

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

JANUARY 20, 2026

PRESENT:

Clara Andriola, Chair
Mariluz Garcia, Vice Chair
Michael Clark, Commissioner
Alexis Hill, Commissioner (via telephone)

Evonne Strickland, Deputy County Clerk
Kate Thomas, County Manager
Michael Large, Chief Deputy District Attorney

ABSENT:

Jeanne Herman, Commissioner

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

26-0051 **AGENDA ITEM 3A1** Invocation by Rajan Zed, President Universal Society of Hinduism

Rajan Zed from the Universal Society of Hinduism provided the invocation.

26-0052 **AGENDA ITEM 4A1** General Update from Truckee Meadows Fire & Rescue, Chief Richard J. Edwards may be available to provide the Board of County Commissioners a verbal report on fuel management and emergency planning, and any other updates as requested monthly to the board, to update to the community related to fire activities. TMFD. (All Commission Districts.)

Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Fire Chief Richard Edwards indicated that the TMFPD had been working with the Reno Fire Department (RFD) and the Sparks Fire Department (SFD) since April to enhance operational efficiency and safety while standardizing policies, training, and response protocols. He noted that the core effort was to develop and implement shared operational guidelines to guide joint emergency response and training. He explained that the guidelines helped reduce redundancy, optimize resource usage, and improve firefighter safety and service delivery. He reported that the vision was to create a unified, mission-driven system that reflected the values of the fire service while fostering trust and seamless collaboration amongst departments, regardless of jurisdiction. During that month, the TMFPD was conducting

training evolutions and acquired a structure with regional partners. He recalled that over the past month, the RFD, SFD, and TMFPD trained side by side in structure fire evolutions to hone skills while learning new guidelines. He asserted that the training was invaluable and would help ensure that the fire departments provided the highest level of service to the communities they served. He expressed appreciation toward the fire agencies involved and their operations chiefs for the training. He said that TMFPD Battalion Chief Chris Black coordinated the training. Chief Edwards commented that he was excited that it had gone well.

Chief Edwards indicated that the weather had been incredible over the past week and that there was no better time than the present to protect homes from wildfire. He noted that within the District, pile burning was permitted through April 30, 2026; however, before initiating any open burning, individuals must visit the TMFPD's webpage to determine permitted days and understand the rules and regulations governing pile burning. He believed that pile burning was a great way to increase a home's defensible space in advance of fire season.

Chief Edwards reported that the TMFPD partnered with Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful (KTMB) for Christmas tree recycling and announced that Washoe Valley collected 188 trees, Lemmon Valley collected 123, and Spanish Springs collected 478. He explained that the Wildland Fuels Division chipped the trees for landscaping mulch, which he thought was a great way to keep the trees out of landfills, streets, and the desert, where they could become fuel for fires. He indicated that the Wildland Fuels Division would assist the Nevada Division of Forestry (NDF) with pile burning near Mt. Rose Highway near Galena Creek Regional Park. He warned individuals traveling in that area to be aware of lingering smoke.

Chief Edwards noted that the Nevada Fire Chiefs Association (NFCA) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) partnered to launch the Wildfire Risk Reduction Program. He said the Wildfire Risk Reduction Program was a grant program that offered up to \$75,000 for hazardous fuels reduction. He explained that the grant funds went towards homeowner associations (HOAs) and reported that the grant recipient had to be a 501 (c) (3) or government agency. He reported that applications were open through March 1, 2026, and informed that individuals could visit the NFCA's webpage for more information.

Chair Andriola expressed gratitude towards all who donated trees to the recycling program and said she was amazed by the over 400 trees provided by Spanish Springs residents. Commissioner Clark thanked Chief Edwards for his report and said that it was beneficial to see fire prevention efforts, including green waste removal and pile burning. Commissioner Hill indicated that she appreciated Chief Edwards' efforts and his motivation to secure additional funding as the County was experiencing revenue issues. Chair Andriola noted that anyone interested in the Wildfire Risk Reduction Program grant should apply and hoped that the County and other jurisdictions would help spread the information.

26-0053 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Public Comment.

Thomas Daly congratulated Vice Chair Garcia and Chair Andriola on their recent appointments. He noted that Chair Andriola would represent the County at the District Board of Health (DBOH) meeting, where she was expected to consider renewing the Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority (REMSA) franchise in perpetuity. He expressed concern that nothing in the 60-page renewal document required REMSA to improve response times in suburban Washoe County by adding additional ambulances to areas with deficient coverage. He mentioned that response times for serious medical emergencies were well above the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1710 standard of eight minutes. He argued that delays beyond that timeframe in cases such as heart attacks or strokes could likely result in fatalities. He suggested that South Reno lacked timely Emergency Medical Services (EMS) response times. He said he recently experienced a serious medical emergency at his home, during which the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Engine 36 responded in 16 and a half minutes and REMSA in 18 minutes, according to the dispatch report. He indicated that the delayed response time caused unnecessary pain and suffering. He suggested that, twice in the past decade, REMSA attempted to improve the EMS response times in South Reno, first by stationing an ambulance at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), Redfield Campus, and later at a storefront across the street. He stated that on both occasions, response times fell dramatically to eight minutes or less for communities along Geiger Grade, in Damonte Ranch, along the Mt. Rose Highway corridor, and Pleasant Valley. He thought that, despite that success, REMSA removed the ambulance from the communities without notice. While some may have questioned that decision, he explained that the ambulance failed to generate sufficient transport revenue to meet financial standards. He argued that, as a result, the need for prompt EMS was sacrificed on the altar of financial expediency. He mentioned that REMSA was revenue-driven, and public safety came second. He indicated that only the DBOH could impose conditions on REMSA to improve response times. He asked Chair Andriola, as the County's representative, to raise the issue at the upcoming DBOH meeting.

Terry Brooks read an original poem regarding discrimination and gender.

Troy Regas congratulated the newly appointed Chair, Andriola, and Vice Chair, Garcia. He said he supported the Dandini Spectrum item, noting that zoning was already in place when the property was purchased, which he considered beneficial since no changes would be required. He felt that the 40 senior units would be a positive addition to the community. He recalled a discussion during the last Legislative session about increasing property taxes (p-tax) and said he hoped that would not occur. He suggested that there were concerns regarding easements but believed negotiations were underway to expand sewer capacity so that, when the jail expanded in the future, adequate sewer and water services would be available. He thought that Parr Boulevard was the ideal location for that type of infrastructure. He hoped that the Board would approve the item, which would also allow the County to collect additional p-tax revenue. He reiterated his support for the Dandini Spectrum project, stating that it would benefit the economy in the future.

Pam Darr said that 2026 would be a good year with positive developments ahead. She shared that she attended the most recent Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) meeting. She believed that community members witnessed issues the Board was not aware of and could not address unless those concerns were brought forward and placed on the agenda for discussion. She noted that she had previously mentioned an incident at Anytime Fitness in Spanish Springs. She said her friend told her that homelessness in that area made her nervous, though she continued to go to Anytime Fitness. She stated that shortly after, her friend went there at midnight, believing it was a safe neighborhood. She said that while using the treadmill, a man began pounding on the glass door. She described her friend as petite and unlikely to defend herself, and commented on her appreciation that the gym door was locked. She explained that while her friend was on the phone with the Sparks Police Department (SPD), she was asked to describe the man's appearance. She added that her friend was extremely upset but continued trying to get a better look at the man without drawing his attention. She shared that he was later arrested and taken to jail due to his criminal history, and her friend's husband picked her up and took her home. She thought that similar incidents occurred in all neighborhoods and could not be avoided. She suggested that homelessness was everywhere. She believed that individuals experiencing homelessness should be in areas where they could utilize available resources. She felt that the homelessness issue was not being handled effectively. She recalled living in Los Angeles (LA) and dating someone from Reno who struggled due to the prevalence of liquor stores, casinos, and bars. She questioned the effectiveness of treating individuals in environments filled with such temptations. She suggested that, rather than placing the burden on taxpayers or allowing the problem to worsen, businesses within the Tahoe Reno Industrial Center could be approached to purchase Bureau of Land Management (BLM) land, build a facility, and provide treatment services for the homeless. She thought that some individuals experiencing homelessness appeared to be angry or under the influence of drugs. She speculated that members of the homeless population were advised by employees of the Cares Campus to panhandle, which she hoped was not true, but added that she had heard that information from someone close to her. She explained that when she recently took her husband to dinner in Sparks, she noticed the homeless being cleared from one area. She noted that more homeless people were seen gathered a block away. She added that she saw one individual picked up in a van, which she noted she had heard was happening. She said that if any businesses were instructing individuals to panhandle, that was an issue that should be addressed. She clarified that she did not place blame on the Board and expressed appreciation for its members. She indicated that one of her friends' husbands worked for the Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) team and acknowledged that those involved had good intentions, but the homelessness continued to increase. She said her friends were fearful and suggested that some businesses had provided coffee or soda to avoid confrontation with homeless individuals, which she viewed as kind; however, she believed that related issues should be reported to help keep individuals off the streets.

Eliza Rouse asked whether the Board had ever seen an official *Guinness Book of World Records*. She explained that it featured people and animals who had achieved the impossible, and shared that her school had an opportunity to be included in the book. She said she was a seventh-grade student at Coral Academy of Science Middle

School. She explained that January 28, 2026, would seem like an ordinary day, but it would be a memorable day for her school. She stated that at 11:00 a.m., nearly 500 students and teachers would attempt to set a new Guinness World Record by reciting the Preamble to the United States Constitution, which she believed was one of the Nation's most important documents. She said she was shocked when she heard the news, as she never imagined that she would participate in such an event. She shared that throughout the school year, the school raised money through private donations for the event. She mentioned that what began as a dream for the parent-teacher booster club and students had now become a reality. She described the event as a once-in-a-lifetime experience achieved by very few people worldwide and invited the Board to attend, not only to celebrate the 250th anniversary of America, but also to witness history in the making. She believed that Coral Academy of Science would make *We the People* a reality.

Virginia Wiggins said that homelessness had taken a toll on her and clarified that she was not a criminal, drug addict, or mentally ill, but was a childhood cancer survivor. She alleged that staff at Our Place had infringed upon her rights on multiple occasions. She said that in October, she informed the Board that staff had taken her insulin. She indicated that the day after that meeting, her insulin was returned, but she no longer felt safe taking it and had not done so since October 26, 2025. She mentioned that on December 27, 2025, she raised concerns that hate speech should not be allowed on the federally funded shelter grounds and asserted that women frequently used offensive language. She alleged that staff offered cigarettes and allowed cell phone use for certain residents classified as level seven. She believed that some women were manipulating and running the system, stating that their behavior while in the shelter differed from how they acted when they were on the streets earning money. She explained that after she reported what she described as misconduct, staff became upset with her and removed her pillows that had been provided as an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) for her spine. She mentioned that there had been a lice outbreak, and staff would no longer allow her to use her pillows. She described her bones as being comparable to those of a 90-year-old woman. She stated that she had not returned to Our Place and noted that she struggled to carry her belongings daily due to multiple surgeries. She added that she had placed her name back on the waiting list for Safe Embrace, as she believed her treatment at Our Place constituted domestic violence. She alleged that some staff members, whom she described as drug addicts and criminals, were stealing donations. She felt that forcing women out into the cold to be left to die was inhumane treatment. She provided her contact information to the Board and formally requested a complete copy of her records related to her stay at Our Place, pursuant to Nevada's Public Records Act (NPR), including case notes, intake records, and documentation regarding housing plans and services. She shared that when she entered Our Place, she independently secured shallow subsidies within approximately a week and a half, and that her case manager assisted her in obtaining housing at the Shoreline Plaza Apartments.

