

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

MAY 26, 2026

PRESENT:

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

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

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

***10:01 a.m.** Vice Chair Garcia arrived at the meeting.

26-0319 **AGENDA ITEM 3** Invocation by Monique Jacobs from Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada.

Monique Jacobs from the Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada (CCNN) provided the invocation.

26-0320 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Informational Update.

General Update from Truckee Meadows Fire & Rescue, Chief Richard J. Edwards. (All Commission Districts.)

Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Fire Chief Richard Edwards was before the Board to share updates on the District. He declared that May was Wildfire Prevention Month across the West, a message that carried more urgency every year. He stated that even as May was coming to an end, their attention to wildfire prevention remained steadfast. He noted that in Northern Nevada, they knew wildfire was not a distant threat, but a year-round reality that impacted their neighborhoods, economy, watersheds, and most importantly, the safety of their residents and firefighters. He felt that what made Wildfire Month so important was that it reminded them that the most effective wildfire was the one that never started. He detailed that, while they continued investing in

suppression capabilities, interagency coordination, fuel mitigation projects, and emergency response, prevention remained their strongest and most cost-effective tool. He stated that the vast majority of wildfires were human-caused, meaning many were preventable through education, awareness, and personal responsibility. He noted that simple actions mattered, such as properly extinguishing campfires, maintaining equipment, avoiding parking vehicles in dry grass, ensuring tow chains were properly stowed, adhering to burn restrictions, and creating defensible space around homes. He shared that the week prior, they had experienced a six-and-a-half-acre fire in the O'Brien's Pass area in the North Valleys, which began along the roadway at several locations, likely caused by a vehicle. He labeled it a fire that could have been prevented.

Chief Edwards recognized the important partnerships that made fire prevention possible. He noted that the firefighters, prevention staff, local governments, State and federal agencies, utility providers, and community organizations were working together to reduce risk before the fire season intensified, and declared that an important part of that community partnership was their volunteer firefighters. He explained that the TMFPD began as a volunteer fire department in 1972, and that they still had a proud tradition and legacy of volunteer firefighters. He added that more than 40 men and women played critical roles in supporting emergency response, wildfire preparedness, and community resilience throughout the region as volunteer firefighters serving from Gerlach, Red Rock, Palomino Valley, Silver Lake, and Washoe Valley. He stated that for community members looking to serve in a meaningful way, becoming a volunteer firefighter was an opportunity to directly protect their neighbors and contribute to public safety. He shared that anyone interested in serving could contact the TMFPD to learn more about training requirements, station opportunities, and the application process, and he listed their phone number. He added that information was also available on their website and listed the web address.

Chief Edwards explained that wildfire resilience was very much a shared responsibility and that every resident had a role in protecting their home, their neighborhood, and their community. He stated that as the community moved into the summer months, conditions across the region reminded everyone how quickly fire danger could escalate. He thought that May was an opportunity to raise awareness and encourage action. He extended an open invitation to the following week's America 250 event at the Washoe County Courthouse, where Truckee Meadows Fire & Rescue had the honor of being June's local champion of democracy. He asked everyone to join them on Wednesday, June 3, at 8:00 a.m. on the courthouse steps for the celebration.

26-0321 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Public Comment.

County Clerk Jan Galassini announced that Vice Chair Garcia had arrived at the meeting after Roll Call.

Tammy Holt-Still displayed documents, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She indicated that her concerns were related to Agenda Item 26 and noted that she had contacted the Nevada Division of Environmental

Protection (NDEP) regarding the Lemmon Valley Water Reclamation Facility (LVWRF) permit, which she said was not listed as renewed. She speculated that the County was in violation of the Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) and Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) for the LVWRF. She urged the Board to read her documents before approving Agenda Item 26 and said that County staff were not qualified to perform a Base Flood Elevation (BFE). She opined that approval of Agenda Item 26 would violate NRS 278.02073 by allowing the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) to move Lemmon Drive up to the berm and reduce access points to Lemmon Drive. She said that, per NRS, the final map should have been provided to the County after four years; however, the RTC received an extension, with no final map yet provided. She believed that the County had not complied with NRS, and neither had the developments. She asserted that staff should be asking questions and that the Board should understand NRS to know that items should not be automatically approved. She demanded that the Board and developers follow the law just as she believed the citizens did.

