a live demonstration.

Vice Chair Garcia noted that Mr. McDonald had a small team, was in the middle of an election year, had brought on new initiatives such as curbside Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-accessible voting, and was moving into a new building, which she noted was a lot of things happening at once. She felt that Project Plain Sight was a worthy effort, but wanted to make sure that his team had the capacity to complete it without overextending themselves moving forward, because, she noted, Washoe County did not have the budget to add new programs or staff.

Mr. McDonald explained that Washoe County sought to push beyond boundaries in the ROV, and that innovation was part of that mission. He added that when he took his position, he wanted to push the boundaries to ensure they could give the public confidence and integrity in the election process. He stated that with the new tool, the public could go out and do the work themselves and verify the information. He felt that, even though it took a bit more work, it was worth every penny.

Vice Chair Garcia asked what would happen if the system went down, as had happened with some live stream cameras, which she felt had created issues for the County. She asked how Mr. McDonald would handle an incident like that.

Mr. McDonald stated that if the system went down, the ROV would post something on its website explaining what happened. He added that a potential issue like that would be part of the overall planning. He noted they had backups for their systems and asked Mr. Warren to speak on the matter.

Mr. Warren stated that the system had been constructed around an immutable ledger that was constantly being written to and could not be modified in any capacity. He suggested that the only thing that could potentially be done was to delete it in its entirety. That, he noted, was how they got the reassurance that the data being compared was accurate; for example, if someone found a malicious action in the data, it would be compared against the immutable ledger to identify why there was an issue. He explained that if there was an outage, they had scripts running automatically on specific days, and if the system was down, they would not be able to capture data for that day. He suggested that if they had a 24-hour outage, they would effectively have to skip that day, and the following day, they would take a new snapshot as soon as service was restored. He declared that it was literally the best they could do, simply due to the availability of that database.

Mr. Victor added that one of the important elements of the CIS Controls was that it was built by a consensus of people that work in the field in information security, and that one of the three key pillars of information security was availability, and that those who were authorized to access a resource could access those resources, and so woven throughout the entire book of protocols for the CIS were elements that made it less likely a system went down. He attested that he had been using those protocols and earlier versions for over 25 years with his clients and that, based on anecdotal experience, he felt they made a big difference. He stated that either there were no outages or, if there were any, they were minor and short-term. He added that they would have a meaningful impact on the website's ability to stay online.

Vice Chair Garcia asked if there was a discrepancy between two days, whether there was a forum or a chat that a constituent could reach out to at the ROV, and what that communication would look like.

Mr. Warren stated that it would be a Microsoft form that would come directly to the ROV Office, and that they would have an email group that many people would monitor. So, he added, once the form was sent, the email group would be notified of a new submission and would review it. He explained they would ask for contact information to get a hold of the submitter, which would allow them to communicate if the submitter did, in fact, find something bad, and reassure them on the matter.

Mr. McDonald confirmed that both email and phone calls would work.

Vice Chair Garcia noted that they could have the best intentions when bringing innovative ideas forward, but that in the last three and a half years, she had seen really good ideas have holes poked in them. She added that the ROV was a department that had undergone tremendous scrutiny, so she was trying to ask questions in anticipation of some of the fears and concerns that might arise. She stated they were bringing forward the

new public-facing tool, but that at the same time, the unfamiliarity of rolling out something new could create even more distrust. She clarified that she did not want to sound unsupportive, but was asking the questions in anticipation of another tough year.

Mr. McDonald stated that it was a pilot program and that nothing was perfect in the beginning. He explained that they wanted to escalate the pilot project and complete it many months ago, but he wanted to make sure that, since he was putting his name on it, it was as good as it could be. He felt it could improve and become more refined. He reiterated that it was a pilot project and that, if it did not make sense for the public or did not have a meaningful impact, they would disband it in the future.