Chair Andriola stated that staff would follow up with Ms. Wiggins.

Janet Butcher said that she would not request that her comments be entered into the record verbatim because she did not believe that would occur. She stated that she

wished Commissioner Herman were present so she could tell her that she was a class act. She mentioned that she had listened to meetings from two years prior and heard Commissioner Herman being chastised by what she described as mean girls, stating that a mature woman would not have treated Commissioner Herman that way. She said Commissioner Herman was respectable and always smiled at every meeting. She appreciated that Commissioner Herman was not a politician. She added that she hoped whoever was elected to District 5 in November would not be a politician or use the position as a foundation to seek a higher office. She recalled speaking on November 18, 2025, about the root causes of the affordable housing shortage and noted that none of the Commissioners responded to her concerns. She suggested that many apartment complexes were owned by limited liability corporations (LLCs), making it difficult to identify the actual property owners. She referenced a substantial rent increase and described a recent conversation with an individual on Social Security whose rent had increased by \$800. She explained that her granddaughter's apartment management company provided only 24 hours' notice to move out. She noted that when her granddaughter requested additional time to move her belongings, the management company told her it would charge \$200 per minute. She expressed concern that such practices could create challenges for individuals who experienced anxiety or Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). She noted that apartment management companies were evicting residents or imposing higher fees and opined that the root causes of the affordable housing crisis were not being addressed.

Nicol Herris congratulated Chair Andriola and Vice Chair Garcia on their election to BCC Chair and Vice Chair. She indicated that the developer of the Dandini Spectrum apartments had been attempting to build the units for five years, with millions of dollars invested in the project. She noted that the continuation of the property build was reliant on the BCC making a recommendation to consider an easement purchase and sale agreement between Washoe County and Dandini Spectrum Holdings. She urged the Board to seriously consider the agreement and abatement, noting that the City of Reno had already approved 640 units, 40 of which were allocated to seniors, which she believed was important. She reported that Governor Joe Lombardo made increasing housing in Clark and Washoe counties a priority. She explained that she was unsure why Sheriff Darin Balaam was opposed to the agreement. She acknowledged that the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Regional Public Safety Training Center was in the area and mentioned that the staff organized the proposed easement to allow Dandini Spectrum Holdings to construct and maintain the necessary infrastructure across a portion of the County's property, while addressing the County's interest in maintaining the operational integrity and future expansion potential of the training facility. She said the easement was to provide secondary access and was not the primary access point to the apartment complex. She asked how the County would convince developers to build units when the Dandini Spectrum apartments had been on hold for five years. She said she was not sure she would invest in any project that would take five years to secure approval. She speculated that developers would build in other counties or states. She asserted that unless the WCSO could provide ample evidence against the agreement, she would urge the Board to approve the recommendation for the easement.

Jill O'Leary indicated that she was a 63-year-old resident of Washoe County and expressed concerns related to her October 2025 request for the Board to review the Washoe County Recorder's Office's (WCROs) policy that she believed allowed unlawful judgments to be recorded as liens, using a non-statutory eligibility notice. She requested that the County provide the electronic metadata log that showed which clerk accepted and enforced the filings. She reported receiving a letter from Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large on December 20, 2025, and said she felt that his response addressed only her requests for the Second Judicial District Court's (SJDCs) metadata log. She said that CDDA Large's letter directed her to a generic court mailing address with no department or point of contact, which she opined was not a meaningful avenue for accountability. She relayed that CDDA Large stated that the County had no custody or control over the SJDC's records because the SJDC was part of the judicial branch. She speculated that if the SJDC were part of the judicial branch, the Board should be able to identify who had the authority to audit or review metadata logs since Washoe County taxpayers funded the building, staffing, software systems, and administrative structure for the SJDC. She speculated that, under Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 247.120, the eligibility notice was a narrow, readability exception rather than a tool to make an unrecordable judgment recordable. She asserted that she had yet to receive a response regarding the WCRO's policy, which she said was still under review despite four months' worth of requests. She asked for written, accountable responses that stated the action taken to review the WCRO's metadata and the agency or official who oversaw the research.

Jim McNamara reported that he attended the BCC meeting at the request of Chair Andriola. He recalled being appointed two years ago as the Washoe County Labor Representative to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). He requested that the Board consider his renewal and thanked the Commissioners and TRPA for the opportunity to serve and listen to the many voices of the community. He said he would be available to answer questions during Agenda Item 7A2 regarding his actions or appointment.

Eileen Ecklund noted that she lived in Sparks and expressed appreciation that the Washoe County Library System (WCLS) was awarded a grant to purchase business-themed digital and physical print materials for the library's business resource center. She speculated that, with the grant, the WCLS could expand its resources to assist budding entrepreneurs in launching new business ventures or to further help small businesses thrive and grow. She said that the materials would provide guidance to job seekers regarding next steps in their careers or help them find a new career path. She felt that the grant would increase access to digital materials for residents across the County, including those who could not easily visit a library in person due to time or distance constraints. She said that matching the grant funds would help spread the word to the public that the materials were available. She believed that the grant was a great example of the many ways in which the WCLS served and supported residents. She proposed that many individuals were aware of the libraries' children's story hours, after-school programming, great books, technology services, inclusive spaces to meet friends, classes, and quiet spaces. However, she asserted that the WCLS provided much more. She urged the Board to approve the grant.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland indicated that Mary Ann Healy, who had signed up to speak, did not wish to provide public comment.

Deborah Plant urged the Board to consider Catherine McFeely for the Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Spaces Commission (WCRPOSC) appointment. She recalled working with Catherine McFeely at the Truckee Meadows Parks Foundation (TMPF) for six months. She relayed that when no one else listened, Catherine McFeely had believed her when she uncovered financial fraud at the TMPF. She stated that Catherine McFeely was honest and had amazing integrity. She speculated that Catherine McFeely did everything in her power to ensure the fraud was handled well after she left the TMPF. She noted that she understood the fraud at the TMPF had created financial constraints for the County; however, she hoped it would not besmirch the Board's view of Catherine McFeely. She reported that Catherine McFeely worked diligently and contributed her own money to help homeless dogs and improve parks. She mentioned that Catherine McFeely assisted with replacing the indoor-outdoor carpet at Link Piazza Park. She felt that the Board would not find a harder-working person. She asserted that Catherine McFeely was an amazing person and worked diligently on behalf of the citizens, parks, and trails.

Helen Neff indicated that during the March 6, 2024, BCC meeting, Jim McNamara was appointed to the TRPA. She noted that with Jim McNamara selected, the Board chose a Reno resident instead of the incumbent, who lived in Incline Village, or two others who lived in that area. She believed that the Incline Village and Crystal Bay residents were the most impacted by decisions made by the TRPA. She opined that many residents lost their voices when Jim McNamara was appointed. She said that prior appointees were full-time residents of the Incline Village and Crystal Bay area. She expressed surprise at the appointment of Jim McNamara, noting that the Board normally ensured that fair representation was appointed for the communities affected by the decisions of boards. She urged the Board not to reappoint Jim McNamara because his reappointment did not meet basic expectations of a transparent and inclusive appointment process. She reported that the opening was not publicly noticed, and that the Incline Village and Crystal Bay communities were not informed that applications could be submitted. She said that she knew of at least one person who was highly qualified and wished to apply to the TRPA. She noted that the individual was a long-term, full-time resident of Incline Village who attended local meetings and understood the funding process. She opined that the TRPA position called for a representative who was present in the community and who could engage in dialogue with residents for challenges that directly impacted Incline Village and Crystal Bay residents. She said that it would be the bare minimum to have an appointee who attended the Incline Village and Crystal Bay Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) meetings. She respectfully asked that the Board withdraw the reappointment and restart the process with proper public notice. She mentioned that she was not criticizing Jim McNamara and had never met him. She said that she had lived in Incline Village as a part-time and full-time resident and believed that there were many challenges in the area that non-residents would not understand.

26-0054 **AGENDA ITEM 6** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas reported that the Office of the County Manager (OCM) was committed to the Board's direction regarding strategic planning. She indicated that interviews with Commissioners and elected officials had taken place, along with listening sessions with appointed department heads, which had led to strong alignment across leadership and general agreement that the current strategic framework made sense. She noted that the OCM was refocusing priorities opposed to rebuilding the Strategic Plan. She explained that some major themes included fiscal sustainability, housing, infrastructure, behavioral health, and serving vulnerable populations. She said that technology, artificial intelligence (AI), and cybersecurity were viewed as tools to protect capacity, improve efficiency, and manage risk. She asserted that accountability was a strong focus that leadership had indicated was important. She explained that workshops would be organized for the Board, by strategic objective, over the next few months to discuss preferred outcomes.

Vice Chair Garcia congratulated Chair Andriola on her first meeting as Chair. She explained that the Regional Fire Services Study Board (RFSSB) was created following the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 319. She said that the RFSSB met on December 12, 2025, to discuss nine proposals, which concluded in the finalized contract for Emergent Global Solutions. She explained that the contract was awaiting approval; however, she wanted the public to know that the information was available on the RFSSB's website. She reported that the next RFSSB meeting would occur on February 2, 2026.

Commissioner Clark indicated that he was the Chair of the Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) and said that he would like to see documentation regarding Virginia Wiggins's situation to understand the allegations. He said he found her recounting of experiences disturbing. He asked if there was any validity in Helen Neff's allegations that proper notice was not performed for the reappointment of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) member. He asserted that he insisted on proper notice and board openings being posted to ensure ample community involvement. CM Thomas explained that discussion among Commissioners was not allowed for Agenda Item 6; however, staff could prepare a discussion regarding noticing processes.

Chair Andriola noted the wonderful historical opportunity for Coral Academy of Science students to attempt to break a Guinness World Record. She indicated that the students would recite the preamble of the United States (US) Constitution on January 28, 2026, and that she would be present as a witness. She thought that the event would be a great opportunity for the children to understand foundational documents.

26-0055 **AGENDA ITEM 7A1** Presentation by District Health Officer Chad Kingsley on Mosquito Abatement Funding with Data, and Future Funding Options. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)

Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH) District Health Officer, Doctor (Dr.) Chad Kingsley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the

following titles: Vector Control-Mosquito Abatement Funding; Mosquito Abatement in Washoe County (2 slides); Confirmed & Probable Cases, Washoe County; Vector Control; Mosquito Abatement; Mosquito Abatement Funding; NNPH Mosquito Abatement Costs (2 slides); Questions; Northern Nevada Public Health.

Dr. Kingsley referred to the first slide titled *Mosquito Abatement in Washoe County* and said the graph provided data from the previous three years to assist NNPH in making informed decisions about future mosquito abatement. He noted that the purple category on the graph represented 2024. He said there were four aerial flights in 2024 during which larvicide was applied to water systems to prevent larvae from developing into adult mosquitoes. He pointed out that the green category represented 2023 and said that larvicide treatment did not occur until halfway through July, when the mosquito numbers decreased. He indicated that the orange category represented 2025 and showed a mild summer in mosquito numbers until August, when they increased significantly. He believed that the graph showcased the impact of not using larvicide.

Dr. Kingsley explained that NNPH provided other larvicidal services besides larvicide. He said that larvicide was distributed by hand or via drone into the water system when possible. He referred to the second slide titled *Mosquito Abatement in Washoe County* and said that in 2025, there were 650 site visits, 478 mosquito control treatments, 17 mosquitofish deliveries, and about 4,000 storm drains treated. He noted that 570 traps were collected, 603 labs were submitted, and 19,794 mosquitoes were tested, all with negative results for mosquito-borne arboviruses. He reported that the map on the slide showed the areas where interns and staff provided treatments, testing, and trappings.