Val White read from a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She indicated that she had observed Washoe County ballot processing for the last five elections under four different Registrar of Voters (ROVs) and had accumulated over 500 hours of observation. She believed that cell phones were used throughout the elections department, including the tabulation room, which was also called the Election Management System room. She indicated that ROV Andrew McDonald was an Information Technology (IT) specialist who allowed staff, vendors, visitors, and the media to use their cell phones anywhere in the department. She speculated that the tabulation room should be the most secure room in the department. She reported that the Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) and other experts strongly advised that all devices capable of wireless communication be prohibited in election departments because they could be used to intrude on data or code and extract data from the election system. She accused Mr. McDonald of knowingly weakening the department's cybersecurity. She recalled that the United States (US) Department of Defense (DoD) experts' assessment concluded that it was a complete and total cybersecurity failure. She said that removable storage devices such as thumb drives and secure digital (SD) cards should be used only once and carry data in only one direction; however, she opined that Mr. McDonald had established a procedure to transfer data in and out of the tabulation room by repeatedly using a single thumb drive throughout the entire election. She felt the thumb drive was not secured between uses and was left in staff's pockets, creating a risk. She presumed that Mr. McDonald knew that the Board were not tech experts and that he was not telling the Board that he disregarded established IT cybersecurity best practices. She asserted that the room where ballots were stored was a mess and that ballots that had already been scanned were not sealed to prevent them from being mixed with those that had not been scanned. She said that there was no visible organization in the ballot storage room, either in person or via video cameras. She mentioned that there was a power outage at almost every election and wondered whether Mr. McDonald would disconnect the backup generator, as she speculated he did in 2024. She urged the Board to call her as she had more information.

Briana Foroszowsky read from a document outlining her concerns regarding security in the ballot processing and tabulation room at the ROV, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk.

Terry Brooks read an original poem regarding discrimination and mental disabilities.

Robby Williams asked the Board if they believed the transparency the ROV provided was the transparency the community deserved. She recalled that in 2024, a livestream monitor was placed in the lobby for citizens to watch ballot processing in real time; however, it had since been removed with no plans to return it. She believed that in 2024, the public had discovered 151 pre-loaded thumb drives in the tabulation room from the lobby. She said that on Election Day 2024, the public could only monitor the counting and securing from the lobby, because if they had asked to be in the observation room inside the ROV Office, they might have been refused. She opined that true bipartisan observation was essential and legally required. She said that the colored partisan badges were difficult to distinguish on the live feed and listed the colors as red for Republican, blue for Democrat, yellow for Independent, and green for others, such as the Communist Party of the United States of America (CPUSA), the Socialist Party of America (SPA), the Marxist Party of America, and for no party affiliation. She indicated that during her 26 hours of observation so far this year, Republicans were extremely rare in the processing room and were absent on many occasions. She reported that several Republicans had told her they had applied to work in the processing area but were informed that all positions were already filled by expensive County staff, who she said were overwhelmingly Democrat and who utilized large amounts of overtime, with few Independents and other party affiliations. She said that visibility remained a serious problem and that in 2024, ballot sorting was performed by a single person in the back of the ballot storage room, only to be later blocked by a bookcase. She relayed that in 2026, large areas of work tables were not observable. She said that over 9,000 undeliverable ballots were returned during the 2026 cycle after removing more than 10,800 inactive voters and canceling 397 registrations between January and March. She wondered why the ROV was still paying for back-end cleaning and why there were so many unreadable, undeliverable, and unknown ballots. She asked why there had been no citizen input regarding the new election center on Longley Lane, as she believed there were serious concerns with the proposed design that would not allow for meaningful observation overall and would not ensure proper Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. She said the community sought confidence in the elections, and that the concerns she listed were ones the Board should share.