Chair Andriola stated she hoped the project would not be disbanded and that the CIS had a long history of protocols and controls that provided assurance. She clarified that it was not buying something, adding another layer onto something, or another machine, but was actually controls and standards that were globally recognized by people in various capacities for anything that had to do with really assuring validity and credibility. She added that if there were a cyberattack or hacking that could be identified, an anomaly could be explained or addressed in some way. She thanked the team for their contributions to the project. She thanked Washoe County Chief Information Officer Behzad Zamanian and his team for their contributions. She also thanked County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas for the support and understanding of how important the project was, not just for elections, but for the County as a whole. She stated that she wanted to go on record with the prediction that she truly believed that Washoe County was about to change the course of history. She felt that election security challenges in the Country were never solved because every attempt to solve them had failed, and that they had failed because they lacked critical proof of performance for election systems as a whole, and a focus on process and people, and not products. She stated that one could not throw money at something and expect to have a result, because there was another layer of need for protocols and controls. She added that the electronics industry had hundreds of products to sell, including hardware, software, and subscriptions, but that Mr. McDonald's project was focusing on process-oriented monitoring and reporting. She felt it made so much sense. She thanked the CIS for their help with the project. She expressed gratitude for their involvement and for how much she had personally learned from them, about them, and about data security. She felt everyone understood the need to protect data and cybersecurity, and that attacks seemed to be part of everyday discussions in one way or another. She reiterated that Mr. McDonald and his team were laying the groundwork for greater confidence in the future of Washoe County elections. She stated she truly believed that when the pilot program had been proven and when it had been applied to the entire election system, the project would echo all over Nevada and across the entire Nation. She believed they had started something that would have a huge impact. She thanked the presenters.

PUBLIC HEARING

26-0305 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Public Hearing and possible action to hold the first reading of an Ordinance repealing and replacing Ordinance No. 1552, to decrease stormwater management fees effective July 1, 2026, from \$9.31 to

\$2.00 per residential parcel or equivalent residential unit (ERU) for non-residential parcels, and other matters properly relating thereto; 2) set the public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption on May 26, 2026; and 3) direct staff to initiate design of the North Spanish Springs Floodplain Detention Facility Phase 2 project utilizing available Program funds to further reduce flood and stormwater impacts this area of North Spanish Springs. Community Services.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Bill No. 1950.

Commissioner Herman indicated that Agenda Item 15 concerned lowering stormwater management fees. She recalled that when the fees were implemented, there was an argument that the fees were too high, which she agreed with. Chair Andriola noted that the fees would be reduced through the official process.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1950 was introduced by Vice Chair Garcia, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

26-0306 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Public Hearing and possible action to hold the first reading of an ordinance: (1) amending Ordinance No. 1000 to change the boundaries of District No. 24 (Groundwater Remediation); (2) providing for a notice of a public hearing and other matters relating thereto; and (3) setting the public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption on June 16, 2026; AND, hold the first reading of an ordinance: (1) imposing a fee on the parcels of land in Washoe County, Nevada District No. 24 (Groundwater Remediation) to pay the costs of developing and carrying out a remediation plan; (2) providing for a notice of a public hearing and other matters relating thereto; and (3) setting the public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption on June 16, 2026. The Remediation Program monitors and remediates existing tetrachloroethene (PCE) contamination in groundwater in the central Truckee Meadows area, which requires updating the Program Boundaries annually. Community Services. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Bill No. 1951.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1951 was introduced by Vice Chair Garcia, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Bill No. 1952.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1952 was introduced by Vice Chair Garcia, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

26-0307 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Public Hearing: Second reading and potential adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Article 302, Allowed Uses and Article 406, Building Placement Standards, and creating Article 403, Residential Uses in Commercial Regulatory Zones, to allow multi-family residential use types in commercial regulatory zones with the application of multi-family development standards, to establish standards for mixed-use including a minimum percentage for commercial use-type square footage, a maximum square foot percentage for civic use-types, site development standards for parking, landscaping and other similar standards, a height restriction, and a requirement for municipal water and waste-water services; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Ordinance No. 1755, Bill No. 1946.

Senior Planner (Dr.) Eric Young conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WDCA25-0005 (Residential in Commercial Zoning); Background (3 slides); Summary of Proposed Standards; Proposed Standards (2 slides); Motion; Thank you. He read from the first slide titled *Background* and said that the County had experienced a series of housing-related code amendments per the Board's direction in the Strategic Plan, and those were updated in the Master Plan. He indicated that the Board could visit the Planning Department website's *Master Plan Implementation* section to see where the housing amendments are located. He referred to the second slide titled *Background* and explained that Agenda Item 17 was at the Board's direction to explore the possibility of allowing residential use in commercial areas. He said the amendment was part of the original housing direction to staff and was consistent with the Master Plan, which allowed greater flexibility in zoning and land-use regulations. He relayed information on the third slide titled *Background* and recalled that the 2025 Legislative Session determined that all local jurisdictions, counties, and cities allow residential multifamily and mixed-use in commercial zoning by right. He indicated that many of the thoughts staff were pursuing in the Washoe County Development Code (WCDC) to comply with the State's requirement that all uses be allowed by right, without a requirement for a mixed-use component. He indicated that many of the ideas staff considered for the Washoe County Development Code (WCDC) amendment aimed to meet the State's requirement that all uses be allowed by right, without needing a mixed-use

component. He said staff wanted to ensure the mixed-use option was included in the proposal.