Dr. Kingsley reported that a list of diseases mosquitoes was on the *Confirmed and Probable Cases, Washoe County* slide. He indicated that the diseases listed in yellow were not carried by mosquitoes in the region and explained that the individuals who tested positive for those diseases had contracted them outside of the area while traveling. He pointed out that the diseases listed in white were carried by mosquitoes in the community and that, among all the diseases, there was only one case of West Nile virus in 2023. He said that vector control mosquito abatement was controlled by the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), listed on the *Vector Control; Mosquito Abatement* slide. He noted that the NRS empowered local health districts and improvement districts to adopt mosquito abatement, issue orders, and recover costs. He said recovery costs were incurred only if there was a lien against a property. He noted that entering a lien was a lengthy process he did not believe was applicable to the community. He reported that mosquito abatement was not a *shall* but an authoritative *may* per NRS.

Dr. Kingsley reported that West Nile virus cases increased from 2005 through 2010, and the County used the Optional Flood and Public Safety Sales Tax to fund mosquito abatement. He indicated that during 2017 and 2018, a General Fund contingency transfer was approved to supplement mosquito abatement post-flooding, and in 2010, NNPH absorbed mosquito abatement costs through a General Fund transfer. He referred to the *NNPH Mosquito Abatement Costs* slide regarding the funding required for mosquito abatement. He asserted that NNPH utilized interns appropriately and attempted to be

conservative. He noted that overall costs for mosquito abatement were reduced by eliminating helicopter services and chemicals the previous year, which helped achieve a more frugal budget. He said that NNPH had many unfunded mandates of *musts*, *shalls*, and *mays* for authorities. He noted that mosquito abatements was one of the *mays*. He mentioned that, while federal, State, and local public health funding decreased, NNPH was required to prioritize risk and impact in delivering services to health programs while exploring alternative funding sources for low- and no-risk authoritative *may* activities. He said that as NNPH increased efficiency and cost-cutting efforts, the District Board of Health (DBOH) would have to consider using the General Fund appropriately for the community while providing the best protection. He urged the Board to pursue innovative approaches or suggest alternative funding for NNPH to continue providing a strong, robust mosquito abatement program.

Chair Andriola indicated that she served on the DBOH and found it commendable that Dr. Kingsley and his staff were doing everything they could to help. She recalled that helicopter services were suspended and expressed gratitude toward the staff who continued to provide alternative mosquito abatement efforts.

Commissioner Hill asked Dr. Kingsley to provide a revenue overview of what NNPH received so that the public could better understand NNPH's financial constraints. Dr. Kingsley reported that over 50 percent of NNPH's budget was funded by grants from the State, federal agencies, and nonprofit organizations to cover unfunded mandates. He said that the original Constitution of the State of Nevada mandated tuberculosis (TB) treatment; however, it was never a funded program. He noted the NNPH usually received annual funding through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). He explained that, outside of the annual funds, NNPH worked through an interlocal agreement among the Cities of Reno and Sparks and Washoe County to receive a General Fund transfer from taxes. Then the DBOH determined which programs and services the funds were allocated to. He reiterated that NNPH wanted to be conservative with their costs while appropriately administering the funds they received. He mentioned that TB funding was reduced by 50 percent the previous week and reported that if the federal government were to close, NNPH could be impacted for 6 months without TB funding. He felt that NNPH's approach to conservative funding was correct and allowed them to be prepared while delivering services to the community.

Commissioner Hill indicated that NNPH charged small businesses and constituents fees for various services. She believed that NNPH did not attempt to increase fees significantly, which contributed to the constraints. She noted that the County's General Fund revenues decreased each year, despite community growth. She asserted that the County was doing what it could to manage services.

Chair Andriola asked if Dr. Kingsley could provide a TB clinic status update. Dr. Kingsley reported that the TB clinic was funded through the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) with no delays to the project. He said the project was on schedule for occupancy and noted that the first inspection might be rescheduled to February, as office furniture was being delivered. He said landscaping was in progress and that he was excited

to offer a TB clinic to the community. He explained that the clinic would be open as early as February or March, but NNPH had until April 1 to open.

Chair Andriola requested that Dr. Kingsley elaborate on the efficiencies NNPH was implementing due to budget constraints and how the staff was collectively collaborating. Dr. Kingsley explained that there had been several vacancies for the past two years that NNPH had kept open. He noted that there was a hiring committee to evaluate open positions and determine whether they were required or could be changed to improve efficiency. He reported that NNPH had saved \$1.7 million in vacancies last year. He said that one-time opportunities, artificial intelligence (AI), internal operations, and grant-seeking enabled NNPH to meet its goals. He believed that NNPH's largest expense was the cost of its staff's expertise. He indicated that while he was happy to share how much money was saved on vacancies the previous year, NNPH was evaluating overall positions by working with the Board.

Dr. Kingsley mentioned that a third-party agency had been hired to assess NNPH's divisions and reported that the clinical, air quality, and environmental health services divisions' assessments were complete. He said the assessment addressed morale and efficiency improvements that NNPH could implement. He indicated that, as part of the assessment, NNPH would announce restaurant visits. He noted that NNPH was organizing its objectives for presentation to the DBOH. He pointed out that a third-party fee assessment would be conducted to ensure that any fee reduction by NNPH was appropriate and the correct cost recovery option. Chair Andriola thanked Dr. Kingsley for his report.

26-0056 **AGENDA ITEM 7A2** George Robison, Executive Director, Truckee River Flood Management Authority to discuss TRFMA's 2026-2031 Capital Improvement Plan. (All Commission Districts.)

George Robison, Executive Director of the Truckee River Flood Management Authority (TRFMA), thanked the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for inviting him to present. He explained that the Interlocal Cooperative Agreement (ICA) between TRFMA, Washoe County, and the Cities of Reno and Sparks dictated that he would offer information on TRFMA's 2026 to 2031 draft Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) to ensure that the Board could understand what his organization had planned. He acknowledged that two Commissioners who served on the BCC, Chair Andriola and Commissioner Hill, concurrently served greatly on TRFMA's Board of Directors. He thanked the Board for placing Chair Andriola and Commissioner Hill on TRFMA's Board of Directors.

Mr. Robison conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Truckee River Flood Management Authority Capital Improvement Plan for Fiscal Years 2027-2031; Overview of the Truckee River Flood Management Authority; TRFMA's Multi-Faceted Mission; Rationale; Components; Projected Costs of TMFP 2025–2032; Costs of Targeted Projects 2025–2032; TRFMA CIP Update; TRFMA CIP Components – Targeted and Mitigation Projects; Total Costs of TRFMA CIP Components; Questions and Discussion.

Mr. Robison explained that since 1998, TRFMA had primarily received funding from a County sales tax, equal to one-eighth of a cent of that tax. He noted that TRFMA had spent those funds on many different efforts, but the organization intended to prioritize being very frugal, diligent, and efficient with that money going forward. He stated that TRFMA was trying to be purpose-driven by focusing on actions with the best benefit-to-cost ratio that would have the greatest impact on the community.

Mr. Robison displayed the *Overview of the Truckee River Flood Management Authority* slide. He explained that TRFMA was a joint effort among the Cities of Reno and Sparks and Washoe County. He stated that TRFMA's primary goal was to build infrastructure to reduce the impacts of flooding. He noted that TRFMA also helped to manage flooding by developing models, collaborating with the Cities of Reno and Sparks and Washoe County, and providing expertise on flooding. He reported that TRFMA's current model, which the organization built for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Map Review, had been distributed approximately 30 to 40 times for development projects. He noted that the model had also been used for projects downstream, as well as for all of TRFMA's designs operating on the Truckee River.

Mr. Robison explained that many of TRFMA's actions were related to management in order to develop a flood project that would do the most while costing the least. He acknowledged that the BCC would likely be aware that TRFMA's governance consisted of a six-member board, with two members from the City of Reno, two from the City of Sparks, and two from Washoe County. Mr. Robison referred to the *TRFMA's Multi-Faceted Mission* slide. He noted that TRFMA's goal was to improve floodplain planning, build flood mitigation infrastructure, and support emergency responders with responder maps, which were made in collaboration with the National Weather Service (NWS) to improve forecast predictability by placing and managing gauges in strategic locations. He reiterated that TRFMA's goal was to construct flood mitigation infrastructure, and he emphasized that the construction of a new flood project would comprise approximately 80 percent of TRFMA's budget over the next 20 to 30 years.

Mr. Robison showed the slide titled *Rationale*. He recalled advice he had been given previously about presenting a problem in a way that others could understand and be invested in solving. He explained that flood awareness was one such problem. He referred to the slide's map and explained that the blue areas represented regions that would be submerged and inundated during a potential 100-year flood event under current conditions. He explained that the flooded regions would include the Reno-Tahoe International Airport, the Grand Sierra Resort and Casino (GSR), and industrial areas across Reno and Sparks. He reported that a 2018 study from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) estimated that the damage from such flooding would cost \$2.5 billion. He emphasized that the original cost estimate would now be considered conservative due to additional infrastructure construction since that study was conducted and economic inflation. He compared the map on the left of the slide to the one on the right, noting that an estimated \$2 billion would be saved if the regions shown in the blue flooded areas on the left were replaced with those highlighted green on the right, indicating they would be

kept dry through the Truckee Meadows Flood Project (TMFP). He reiterated that the green areas on the map included the airport, the GSR, industrial areas, and neighborhoods, which would be removed from the floodplain that could be created by a 100-year flood event.

Mr. Robison displayed the *Components* slide. He reported that the TMFP was financially feasible to complete using TRFMA's available funds and financing. He recalled that he had tried to assess funding feasibility since the early stages of the project's development, noting that a strategic plan was developed in 2024 to better understand the project's costs, financing options, and benefit-to-cost ratio. He explained that TRFMA had attempted to request additional funds in the past but had failed, and he acknowledged that every organization ideally wanted to receive more money. He reiterated his belief that TRFMA could successfully complete the TMFP with the organization's current funding. He reported that the estimated cost forward for the TMFP was approximately \$200 million, and he reminded the Board that the project's estimated savings were at least \$2 billion in the event of a major flood and about \$30 million annually on average. He emphasized that the benefit-to-cost ratio was high for those figures, which he calculated at 4 or 5 to 1. He noted that TRFMA had \$78 million in overall funds saved, and that saving had been a focus for the organization to avoid the need to borrow at a high interest rate in the future. He reported that TRFMA had an annual cash flow of approximately \$11 million.

Mr. Robison explained that TRFMA engaged in mitigation through the TMFP, noting that the *Components* slide depicted all the project components. He stated that one of the largest components that had received recent press attention was the Rock-McCarran Project. He noted that TRFMA had recently reinitiated the Vista Narrows Project, which was approaching the final design stage. He reported that TRFMA had also engaged in mitigation work downstream along the Truckee River, including bridge construction in Wadsworth. He stated that every component of the TMFP would be in the design phase in 2026.

Mr. Robison introduced the *Projected Costs of TMFP 2025–2032* slide. He reported that the Rock-McCarran Project was very expensive, costing \$77 million, as it spanned a large area, involved levees on both sides of the river, required substantial floodplain restoration, and created a park area. He noted that the Sparks North Bank Levee Project would cost approximately \$55 million due to its length. He stated that the Vista Narrows Project would cost \$51 million, the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) Levee Project would cost \$11 million, the Airport Terrace and Berm Project would cost \$6.6 million, and the GSR Berm and Levee Project would cost \$750,000. He indicated that the cost elements of each of the projects he listed on the slide accounted for the estimated total cost of approximately \$202 million.