Oscar Williams displayed a document, copies of which were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He recalled that the previous Friday, he delivered a civil and voting rights complaint regarding the sample ballot to the County. He said that he had a copy for the Clerk and legal counsel, which he provided to County Clerk Jan Galassini. He speculated that the complaint was straightforward and concerned voter trust and data transparency. He speculated that the community would benefit from a Countywide Citizens' Advisory Board (CAB) on elections. He said that the voters had the right to an accurate sample ballot per the Constitution of the State of Nevada and NRS. He

reported that NRS indicated that the sample ballot must be mailed to an individual and be for his or her precinct. He said the sample ballot mailed should reflect the ballot the voter would cast. He pointed out that in the 2022 Primary Election, the sample ballot stated that it was a sample of the ballot the voter would receive when voting, but the 2024 Primary Election sample ballot was partywide, while the 2026 Primary Election sample ballot had no pullout. He noted that the 2026 Primary Election sample ballot included a quick response (QR) code that directed an individual to an online preview of their sample ballot. He asserted that not everyone had access to or wanted to use the internet and that by offering a QR code, thousands of people in the County would be denied an accurate sample ballot. He reiterated that he had delivered a copy of his complaint to each of the Commissioners, the County Manager (CM), the ROV, and would be sending copies to the Department of Justice (DOJ) Civil Rights Voting Section Director Eric Neff and the US Attorney General.

Laura Wetherington thanked the Board for their service and for the opportunity to speak. She believed that the Board would soon have the privilege of appointing new trustees to the Library Board of Trustees (LBT), and she encouraged the Board to work with Human Resources (HR) to develop substantive onboarding for new appointees so that they could understand, at minimum, Open Meeting Law (OML), Robert's Rules of Order, and NRS pertaining to ethics. She also recommended that the Board assign a Commissioner as a liaison for the LBT. She recalled telling the LBT the previous week that she wanted more accountability. She explained that she would be concerned if a member of the community attended an LBT meeting to ask that books be censored on behalf of a certain group, and the LBT Chair was also a member of that same group. She said that, rather than disclosing the connection or recusing herself from the vote, the chair requested a change in the meeting format so that the group and its supporters could speak for an unlimited amount of time, which Ms. Wetherington asserted was wrong. She felt that avoidance was not a sufficient response to concerns, and while she understood that a board member could only be removed for missing three consecutive meetings, she believed the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) could take other actions to clarify how it would like the LBT to address conflicts of interest. She recommended that the BCC place an item on its next agenda to amend and define the LBT bylaws regarding conflicts of interest and to require trustees to publicly disclose potential conflicts before casting their votes. She said that another option would be to have an action item that recommended the bylaws be amended to require trustees to complete the Nevada State Library and Archive's (NSLAs) trustee training or have an item to collect questions for the BCC to consider for potential trustees, including asking said trustees if they belonged to groups that might bring matters before the LBT and how the candidates would deal with that situation. She expressed hope that her comments did not feel like an attack on a single member of the LBT but imagined that anyone with strong convictions or without much prior public service experience could make mistakes. She urged that the Board stand for honorable leadership before the makeup of the LBT changed.

Hayley Hayden noted that she worked with the Donor Network West as their community engagement and partnership development specialist and was a member of the Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce (The Chamber) Leadership class of 2026. She indicated that one of her assignments related to a civic engagement project that required her to provide public comment before the Board. She thanked the Board for everything they did. She recalled working in the nonprofit sector for the past eight years across various areas, from children's literacy to animal welfare, and mentioned she was currently in the organ donation field. She recalled seeing many of the Commissioners at events and expressed appreciation for the Board's work.

Sandra Miller asserted that she had concerns related to the Social Security Administration (SSA) and landlords. She believed that the rising rents from landlords were becoming difficult to afford. She divulged that she had a history of strokes. She noted that her son had lived in the area for 12 years, and after deciding to follow him to the area, she had a stroke, which she reported when attempting to file with the SSA for disability. She relayed that she had lived in a one-bedroom space for three years. She said the SSA denied her even though it had received her medical records. She wondered what her chances were of winning against the SSA if she resubmitted. She explained that she had contributed to her Social Security, had no car, worked late nights, and had experience in dangerous situations. She mentioned that she had her first stroke while working at Walgreens and had to save her money because she knew she had to recover for two months. She indicated that after Walgreens, she worked at Atlantis Casino Resort Spa and was able to get her own apartment. She felt that working at the Atlantis Casino Resort Spa caused more damage due to stress. She said that she was normally a very intelligent person, but since she had memory issues and speech concerns, due to strokes, everything changed. She indicated that in 2024, she was let go from a job because she could not remember how to open a register. She reiterated that SSA denied her disability benefits. Chair Andriola opined that staff could connect Ms. Miller with resources and thanked her for sharing her concerns.