Dr. Young read from the *Summary of Proposed Standards* slide and noted that the proposal had to establish some density requirements since the County had no densities in the commercial zones except for neighborhood commercial, which was similar to single-family density and required a special use permit (SUP), which the County would not be allowed to do anymore. He said that staff researched the appropriate density and decided to tag the neighborhood commercial density as high-density suburban (hds) residential. He recalled that staff compared commercial and tourist commercial and decided that they most closely matched, on average, the low-density urban (ldu) designation. This resulted in staff recommending 9 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) for neighborhood commercial and 14 du/ac. He mentioned that staff established minimum percentages for commercial use types and for mixed-use projects. He said that the County was not required by the State to include any commercial component in the new WCDC. He believed that an honest attempt should be made by not dedicating a small portion of the project to commercial; therefore, a minimum percentage was established to give the commercial component a better chance. He expressed concern that mixed-use projects could involve one or both components failing.

Dr. Young speculated that certain civic types may be appropriate, but staff set a maximum percentage for the amount that could be devoted to civic. He said that parking and landscaping standards were developed at the direction of the Planning Commission (PC), which established a maximum height of 35 feet (ft) for residential and mixed-use projects without a SUP because all commercial districts had a higher height limitation. He opined that the 35 ft standard was a standard the Board may be familiar with from Sun Valley and other areas with established maximum heights. He said that there were requirements for municipal water and wastewater services. He referred to the first slide titled *Proposed Standards* and pointed out that the new WCDC removed any references to not allowed or SUPs, while the second slide titled *Proposed Standards* showed replaced densities with what was allowed. He displayed the *Motion* slide and thanked the Board for their time.

Chair Andriola asked if the amendment satisfied Assembly Bill (AB) 241. Dr. Young confirmed that it was the last step to satisfy AB 241. Vice Chair Garcia recalled that the County was required to update the WCDC under AB 241; however, during Legislative discussion, the County, with the help of Legislative Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevich, raised concerns that multifamily development could diminish or even eliminate essential services in unincorporated neighborhoods and communities. She stated that her previously stated concerns were her own and that, as a Board, there were no guardrails to prevent the community from losing another grocery store or any other service important to unincorporated neighborhoods. She asked if anything over 35 ft would require a SUP, which would then have to go through the public process. Dr. Young affirmed Vice Chair Garcia's question. Vice Chair Garcia hoped that a well-intended piece of legislation would not negatively impact unincorporated communities. She thanked the staff for raising the Board's concerns.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Hill absent, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1755, Bill No. 1946, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100

26-0308 AGENDA ITEM 18 Public Comment.

Penny Brock indicated that she found Agenda Item 14 humorous because Registrar of Voters (ROV) Andrew McDonald discussed the Data Transparency Project; however, she believed no transparency was provided because the PowerPoint presentation was not attached to the Agenda in advance for the public. She reported that the Safeguard American Voter Eligibility (SAVE) America Act was pending in Washington, D.C., and that 83 percent of Americans, regardless of political affiliation, favored paper ballots and hand counting and wanted the SAVE America Act passed. She asserted that Americans did not want electronic voting equipment. She recalled that in November, the Board approved ballot marking devices, to which she had provided a report from two or three years earlier that found the devices to not be secure. She said that Dominion Voting Systems was not secure. She speculated that the Data Transparency Project would add another layer of inaccessibility to voting because some people lacked internet access, and many did not want to be bothered by what she believed was a convoluted process. She said she had researched voting rights groups across America and noted that if those groups had thought the Data Transparency Project was a good idea, they would have adopted it. She felt that ROV McDonald's background indicated that he loved information technology (IT). She said that voters wanted to vote on paper ballots with hand counting and receive their election results by midnight on Election Day; however, the State had previously received an extension of seven to eight days to get results. She asserted that President Donald Trump won Washoe County on Election Day in 2024, yet the ROV took seven or eight days, during which he lost Washoe County and Clark County. She said that something strange had occurred and that more research was needed regarding the Center for Internet Security (CIS).

26-0309 AGENDA ITEM 19 Announcements/Reports.

Chair Andriola noted that in April of 2026, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) conducted research on elections and ranked Nevada second in administering elections, up from its previous rank of 13.

* * * * *

1:48 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

CLARA ANDRIOLA, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

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

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

Pending Board Approval