Mr. Robison showed the *Costs of Targeted Projects 2025–2032* slide. He explained that the slide's listed projects were not involved in the TMFP but still represented needed mitigation efforts or were brought to TRFMA's attention by the Cities of Reno and Sparks or Washoe County as a priority. He opined that a great example of such a project was the Riverside Drive Floodwall, Levee, and Berm Project. He reported that TRFMA estimated that their organization would need to spend approximately \$4 million more than

had already been spent on that project. He noted that the total costs of the listed projects would be just over \$8 million. He reiterated that, while those projects were not part of the TMFP, they were still of great importance.

Mr. Robison displayed the slide titled *TRFMA CIP Update*. He opined that one of the best ways to determine whether TRFMA's operations would be financially feasible was to conduct a cash flow analysis of everything the organization did, with consideration of its General Fund and Capital Fund in that research. He reported that the ending balance was estimated to be a \$95 million deficit. He explained that TRFMA had been researching various financing options as part of its strategic plan, which the organization could afford to do over a 20- to 30-year bonding or loan cycle. He emphasized that TRFMA had considered various loan programs, grants, and other funding sources to make achieving their goals feasible, which he believed they could accomplish given the organization's current costs and composition. He stated that the next step for TRFMA would be to act on those funding options, though he acknowledged certain barriers, including permitting, timing, and design development. He explained that TRFMA was working through those difficulties and wanted to do so on a schedule, with the goal of completing the TMFP by 2032 to save the region over \$2 billion in damages should a substantial flood similar to the one in 1997 occur again.

Mr. Robison introduced the *TRFMA CIP Components -Targeted and Mitigation Projects* slide. He explained that the slide depicted the trends of TRFMA's CIP for targeted projects over several years. He showed the slide titled *Total Costs of TRFMA CIP Components* and noted that it reflected TRFMA's major TMFP projects. He noted that the slide showed the TMFP's overall cost growing from \$11 million one year to \$34 million the next, and onward to \$78 million, which was more money than the organization had available as its annual cash flow was \$11 million, and it had approximately \$73 million in savings. He reported that the organization had sufficient funds to complete the Vista Narrows Project and all design elements for each of the listed projects. He stated that TRFMA would need financing to continue its efforts on other projects and complete the Rock-McCarran Project. He explained that TRFMA had begun designing all projects at that time, rather than later, so the organization would have solid data to predict total project costs and be able to provide all the necessary information for bank lenders or federal loan programs, which would ensure TRFMA would be given the best possible financing rate with the least amount of burden on the local taxpayer.

Commissioner Hill stated that she did not have a question but rather wanted to commend Mr. Robison for his work. She noted that it was a joy to serve on TRFMA's Board of Directors when the organization was making progress. She expressed excitement to show the public their efforts when the ground was broken on project sites. She described her enthusiasm for the future of flood management in the region.

Vice Chair Garcia thanked Mr. Robison for attending the BCC meeting. She expressed appreciation for her colleagues who served on TRFMA's Board of Directors. She noted that she and many others interested in outdoor space and recreation had been tracking recent decisions from TRFMA. She expressed hope that Mr. Robison could

broadly discuss some of the amenities the Rock-McCarran Project would provide to the community and mention anything else he wanted to add about the project. Mr. Robison opined that the Rock-McCarran Project was really interesting because, as he researched it, he found that the last time a major regional park was built in the project area was in 2008, in Sparks. He recalled realizing that there would be significant interest in the park beyond just flooding concerns. He noted his desire for the park to encompass multiple uses without incurring high costs. He reported proposing to the project consultants that they create an area that could flood but could also be used for flat fields or other purposes, making it inexpensive while providing community value and helping mitigate flooding. He reiterated that the property was intended to serve many functions simultaneously.

Mr. Robison recalled that TRFMA had received hundreds of comments from residents during community meetings, with some people expressing a desire for flat fields of various types, while others preferred natural areas. He noted that TMWA tried to combine those desires to create a compromise that would provide protection for the river and wildlife, such as the bats under the bridge, while also providing around 10 or 11 flat fields, which individuals had indicated would be beneficial for tournaments and attracting tourism. He stated that TMWA aimed to work with all its partners to optimize the project as much as possible, which was the main objective. Vice Chair Garcia thanked Mr. Robison for being such a good partner by finding a solution that met the needs of all residents despite differing interests. She expressed her excitement for the project's planning as both a parent and an outdoor enthusiast. She opined that it was great to hear that the project had been voted on unanimously.

Commissioner Clark thanked Mr. Robison for his report. He stated that those who had lived in the area long enough to have experienced the major flooding understood what had occurred and what Mr. Robison had meant in regards to his comments about the airport flooding. He recalled that the airport had smelled musty and like mold for years after the flooding. He noted that flooding had not only occurred along the Truckee River in the past, but also impacted Walker River Canyon, closing the road between the California cities of Walker and Bridgeport for about a year and a half. He explained that he had not been able to drive from Reno to Gardnerville or Carson City at that time. He stated that the flooding had a major impact on the community. He opined that Mr. Robison was being forward-thinking. He emphasized that the matter was not whether another flood would occur, but rather when it would happen next, which demonstrated the need to be prepared to mitigate the problems it would cause and save money on damage. He agreed with Mr. Robison's remarks that the savings value was significantly higher than the cost of the initial investment. He expressed his support for Mr. Robison's actions, and he agreed that the public needed to be convinced of the matter's importance. He noted that there were books, pictures, and historical photographs of downtown Reno underwater that people could view if they had not personally experienced the flooding, so they could imagine what it would be like if the region were not prepared for the next flood.

Mr. Robison agreed, explaining that Commissioner Hill and Chair Andriola had convinced him of the need to increase public awareness of flooding. He reported that TRFMA had created multiple videos, including one on the history of flooding on the

Truckee River, which had received over 70,000 views on Facebook. He noted that people who had just relocated to the area or had not lived in the region for a long time, given the local community's reputation for being very transient, would now join the growing number of residents who were aware of the potential flood conditions. He explained that he had often heard from people who were unaware of the flooding issue, which was why he believed it was important for TRFMA to act as a caretaker, making those individuals aware of what the Truckee River was capable of. He noted that the river only flooded to that extent occasionally, but he emphasized that it was devastating when those conditions occurred. Commissioner Clark stated that he had a coffee table book at his home with pictures of the flooding devastation, which he showed to out-of-town guests. He explained that the guests had never imagined the extent of that damage. He noted that many people had forgotten the major flooding, despite it occurring not long ago. He agreed that when people migrated to the region, they were not aware that the beautiful river they often enjoyed walking along could reach a point where it needed to be navigated in a kayak, or that they might need to evacuate from it towards high ground. He reiterated that preparing for flooding was necessary, and he thanked Mr. Robison for his good work.

Chair Andriola thanked Mr. Robison for mentioning the Facebook video, and she expressed hope that everyone would have an opportunity to see all the work TRFMA had done to educate the community. She asked Mr. Robison to explain what the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was and its role in managing the Truckee River as it passed through the region, as shown in the slide titled *Components*. She mentioned how TRFMA's hard work impacted various individuals, businesses, and organizations, including the UNR. She expressed curiosity about TRFMA's agricultural contributions and how that component was related to the TAC.

Mr. Robison explained that the TAC was comprised of permanent members with two members each from the Cities of Reno and Sparks and Washoe County, as well as a member from Storey County, a member from the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, and State representatives. He noted that additional individuals would attend TAC meetings by Zoom, including those from UNR and other interest groups, such as the Tahoe-Pyramid Bikeway. He noted that various people would attend the meetings and sometimes provide comments. He explained that the TAC's goal was to assist TRFMA and to provide guidance and technical advice on the organization's efforts. He provided an example of someone who might be involved with the TAC as the utilities director or certain engineers with the City of Reno. He noted that TRFMA wanted to present information and bring up questions before those professionals. He added that TRFMA also had a working group that provided more detailed presentations. He reported that one such working group meeting that year had included 88 people and generated 250 comments. He acknowledged that significant input was gathered during that meeting and opined that TRFMA occasionally needed to do a better job of reaching out to the public, as people sometimes attended those meetings but never spoke. He emphasized that TRFMA wanted to ensure that the public knew what the organization was doing, as they never wanted people to be surprised by their actions.

Chair Andriola agreed, noting that what Mr. Robison had mentioned was important. She described the importance of continuing the effort to have TRFMA reach

out to all its partners to participate in discussions, such as the GSR, which she thought Mr. Robison had mentioned during a previous meeting. She thanked Mr. Robison and his team for their creativity in finding solutions that would not burden taxpayers and for the effort they put into obtaining authorization as a step in the process of allowing grants and funding to be utilized and saved. She commended them for leveraging those efforts with other opportunities to continue work on necessary projects. She expressed excitement for breaking ground on those projects and thanked Mr. Robison again for his hard work. Mr. Robison believed everyone was dedicated to completing the Wadsworth Bridge construction project, and he reported that TRFMA expected to break ground on the Vista Narrows Project early the following year. Chair Andriola hoped that Mr. Robison would share that news with the entire community so everybody could attend to celebrate TRFMA's hard work.

26-0057 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Recommendation to consider an easement purchase and sale agreement between Washoe County (“Grantor”) and Dandini Spectrum Holdings, LLC, a Delaware limited liability corporation (“Grantee”) (DSH) for design, construction, installation, use and maintenance of a requested emergency access road, including relocation of an existing public utility easement and associated improvements over, across and through a portion of Washoe County property Assessor’s parcel number (APN) 520-250-31, (5100 Spectrum Boulevard, Regional Public Safety Training Center) located at the terminus of Spectrum Boulevard Reno, Nevada at a cost of [\$650,000.00]. Said easement request would provide for emergency ingress/egress to the adjacent City of Reno approved residential development; and if approved, authorize the County Manager to execute all necessary documents. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts).

County Manager Kate Thomas announced that Agenda Item 15 would not be heard.

PROCLAMATIONS

26-0058 **8A1** Proclamation for the week of February 2 - 6, 2026 as News Literacy Week, to be received by Jody Baden, Coordinator - News Literate Community Initiative. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Garcia read the proclamation.

Steering Committee Member of the Nevada Adolescent Literacy Network (NALN), Rachel Tillotson, indicated that it was an honor to be in attendance for Agenda Item 8A1. She said she worked with the Nevada Department of Education (NDE) and collaborated extensively with the News Literacy Initiative and the News Literacy Project (NLP). She explained that Jody Baden and Dr. Steve Mulvenon were the founders of the News Literacy Initiative. She expressed appreciation for being able to accept the

proclamation on behalf of Ms. Baden, Dr. Mulvenon, the community, and fellow collaborators. She thanked Commissioner Garcia and the Board.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland conducted a roll call vote due to technical complications.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Clark, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8A1 be adopted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 9A1 THROUGH 9F1, EXCLUDING AGENDA ITEM 9E1 HEARD SEPARATELY

26-0059 **9A1** Acknowledge the communications and reports received by the Clerk on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, including the following categories: Communications, Monthly Statements/Reports, and Annual Statements/Reports. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0060 **9A2** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of December 9, 2025, and December 16, 2025. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0061 **9B1** Recommendation to confirm the appointment of Crystal Sublet, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District Chief Fiscal Officer, as a Trustee of the Washoe County, Nevada Other Post-Employment Benefits Trust Fund from January 22, 2026, for a two-year term to January 22, 2028 with the eligibility of continuing for an additional two-year term ending on January 22, 2030. The OPEB Trust is a legally separate entity from Washoe County for the exclusive purpose of providing funds to pay for the post-retirement benefits provided by the employee welfare benefit plans maintained by the County and all assets of the fund are irrevocably dedicated to, and are used for the exclusive purpose of, providing for the payment of benefits and for paying reasonable expenses of administering the Fund, and will not be available to any creditors of the County or Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0062 **9C1** Recommendation to approve an Interlocal Contract between the Nevada Health Authority and Washoe County to authorize the Human Services Agency to participate in claiming allowable reimbursements covered under Federal Title XIX of the Social Security Act, for activities performed for Medicaid Targeted Case Management (TCM) Services, and Medicaid Administrative Services, for the period of July 1, 2026 to June 30, 2030, for approximately [\$9,087,063] for SFY 2027, [\$9,432,361] for SFY 2028, [\$9,549,874] for SFY 2029, and [\$10,150,274] for SFY 2030 with a

total reimbursement not to exceed [\$38,219,573] for the term of the contract; and if approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the Contract. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0063** **9C2** Recommendation to accept the 2025-2026 LifeSet Implementing Partner Incentive Program from Youth Villages, Inc., a private foundation, as an Award Amendment in the amount of [\$24,500.00; no county match] retroactive to July 1, 2025 through November 30, 2027 to reinvest the funds into the LifeSet program by maintaining quality staff services and supports for participating youth; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to retroactively execute the funding agreement; and direct the Finance office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0064** **9D1** Recommendation to approve 2025 Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) Business Resource Center Award funds in the amount of [\$35,000.00; 10% County match required] for print and digital business materials, awarded to Washoe County Library by the Nevada State Library, Archives and Public Records through the Institute of Museum and Library Services for the retroactive grant period of September 1, 2025 to September 30, 2026; if approved, to direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Library. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0065** **9E2** Recommendation to accept two FY26 subgrant awards from the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH) to support the position and activities of the Regional Behavioral Health Coordinator whose mission is to coordinate regional behavioral health services: (1) in the amount of [\$107,982.00; no county match] retroactive from October 1, 2025 through September 30, 2026; and (2) in the amount of [\$91,924.00; no county match] retroactive from October 1, 2025 through September 30, 2026; authorize the County Manager to execute the grant award documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0066** **9E3** Discussion and possible action by the Board of County Commissioners on approval of a Special Improvement District (SID) policy. A SID is a defined geographical area within Unincorporated Washoe County in which a developer proposes to construct eligible infrastructure that otherwise would not be constructed or installed by Washoe County using tax-exempt bonds. While the bonds are not obligations of the County, the Board must approve their issuance. This proposed policy addresses the terms and conditions under which the Board of County Commissioners will consider a Special Improvement District. Manager's office. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0067 **9F1** Recommendation to approve an Interlocal Agreement between the County of Washoe and the City of Sparks for election services provided by Washoe County for the 2026 Primary and General Elections. Reimbursement to the County will be \$0.15 for each active registered voter residing in the City of Sparks and is estimated to be approximately \$20,475. Voters. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Hill requested that Agenda Item 9E1 be pulled from the Consent Agenda.

Assistant County Manager (ACM) David Solaro indicated that Agenda Item 9E3 was to be heard due to a policy requirement for Special Improvement Districts (SIDs) within unincorporated Washoe County, as outlined in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 271. He said that NRS 271 authorized the Board to enter into agreements for SIDs with development. He explained that developers could propose a SID if their capital improvement goals did not align with the County's, including aspects such as the development's needs and timing. He mentioned that when a developer submitted a project, the County required the developer to construct streets, pipelines, and sewer lines to established standards. He said that in many cases, those facilities were subsequently dedicated to Washoe County, or potentially to the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA), for ongoing operation and maintenance to support the broader community. He reported that the costs were not paid by Washoe County taxpayers; rather, the developer paid for the infrastructure, with the costs ultimately recaptured through home sales and similar mechanisms.

ACM Solaro noted that the challenge with SIDs was that some of the improvements ultimately became municipal assets, which he believed should not require the developer to pay higher interest rates to then be transferred to the homeowner. He explained that SIDs reduced development costs by allowing Washoe County to issue bonds without assuming an obligation to repay them. He reported that repayment was instead secured by the land and ultimately paid by homeowners through assessments on individual parcels. He believed that one downside of that structure was that foreclosure applied, as the obligation rested with the homeowner and was paid over the life of the loan or during the period of property ownership. He asserted that while risks existed, they were addressed through established policy. He said that the staff was comfortable with the framework and the mitigation measures in place to protect the Board, the County, and the public.

ACM Solaro mentioned that the policy established a minimum bond issuance of \$15 million, as projects below that threshold were determined to require disproportionate time and effort relative to the benefit to the County. He reported that the developers were required to provide financial statements and safeguards, including bond-to-land ratios, improved land requirements, and indemnification provisions. He believed that all safeguard measures were designed to mitigate risk and protect both the County and its taxing citizens.

Chair Andriola thanked ACM Solaro and the staff who organized the presentation for Agenda Item 9E3. She believed that housing was the County's top priority and that it had been supported by several ordinances. She opined that it was important to understand that SIDs were supported by homeowners and were in place as tools and resources that enabled cost savings for homeowners and the County. She thanked everyone involved for their hard work regarding prioritizing infrastructure. She said that she hoped to keep attainable housing a priority.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland advised the Board that she received an emailed public comment, which was placed on file.

On the call for public comment, McDonald Carano Partner, Josh Hicks, expressed support for Agenda Item 9E3 and said that he had provided feedback on the SIDs policy. He noted that SIDs were effective, had been used in other jurisdictions, and had been in place since the 1960s. He mentioned that they were not as widely used in Northern Nevada, but were common in Southern Nevada. He noted the commercial residential area of Summerlin in Clark County was a SID. He thanked the Board and believed that their approval of Agenda Item 9E3 was forward-thinking.

Commissioner Hill commended Chair Andriola for her leadership on the SID policy while ensuring the County received community feedback. She thanked the staff for their hard work and believed that Agenda Item 9E3 was a good compromise.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Clark, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 9A1 through 9F1, with the exclusion of Item 9E1, be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 9A1 through 9F1, with the exclusion of Item 9E1, are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

26-0068 **9E1** Recommendation to reappoint James (Jim) McNamara as the Lay Member on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Advisory Planning Commission for a second two-year term beginning March 26, 2026, and ending on March 25, 2028. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Community Outreach Coordinator Alexandra Wilson addressed a previous question about reappointments to clarify the process for the Board and the public. She noted that, for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) reappointment, there was a single inquiry, during which information about the process was provided. She indicated that the recruitment for reappointments did not include public notice outside of the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting. She explained that James McNamara was reappointed by the BCC in March 2024 for a two-year term and was eligible for reappointment. She stated that, for reappointments, the County determined whether members were eligible and interested in continuing, noting that Mr. McNamara had expressed interest in remaining a member. She mentioned that the above approach was standard County practice for eligible and willing incumbents. She said that, in general, reappointments were prioritized to

maintain continuity and forward momentum for the board's work, as returning members often already understood the board's purpose, past decisions, and current initiatives, which was the case for Agenda Item 9E1. She noted that reappointing allowed the County to retain existing expertise and to continue benefiting from members' varying perspectives and contributions. She believed that reappointments helped build trust within the board, as appointed members had the opportunity to continue growing their relationships, not only within the board itself but also in the community they served. She indicated that if, during the BCC meeting, the Board chose not to proceed with the reappointment, which was an option for all reappointments, the Board could direct staff to open the position for applications.

Chair Andriola asked Commissioner Clark whether he had received the response he needed regarding notification of the reappointment.

Commissioner Clark said that although he had received an answer, he did not agree with the process. He believed that the public should have the opportunity to apply whenever an appointment was available. He shared that Helen Neff from Incline Village had stated that a notification had not been sent, which he agreed was accurate. He appreciated the explanation but felt that the emphasis on maintaining continuity was counterproductive. He thought it was important to regularly bring in new perspectives, and without that, he questioned the purpose of elections or new member appointments. He indicated that keeping things the same made no sense and emphasized that new ideas needed to be shared. He suggested that relying too heavily on institutional knowledge could limit the number of new appointments and the introduction of different ideas. He emphasized the importance of sharing new ideas and opposed reappointing someone without considering all candidates. He referenced another agenda item in which a board position would be filled and noted that many candidates had applied, which he felt was a successful example of an appointment process. He explained that positions should be advertised publicly so that many people with valuable ideas could apply. He opposed reappointing members without considering other candidates.

Commissioner Andriola felt there was an opportunity to review the policy for potential changes, which she believed was the Board's responsibility. She indicated that decisions were being made based on the current policy and shifting the parameters was not conducive to the process. Commissioner Clark indicated that he had recommended policy review on many occasions. Chair Andriola remarked that reviewing policies could take time and would not likely be immediate.

Commissioner Clark suggested that there were ample opportunities to change policies. He believed that without policy review, processes would remain the same, which he disagreed with and felt that many citizens shared that concern. He thought that Incline Village residents made a valid point in observing that no one from their area had served on the TRPA. He stated that he wanted those residents to know that he heard their concerns.

Chair Andriola shared that she took great pride in personally calling all applicants, whether they were reappointments or not. She explained that after speaking with Mr. McNamara, she learned he currently owned a home in Incline Village, which may not have been clear to some. She mentioned that he was possibly one of the most senior individuals with an understanding of growth in Incline Village, having served on the Homeowners Association (HOA) there. She acknowledged that balancing information could be difficult but emphasized that she was fact-driven and that the information she provided was factual.

Commissioner Clark said he had never met Mr. McNamara, but acknowledged it was possible he could be the most qualified person. He mentioned a prior public comment stating that nobody received notice of the appointment, suggesting there may have been a misunderstanding of the process. He thought that the appointment process should be uniform across the County, giving everyone an opportunity to apply, and clarified that he did not intend to insult or offend Mr. McNamara. He questioned the long-standing County practice of repeatedly reappointing individuals and noted that others who were passionate and had good ideas could be overlooked. He suggested that Mr. McNamara was Chair Andriola's candidate and friend. Chair Andriola replied that Mr. McNamara was neither her friend nor her candidate. Commissioner Clark indicated that everyone should have an opportunity to speak.

Commissioner Hill said she appreciated the discussion and thought Mr. McNamara had served very well on the TRPA. She explained that, two years ago, she had voted against his appointment because she wanted to keep the incumbent in the seat, but the Board at the time voted against her recommendation. Despite her initial vote, she clarified that she valued Mr. McNamara's service. She expressed uncertainty because she agreed with the policy of keeping the incumbent in when they had represented what they believed was best for the community and the County's best interests. She said that after hearing the community's concerns, she thought a compromise might be appropriate. She asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large to weigh in on the feasibility of her suggestion. She expressed concern about a potential lapse in Washoe County representation on the TRPA and wondered whether the Board could vote to prevent a break in service and then vote on the appointment. She said she was unsure whether that approach was allowed, but felt that, given the community's concerns, it was important to find a candidate who lived there full-time. She believed Mr. McNamara could be considered as living in Incline Village full-time. She reiterated her support for keeping incumbents in their seats and explained that, having been outvoted the previous time, it was important to represent her constituents' concerns. She asked CDDA Large whether her suggestion was feasible.

CDDA Large stated that Commissioner Hill had raised two suggestions. He explained that one was to appoint a layperson to the TRPA and whether Mr. McNamara should fill that role. He indicated that the Board could vote on that during the meeting, with the effective date set for March 26, 2026, as noted in the Agenda, for the two-year term. He stated that the item could also be pulled to allow additional applicants to apply. He asked staff whether that could be done in time to avoid a break in service and expressed

uncertainty about how much notice was required to advertise an appointment to the Advisory Planning Commission (APC) and whether the March 26, 2026, deadline could be met.

Ms. Wilson commented that the process took approximately one month. She indicated that appointments were brought forward early in case such situations occurred. She believed that a new agenda item could be added to a BCC meeting in late February.

CDDA Large stated that if the timeline worked for the Commissioners, the item could be pulled and discussed at a future meeting to allow additional applicants time to apply. He addressed Commissioner Hill's second question and noted that the Board's reappointment policy would need to be a separate agenda item, as both Commissioner Clark and Chair Andriola had indicated. He recommended adding an item to the agenda to discuss the BCC's policies in Section 8.2 of the Washoe County Handbook. He said that, while the policies were not necessarily codified in terms of giving priority, that had been the practice. He suggested placing the item on a future agenda for the Board's consideration, depending on how the Board wished to proceed.

Chair Andriola said that her intent, specifically regarding the policy review, was within the Board's purview. She thought the strategic planning meeting was a common forum for reviewing policies and procedures, but noted she would discuss options with Washoe County Manager Kate Thomas to determine the best time for that discussion. She explained that strategic planning was a comprehensive process for reviewing future opportunities. She agreed that a discussion could be added to the agenda for a future meeting. She asked whether the Board agreed to consider the options suggested by CDDA Large to vote to table the item and reopen the recruitment, or if it wished to vote to appoint Mr. McNamara, with the understanding that the matter would return in March when that term expired. She mentioned she wanted to hear Commissioner Hill's recommendation because it affected her district.

Commissioner Hill urged the Board to consider pulling the item. She suggested retaining Mr. McNamara's application if he was willing to proceed. She apologized to him for the painful public process he had endured. She noted that Mr. McNamara's application could be kept for consideration at a future BCC meeting after staff had time to advertise the appointment and added that the Board could have additional discussion before the term expired. She expressed concern about ensuring that Washoe County did not lose representation on the committee.

CDDA Large commented that the Chair could pull the item.

Chair Andriola stated she was pulling Agenda Item 9E1.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland advised the Board that she received three emailed public comments, which were placed on file.

Chair Andriola said that she looked forward to a robust discussion on the item. She added that she had many comments to make, at the appropriate time, regarding the length of time applications were kept.

The item was tabled, and no vote was taken.

BLOCK VOTE – 11, 13, 14, AND 16

26-0069 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to 1) approve Resolution R26-013 to augment the Capital Improvements Fund in the amount of [\$749,042.12] for revenue and expenditure authority for the West Hills Rehabilitation project in accordance with Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005. The augmentation will utilize revenue from the sale of real property located at 10 Kirman Avenue, Reno, Nevada, Assessor's Parcel Number 012-150-12 from Renown Health; Direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments; and
2) acknowledge a [\$300,000] cross-functional appropriation transfer from various functions to Public Works within the Capital Improvements Fund as allowed per NRS 354.5989005(5)(b); net fiscal impact [\$-0-]. Acknowledgement of this cross-functional appropriation transfer will increase expenditure authority for Major Maintenance Replacement. All adjustments are within the Washoe County existing approved FY26 budget. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland conducted a roll call vote due to technical complications.

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

26-0070 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to accept an FY26 Mobile Crisis Response Team subaward from the State of Nevada, Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) in the amount of [\$2,391,246; no county match] retroactive to July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026 to support staffing and operational costs of the Northern Nevada unit of the Children's Mobile Crisis Response Team (MCRT); authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to retroactively execute the sub-grant agreement and related documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland conducted a roll call vote due to technical complications.

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

26-0071 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to accept a Federal Title IV-E Subgrant award from the State of Nevada, Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Child and Family Services in the amount of [\$19,979,596.00; \$9,915,705.00 county match] for Washoe County Child Welfare Services retroactive from July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026; authorize the Director of the Human Services Agency to retroactively execute the sub-grant award and related documents; authorize a Subgrant Agreement between Washoe County and the Washoe County School District to pass through Title IV-E federal funds to reimburse for actual expenses incurred to provide out-of-zone transportation for children in foster care allowed under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act which is estimated to be an annual cost of [\$450,000.00], retroactive from July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026; direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments; and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to sign the agreement between Washoe County and the Washoe County School District and approve the Resolution (R26-0000008) necessary for same. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland conducted a roll call vote due to technical complications.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Clark, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be accepted, authorized, directed, and approved.

26-0072 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Recommendation to approve Change Order Number 20 to the System Purchase Agreement between Washoe County and Harris Corporation Communications Systems Segment (L3Harris), Dated September 27, 2018; to approve the final scope of work regarding construction on the Red Peak Communications Site for a cost not to exceed [\$313,523.51]; if approved, authorize the County's Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the Change Order; and authorize L3Harris to commence construction activities at the Red Peak Site. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland performed a roll call vote due to technical complications.

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

26-0073 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to approve the appointment of one candidate to fill a full term beginning on the date of appointment and ending on January 19, 2030 for the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission. Applicants for the vacancy include: Paola Agramon, Breanne Antos, Will Arndt, Jane Balvin, Adam Bishop, Michael Bosma, Patricia Cashman, Matthew DeMartini, Brian Erbis, Nicole Flangas, Gregg Gehlert, Patrick Gubbins, Keith Hayes, Sophia Heidrich, John Henderson, Jean Johnson, George Jostlin, Matthew Kaempfe, Kody Kendrick, Jesus Lopez-Baez, Austen Lorenz, Catherine McFeely, Kelly Orr, Michael Pintar, Matt Polley, Tami Rougeau, Michael Skolnick, James Stewart, Kim Toulouse, Duong Betty Tsuji, Rita Vinci and Beau Walker. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Community Outreach Coordinator Alexandra Wilson reported that 32 candidates had applied for a regular term on the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission (WCOSRPC). She explained that the Board needed to select its top three candidates from a ballot distributed by the Washoe County Clerk.

Chief Deputy District Attorney Michael Large advised Chair Andriola to accept public comment before voting.

On the call for public comment, Kim Toulouse, a candidate for the WCOSRPC, introduced himself and shared his background with the Board. He mentioned that he had lived in the area for nearly his entire life and was very familiar with the WCOSRPC, although he had not attended meetings as regularly as others. He explained that he had been involved with Washoe County for many years, noting that one of his first endeavors was serving on a committee that developed the sensitive and critical streams code in the late 1990s. He stated that he served on the Board of Adjustment (BOA) for 11 years, having been appointed by Commissioners Bonnie Weber and Jeanne Herman. He explained that he served a partial term, which was why his total service was 11 years, rather than 8. He believed that parks and open spaces were a critical part of the quality of life, particularly given the rapid growth. He recalled that many years ago, he often hunted at Rancho San Rafael Regional Park and was caught by the caretaker. He indicated that many open spaces were being developed into apartments, which were desperately needed, but emphasized that parks and open spaces were essential to maintaining the quality of life. He said he had been involved with the Oxbow Nature Study Area since its inception and had administered the park for 20 years before retiring from the State of Nevada. He mentioned

that, because of his experience working with parks and with Washoe County, he wanted to apply for the WCOSRPC. He stated that, regardless of who was chosen for the position, he felt it was critical to focus on quality-of-life issues for the area and to preserve parks and open space.

George Jostlin, a Sparks resident in unincorporated Washoe County, expressed his desire to join the WCOSRPC. He shared that he moved to Washoe County in 2007, when he accepted the position of Director of Government Affairs at Charter Communications, and that he fell in love with a local. He mentioned that he served on the Reno Ward 2 Neighborhood Advisory Board (NAB), was a proud member of the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) Reno Silver Circle, and had recently become a docent providing tours to community members. He indicated that, having recently retired, he had the time to serve on the WCOSRPC and could support Washoe County and the community. He explained that, like Mr. Toulouse, he believed in preserving open space and wanted to serve the community to ensure it was maintained. He believed that growth needed to be controlled and that open space contributed to the quality of life in Washoe County. He questioned why libraries were closed on days when schools were closed.

Chair Andriola asked how voting would be handled for Commissioner Hill, who was present via telephone. County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas stated that Commissioner Hill would submit her vote via text message, after which Manager Thomas would complete the ballot on her behalf.

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the Commissioner's votes aloud. Chair Andriola summarized that the top candidates were Nicole Flangas and Kim Toulouse. She said the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) would vote between those two candidates per staff direction for round two. Chair Andriola requested confirmation that the Board should select only one candidate and asked staff to repeat the names to be voted on. Ms. Wilson replied that the Board would select either Nicole Flangas or Kim Toulouse.

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the Commissioner's second-round ballots. Chair Andriola stated that the vote resulted in a tie between Nicole Flangas and Kim Toulouse. Chair Andriola asked the staff which districts Nicole Flangas and Kim Toulouse were from. She noted that there was no representation for Districts 3 or 4 and stated that Kim Toulouse was from District 5. She acknowledged that George Jostlin was from District 4 and said district representation would be part of future policy discussions.

CDDA Large said that the item could be tabled until all five Commissioners were present. Chair Andriola questioned whether that was an option, as she did not want to breach the process. Commissioner Clark suggested conducting one more round of votes.

Ms. Wilson clarified that Nicole Flangas was from District 2. Commissioner Andriola said that the information was not helpful in making her selection.

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the Commissioner's results from the third round of ballots. Chair Andriola stated that she did not want to table the item and requested another round of voting.

Deputy County Clerk Evonne Strickland read the results, naming Nicole Flangas as the selected candidate.

Chair Andriola explained that compromise within the community was a dignified approach that could be embraced. She noted that Nicole Flangas had been selected to serve on the WCOSRPC and called for a formal motion. She thought the moment was memorable for all and she congratulated Nicole Flangas.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland conducted a roll call vote due to technical complications.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Chair Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Nicole Flangas be appointed to fill a full-term member vacancy on the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission beginning on January 20, 2026, and ending on January 19, 2030.

26-0074 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to acknowledge presentation and possible direction to staff of the Washoe County Financial Outlook for Fiscal Year 2027 and Budget. The overview includes a review of the General Fund's financial results for Fiscal Year 2025, a Mid-Year 2026 review, and economic, revenue and expenditure trends, Board of County Commissioner strategic goals, known cost increases, unquantified/outstanding cost impacts, and a general outlook for Fiscal Year 2027 and Budget. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas reminded the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) that the presentation for Agenda Item 12 served as a precursor for the upcoming budget workshop, which was scheduled for January 27, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.

Budget Manager Lori Cooke conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Fiscal Year 2027 Preliminary Financial Outlook; Fiscal Year 2027 Financial Outlook; FY 2025 General Fund Financial Results (2 slides); FY 2026 Year-to-Date Review (2 slides); FY 2027 Financial Outlook; Financial Outlook – Preliminary; Summary; Next Steps; Questions/Discussion.

Ms. Cooke thanked the Board for their willingness to hear the details from her presentation. She noted that her presentation would follow the same format as in years prior, but she would be providing additional details and discussion during the BCC workshop scheduled for the following week. She explained that she would briefly review the budgetary outcome for fiscal year (FY) 2025 and the mid-year status for FY 2026, which included the current year through December and preliminary expectations for FY

2027. She referred to CM Thomas' earlier comments and affirmed that her presentation would provide additional context for the BCC budget workshop meeting the following week. She emphasized that her presentation would focus on the General Fund, as it was the County's largest fund and had the most operating departments.

Ms. Cooke displayed the second slide titled *FY 2025 General Fund Financial Results*. She explained that FY 2025 ended with the County in a better financial position than anticipated, which she considered good news. She noted that most individuals in finance were very risk-averse, meaning that when they saw results better than expected, they would have a better sense of what had happened the year prior and how that would carry over to the current year and future years. She reported that the FY 2025 revenue was slightly higher than estimated, with the majority coming from consolidated tax (c-tax). She referred to the process for adjusting estimated figures to align with the actual results in the Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR). She explained that the middle column of the table on the slide corresponded to the estimated FY 2025 results staff had expected, while the column to the right reflected FY 2025's audited actual results that represented where the County's budget ended up in the audit. She noted that the variance between those figures demonstrated the difference between the estimated and final results. She explained that staff adopted an annual budget for the County anywhere between 12 and 18 months prior to the beginning of that FY. She stated that staff reviewed their estimates frequently and routinely throughout the year to make adjustments, report them, and include them as necessary when there were recommendations or budget forecasts. She emphasized that the figures related to the County's prior financial performance were not just data points, as that information directly influenced the current FY's outcome and created a foundation for future FYs. She emphasized that if a FY turned out better than anticipated, the following year would begin on better terms, while if it instead ended worse than expected, the following year would instead start with the County being behind the estimates. She noted that the County's budgetary situation still warranted ongoing caution and prudence based on the forecasted structural deficits.

Ms. Cooke reported that FY 2025 ended with higher than estimated interest and unrealized gains of \$6.9 million. She explained that the net change of \$9.4 million in the fund balance between the estimated results and the final results included the \$6.9 million of unrealized gains, which she recalled having mentioned previously as not being a cash entry but rather a reflection in the fund balance. She referred to the listed sources and uses in the table labeled *Other Sources/Transfers In* on the slide. She noted that there was also a category for the Governmental Accounting Standards Board's (GASBs) intangible assets. She stated that certain items must be recorded in a specific manner per the requirements of GASB Statement 87, which pertained to leases and physical assets needed to recognize a right-to-use lease asset. She referred to GASB 96, noting that it applied to Subscription-Based Information Technology Arrangements (SBITAs) for software maintenance and subscriptions used by the County to recognize related expenses on the financial statements. She noted that the GASB requirements were implemented relatively recently, within the previous few years. She explained that the \$22 million

generated by the General Fund sources she had described were offset by \$22 million in uses. She reiterated that staff were required to show those values separately.

Ms. Cooke reported that the County's personnel costs in FY 2025 were higher than estimated. She clarified that those expenses were not higher than the budget allocation, but the final results were higher than the estimate. She noted that such information was only demonstrated by FY 2025's audited actual results, which were in alignment with the monthly updates that had been provided to the Board. She explained that nothing had changed between November and the audit conducted in December. She reported that FY 2025 ended with unspent encumbrances, and staff tried to limit the use of contingency funds as much as possible, leaving some contingency funds remaining at the end of FY 2025. She noted that staff anticipated a net reduction of \$12.9 million in the fund balance and ultimately recorded an increase of \$9.4 million, including the unrealized gains that she had mentioned previously. She indicated that the total ending fund balance was shown on the chart, as listed on the second slide titled *FY 2025 General Fund Financial Results*. She explained that there were restrictions and assignments within the fund balance that effectively prevented those funds from being spent. She reported that the restricted, unassigned fund balance for FY 2025 was almost \$158 million. She acknowledged that the unassigned fund balance exceeded the Board's policy on ending fund balances but noted that the result was not illegal. She reminded the Board that the County had a financial policy that required the County to accelerate capital improvements that had not been funded or had been deferred in prior years when there was a financial surplus. She explained that such a policy provided additional context to her earlier remarks regarding starting future FYs in a better financial position.

Ms. Cooke showed the second slide titled *FY 2026 Year-to-Date Review*. She stated that the slide listed FY 2026 year-to-date values through December 31, 2025, to reflect the unaudited figures for the current year. She noted that the data was provided for comparison to the audited results from the prior year, FY 2025. She opined that there was currently no significant cause for immediate concern based on the listed values. She reiterated that when results were better than anticipated in the prior year, they would benefit the following year and future years. She reported that the FY 2026 year-to-date values were tracking within expectations and that the information was reviewed regularly. She explained that staff updated the year-to-date figures as they received additional information and that further details would be shared during the budget workshop scheduled for the following week.

Ms. Cooke explained that the revenues for FY 2026 were currently in better alignment with the budget than were seen for the same period in FY 2025, based on the County's c-tax distributions having increased over the prior year, as well as some other charges for services. She explained that those trends were similarly reflected in expenditures and transfers out, with FY 2026 data tracking closer to the budget. She attributed those expenditure results to efforts to budget salary savings. She noted that when the County had a lower budget, actual results tracked more closely to the budgeted estimates, which she described as intentional, following discussions that led to the budget being adopted with those savings integrated. She stated that staff wanted to be cautious

about the continued performance of the budget, as there were still some challenges associated with trying to forecast changes and work with c-tax data. She explained that c-tax was the second-largest revenue source in the General Fund and often fluctuated in line with leading economic indicators, such as consumer spending. She reported that staff had not yet received the October taxable sales data as of that morning. She elaborated that while staff had received the distribution information, they were uncertain what that distribution was based on, which she attributed to her understanding that there were issues with the State of Nevada's reporting mechanisms. She disclosed that staff had also not received an estimated time of arrival for that information. She emphasized that issues with the reporting mechanisms and the lack of details regarding that system compounded the challenges staff had experienced throughout the previous 12 to 14 months.

Ms. Cooke displayed the *Financial Outlook – Preliminary* slide. She explained that the slide provided a preview of the topics to be discussed at the BCC workshop the following week regarding FY 2027. She acknowledged that the agenda for that meeting had not yet been posted, but she noted that it would include presentations from guest experts providing an overview of national, regional, and local economic information to the Board and the public. She explained that the presentations would also include information on strategic planning direction and the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) Scorecard to enable discussions on capital and infrastructure needs.

Ms. Cooke showed the slide titled *Summary* and stated that staff predictions for FY 2027 remained the same as in previous years, in that adding additional expenditures, particularly those of personnel costs, was not sustainable. She emphasized that personnel were the largest source of budgetary use, which was consistent with past years. She explained that the budgetary status had not changed since she reported to the Board the month prior. She noted that staff were still reviewing departmental estimates, with some estimates still awaiting completion. She explained that the various departments were given a deadline to submit their reports to the budget team and that departmental information was still being received on a periodic basis. She noted that the budget team might receive notifications from departments about information submitted outside the prescribed deadlines. She clarified that the budget team would still accept late information and would run another personnel simulation on the coming Thursday. She explained that the simulation enabled the budget team to estimate personnel costs through the end of FY 2026 and all of FY 2027. She stated that the simulation was performed on the County's Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system and processed data by categories such as person and pay period to collectively calculate the compensation for each of the over 3,000 staff members. She noted that the simulation accounted for a person's current compensation rate, anticipated merit increases, and changes in the salary schedule, and further identified and excluded vacancies from the data. She opined that it was beneficial to perform those simulations more often to ensure that staff could better estimate how a FY might end and predict the starting status of the following FY.

Ms. Cooke stated that the primary messaging and information when working with the various departments focused on strongly emphasizing net zero and reallocation requests, while encouraging consideration of how any necessary departmental

expenditure requests could yield outcomes, efficiency gains, or leverage resources. She noted the importance of considering the potential gains of one-time investments into certain expenditures, particularly in technology. She acknowledged that there had been substantial benefits from the implementation of new technology in recent years, though she reminded the Board that there was an indirect financial impact, as a staff member had to support that technology. She emphasized the importance of considering the comprehensive impact of maintenance and ongoing use of implementations that might seem to only involve a single investment. She reported that staff were still forecasting unsustainable structural deficits, which she would discuss further at the upcoming budget workshop.

Ms. Cooke referred to the *Next Steps* slide by reviewing the slide's listed dates. She stated that the January budget workshop marked the start of the annual budget cycle. She reported that, following the budget workshop on January 27, 2026, staff planned to continue bringing monthly financial updates to the BCC, with dates for those presentations scheduled for February and March. She explained that staff would present the recommended FY 2027 budget to the Board in mid-April to provide staff with enough time to update the budget according to comments and directions from that meeting to ensure those details could be correctly reflected and prepared in the tentative and final budget for the public hearing, which could be done at the earliest during the May 19, 2026, BCC meeting. She explained that the final budget had to be submitted to the Nevada Department of Taxation (NDT) by June 1, 2026, while the Clerk needed to submit the five-year CIP, debt management policy, and statement of indebtedness to the NDT by August 1, 2026. She noted that those three items required Board approval prior to submission to the State. She stated that the five-year CIP was typically considered a complementary item following the adoption of the budget, with the debt management policy and statement of indebtedness often receiving approval at a later point in late June or early July to meet the August 1, 2026, submission deadline.

Vice Chair Garcia referred to Ms. Cooke's earlier statement that some departmental requests were still in the review process. She inquired how many outstanding requests there were. Ms. Cooke answered that the status of each request's review was determined individually by each department, noting that the budget team had received responses indicating that some departments had no requests to make. She explained that the budget team was verifying responses from departments that had indicated they had no changes to declare but would request additional resources. She noted her intent not to misspeak and expressed uncertainty about whether Vice Chair Garcia wanted exact values, but she indicated that the requests reflected an increase to departmental base budgets by hundreds of thousands of dollars, including contractual items beyond personnel costs. She acknowledged that such an increase was not insignificant, noting that the budget team had to consider whether there were savings opportunities elsewhere when determining how to respond to those departmental requests and work with staff from the various departments to review historical trends. She disclosed that submissions for departmental above-base requests, enhancements, and extras were due to the budget team by February 13, 2026. Vice Chair Garcia thanked Ms. Cooke, noting that her response was helpful.

Commissioner Clark thanked Ms. Cooke for her report. He stated that it was always good to hear from her and expressed his anticipation for future meetings.

Commissioner Hill noted her excitement for the upcoming budget workshop. She commended Ms. Cooke and her team for their hard work during a period that demanded greater frugality. She stated that financial conditions had changed since she started serving on the BCC. She noted that she looked forward to investigating creative solutions while ensuring the County continued to provide essential services to the public.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Andriola expressed her belief that everyone on the Board anticipated hearing what the financial plan was to maintain the balance between addressing budgetary concerns and providing essential services. She stated that she could only assume how frustrating it must be for staff not to receive notification of c-tax reports in a timely manner, as it hindered staff's ability to plan in advance based on those reports, which represented a significant portion of the County's funding. She thanked Ms. Cooke for trying to navigate the complexity of that challenge, which she stated was not an easy task. She recalled mentioning that she had previously spoken with other jurisdictions and various entities that were undergoing similar budgetary review processes. She inquired whether staff had considered reviewing the County's insurance policies or other policies that represented a direct financial impact. She clarified that she had referred to insurance policies only as an example and that she did not believe there was any excessive coverage. She explained that she had mentioned the topic instead to suggest a comprehensive review of certain expenditures that might not have been scrutinized to the necessary extent during cost-saving measures. She reiterated that she had mentioned the policy review solely as an example and expressed confidence that Ms. Cooke had already been considering those opportunities.

Chair Andriola acknowledged that Ms. Cooke and her team had worked very hard and expressed her appreciation. She thanked CM Thomas for organizing the upcoming presentation of national, regional, and local economic forecasts. She stated that it was important for those facts to be presented and considered to prepare everyone for what she believed would be challenging times ahead. She opined that it was important to balance what was happening presently with consideration for future projections. She thanked CM Thomas for the strategic planning and direction she had provided to staff for investigating capital improvements and the related costs. She stated that it would be helpful to review those matters, along with the County's investment policy for the fund balance. She acknowledged that providing those details would be difficult for Ms. Cooke, as she did not have all the information regarding c-tax and could not provide it to the Board at that time. She noted that it was important to remind the Board of those matters when appropriate. She thanked Ms. Cooke and her team for their hard work and dedication in identifying potential hidden savings opportunities.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland conducted a roll call vote due to technical complications.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Clark, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be acknowledged.

26-0075 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Public Hearing: Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0004 and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA25-0005 (Sunset Ranch). Consideration of Planning Commission's recommendation to:

(1) Adopt amendments to the Washoe County Master Plan, South Valleys Master Plan Land Use Map, to change the master plan land use designation for a ±41.7 -acre parcel (APN: 055-042-37) from Rural (R) to Rural Residential (RR); and if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect; and

(2) Subject to final approval of the associated master plan amendment and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by regional planning authorities, recommend adoption of an amendment to the South Valleys Regulatory Zone Map, to change the regulatory zoning on the same parcel from General Rural (GR 1 du/40acres) to Medium Density Rural (MDR 1du/5acres) on the same parcel; and if approved, authorize the chair to sign resolutions to this effect.

The applicant is Wood Rodgers, Inc. and the property owner is Sunset Ranch LLC. The property is located at 5000 Old US 395. The Board of County Commissioners may adopt the proposed amendments, may modify the proposed master plan amendment and refer the matter back to the Planning Commission for its report in accordance with NRS 278.220(4), or may deny the proposed amendments after the public hearing. In making its determination regarding the regulatory zone amendment, which may only be approved subject to adoption of the master plan amendment, the Board shall either affirm, modify, or reject the findings of fact included in the Planning Commission's recommendation. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

Chair Andriola opened the public hearing. She explained that staff would provide a PowerPoint presentation to share information with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC).

Planner Julee Olander introduced herself, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, and reviewed slides with the following titles: WMPA25-0004 & WRZA25-0005 (Sunset Ranch); Request; Aerial Image; Master Plan Request; RZA Request; Evaluation; Neighborhood Meeting & Public Comment; Planning Commissioner Recommendation; Thank you.

Ms. Olander displayed the *WMPA25-0004 & WRZA25-0005 (Sunset Ranch)* slide. She referred to Chair Andriola's earlier introduction to Agenda Item 17 and confirmed that the item concerned a proposed amendment to the Envision Washoe 2040 Master Plan (Master Plan) for the Sunset Ranch project. She showed the slide titled *Request* and explained that the proposal was to change the Master Plan designation from Rural to Rural Residential (RR) and to obtain a regulatory zone amendment (RZA) to adjust the subject parcel's classification from General Rural (GR) to Medium Density Rural (MDR). She noted that approval of the amendment would allow approximately eight potential parcels to be developed on the 41.7-acre subject parcel. She introduced the slide titled *Aerial Image* and reported that the subject parcel was located off historic United States (US) Highway 395, with an access easement to the north of the parcel.

Ms. Olander introduced the *Master Plan Request* slide by describing the two maps on the slide. She noted that the map on the left depicted the existing Master Plan designation for the subject parcel, with the map on the right reflecting the proposed designation. She comparatively showed the *RZA Request* slide, explaining that the two maps on the slide similarly reflected the subject parcel's existing regulatory zoning on the left and proposed regulatory zoning on the right. She displayed the slide titled *Evaluation*, noting that the proposal for the Master Plan designation of the subject parcel was to change the designation from Rural to RR. She stated that the proposal supported the area's vision by allowing for lots designated as RR, for small-scale agriculture and conservation, and for densities ranging from 1 unit per 40 acres to 1 unit per 5 acres. She explained that the zoning options under the RR designation supported such usage better than those that were available under the current Rural designation. She noted that the subject parcel was located outside of the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA), which required a minimum of five acres for dwellings to be served by well and septic systems.

Ms. Olander showed the *Neighborhood Meeting & Public Comment* slide. She reported that a neighborhood meeting was held on August 25, 2025, during which there were questions and comments regarding the proposed amendment, development potential, site access, and drainage. She noted that questions concerning the proposal process and how individuals could provide public comments on the matter had also been voiced during that meeting. She displayed the slide titled *Planning Commission Recommendation*. She reported that the Planning Commission (PC) had made all the required findings in support of the recommended approval and had unanimously passed the motion. She stated that proposed motions for Agenda Item 17 were included in the Staff Report for the Board and that the applicant was available to answer questions. She noted that the applicant had prepared a presentation for the Board, should they choose to hear it. She thanked the BCC and emphasized that she would be present to answer the Board's questions.

Chair Andriola asked whether the Board had questions for staff at that time, and it was determined that there were none. She invited the applicant to provide a presentation.

Eric Hasty, representative of the applicant and Planner with Wood Rogers, Incorporated (Inc.), conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the

following titles: Sunset Ranch; Location; Site Features; Current Master Plan & Zoning; Proposed Request; Master Plan Amendment; Regulatory Zone Amendment (2 slides); Regulatory Zone Amendment: Permitted Uses; Services and Future Use; Future Use; Sunset Ranch MPA & ZMA Review; Sunset Ranch MPA & RZA.

Mr. Hasty displayed the *Sunset Ranch* slide. He noted that he would keep his presentation brief and provide the Board with background information on the project by discussing the proposed plans and the reason for the request. He showed the slide titled *Location* and explained that the Sunset Ranch project was approximately 600 acres. He explained that the subject parcel was depicted on the slide in blue and represented only a portion of the larger Sunset Ranch property. He noted that the property had been owned by the same family for several decades. He referred to the *Site Features* slide. He reported that the property was primarily used for cattle grazing, noting that the slide image showed evidence of irrigation water and a barn on the site. He stated that there would be site access from the primary ranch house, which was connected to US Highway 395 at the area where the highway met Franktown Road.

Mr. Hasty showed the slide titled *Current Master Plan & Zoning*. He explained that the site's current designation in the Master Plan was Rural, while the regulatory zoning was GR. He displayed the *Proposed Request* slide and noted that the applicant's proposal was for a Master Plan Amendment (MPA) that would change the parcel's designation from Rural to RR, allowing an RZA to change the regulatory zoning designation from GR to MDR. He referred to the second slide titled *Regulatory Zone Amendment* and stated that the real reason for the applicant's interest was their intent to separate the subject parcel for the future residences of their family members. He explained that the current GR designation did not allow residential lots smaller than 40 acres, whereas the proposed MDR zoning allowed residential lots of 4 acres or more, per Washoe County Code (WCC). He reported that State law required lots to be at least five acres to use well and septic systems. He explained that the lots would need to be served by wells and septic systems, so, despite the WCC's local allowance for four-acre residential lots, the project parcels would need to be at least five acres to accommodate any new residences utilizing those systems.

Mr. Hasty introduced the *Regulatory Zone Amendment: Permitted Uses* slide. He explained that far fewer uses would be allowed on the parcel by transitioning its zoning designation from GR to MDR. He referred to the list on the slide, noting that it showed the uses currently allowed under a GR designation that would no longer be permitted under the proposed MDR zoning designation. He explained that the MDR zoning was more closely associated with residential homes than with property intended for resource extraction. He showed the slide titled *Services and Future Use*. He stated that the MDR zoning could allow up to eight dwelling units per acre, which would require a tentative map. He noted that the applicant intended to avoid doing so, as they had hoped to create a parcel map with fewer than 44 lots. He concluded his presentation by displaying the *Future Use* slide and noting that he would be happy to answer any additional questions from the Board.

On the call for public comment, Paul Cavin displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He introduced himself and stated that he lived at 4790 Franktown Road, which was located west of the subject parcel. He said that he was a licensed architect in the State of Nevada and the owner of an architectural firm in Reno. He stated that he was in opposition to amending the Master Plan and the South Valleys Master Plan Land Use Map. He referred to the document he had displayed and submitted, noting that it was the Washoe Valley Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan. He stated that the document was created for Washoe County and the PC. He said that those who read the document would find that an amendment to the Master Plan or changes to any open space were in direct conflict with the Washoe Valley Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan. He asked that the Board deny the amendments to the Master Plan or return the matter to the PC. He recalled finding that the Washoe Valley Scenic Byway Corridor Management Plan had not been included with the attachments for Agenda Item 17. He stated that the document was not mentioned in the item's reports, recommendations, and applications. He opined that the document truly preserved the Washoe Valley's cultural and natural resources. He reiterated that the amendments were in direct conflict with the Master Plan. He referred to earlier comments made during Agenda Item 10, where two individuals spoke about the importance of open space in Washoe County. He said that there were beautiful open spaces along US Highway 395 in Washoe Valley. He opined that the amendments would start to limit that open space. He reiterated his opposition to amending the Master Plan and requested that the BCC deny the amendments.

Mary Anne Healy introduced herself as the resident of 4957 Franktown Road. She stated that her 40-acre property was located directly across from the proposed project's parcel, which she described as a subdivision. She reported that the applicants already owned six homes in that location, including one near her property that was a schoolhouse. She described her opposition to Agenda Item 17 and opined that the area did not need another subdivision. She acknowledged that the lots would be slightly larger, but she believed the zoning changes would mark the beginning of Washoe Valley becoming Reno, which she did not think the area needed.

Chair Andriola asked if there were any questions from the Board for staff or the applicant. She asked staff for clarification on whether the matter would proceed to a review by the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) if the BCC chose to move forward with the item's approval. She inquired whether the item would be brought before the TMRPA for a regional review of the matter, or whether it had already been presented to that agency. Ms. Olander responded that the steps following the BCC's action on Agenda Item 17 depended on the applicant's choice. She explained that if the applicant chose to proceed with dividing the subject parcel into four lots or fewer, it would be considered a parcel map application and reviewed by the Parcel Map Review Committee, primarily composed of internal County staff. She noted that, if the applicant instead pursued more than four parcels, it would be brought before the PC for their review. Planning Manager Trevor Lloyd clarified that the next step in the process would require approval and conformance review through the TMRPA.

Chair Andriola thanked Mr. Lloyd for confirming that the TMRPA would need to review the matter. She stated that the TMRPA was responsible for ensuring that the entire region met all requirements and that the agency would consider all factors associated with the project, which she believed was important. She noted her understanding that, based on her review of the materials for Agenda Item 17 and the information provided during the earlier presentations, the PC had approved the amendments unanimously.

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland conducted a roll call vote due to technical complications.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, with Commissioner Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 17 adopted, approved, authorized, and recommended, based on the Board of County Commissioners having found all five findings required to adopt the amendment of the South Valleys Master Plan Land Use Map, and six of the seven findings required to adopt Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA25-0005, with the exception of the non-applicable finding regarding Effect on a Military Installation.

26-0076 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

26-0077 **AGENDA ITEM 19** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas announced that the Budget Workshop would occur on January 27, 2026. She noted that the Budget Workshop would be a different meeting format from regular Board meetings and would take place at 9:00 a.m.

* * * * *

12:49 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