Ashley Muckway indicated that she was a member of Big Brothers, Big Sisters of Northern Nevada (BBBSNN), and the Chamber Leadership Class of 2026. She explained that throughout the course, she witnessed how the County operated in the region. She thanked the Board for their work and noted that BBBSNN was always in need of more qualified adults to volunteer. She said that BBBSNN had 150 kids on the waitlist, with many more interested if the waitlist opened. She mentioned that the youth faced many challenges. She said that the volunteer work through BBBSNN took four hours a month and was very fun. She recalled that her boss and the youth visited Costco, discussed shopping and healthy habits, and celebrated with a hot dog. She urged those interested to visit the BBBSNN website.

Sun Valley CAB Chair Heidi Soper noted that she originally did not want to provide comments related to Agenda Items 20 and 21; however, after speaking with Vice Chair Garcia, she believed that Agenda Items 20 and 21 were wonderful ideas, and she hoped they would be approved because they would help the CABs serve more people and become more diverse by representing a larger population. She said that the approval of Agenda Items 20 and 21 would allow the CABs to provide better and more information,

concerns, and ideas. She speculated that the CABs would need to reorganize to ensure that everyone was included. She recalled that when she joined the CAB, there were 6 people in attendance, and since then, it had grown to 39. She said that she would need to figure out how to inform everyone in District 3 of the meetings. She felt the bylaws for Agenda Item 21 were wonderful. She urged the Board to provide a copy of the bylaws to every CAB if it was approved. She recalled that when she became Chair of the Sun Valley CAB, she had to repeatedly ask for a copy of the bylaws, which she believed should have been automatically provided.

26-0322 **AGENDA ITEM 6** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas reminded the public that early voting was May 23, 2026, through June 5, 2026. She mentioned that Election Day was June 9, 2026, and encouraged everyone to vote. She advised voters who planned to mail their ballots not to wait until the last minute, explaining that receiving ballots earlier helped to reduce Election Day voter traffic. She added that the Secretary of State (SOS) had shared the same message and said it was important enough to repeat. She thanked the speakers from the Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce (the Chamber) Leadership Class and shared that she had also participated in the program 20 years ago.

Commissioner Clark stated that a recent issue had been discussed on social media. He referenced a prior budget meeting during which he did not oppose anything and acknowledged that over 80 percent of the budget was likely employee benefits and salaries. He indicated that during that discussion, he briefly stepped out of the meeting to use the restroom. He commented that he was unclear why his brief absence had drawn media attention and questioned how such situations should be handled. He clarified that the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) did not have the authority to ever speak on his behalf. He explained that although the Chair or the County's Public Information Officer (PIO) might speak for the County or the other Commissioners, if anyone needed answers from him, they should contact him directly. He asked what the appropriate protocol was when someone at the dais needed to use the restroom, and whether that person needed to sound an alarm or obtain a note from a doctor. He recalled that when he watched the video of the budget meeting, the Chair indicated she would follow up with him upon his return regarding a vote he had missed. He pointed out that after a week, he had not been asked about the vote either publicly or privately, which he described as hypocrisy within the County. He stated that community members often asked why he chose to become a Commissioner, and he responded that he was interested in studying hypocrisy, which he alleged he regularly observed. He explained that an assessor was another term for an appraiser who valued property and made comparisons. He indicated that during the previous election cycle, the former CM took a nearly 30-day leave of absence, which he advised could have been for medical reasons. He suggested that the former CM's leave of absence received less scrutiny than when he left a meeting to use the restroom. He alleged that the former CM was witnessed in a bar drinking, several days into his leave, and it was unclear if the former CM was self-medicating. He reiterated that the former CM received less scrutiny than he had. He noted that when other Commissioners left the dais to use the restroom, the Chair did not specifically point out their absence, nor were those absences

placed on the public record. He believed that such absences were not typically shared with the media. He remarked that he had valid concerns that he wanted additional information on, which he felt were actual news stories that the media should investigate.

Commissioner Clark shared that the County had previously paid for an outside investigation. He reminded the public that the County had nearly 100 attorneys on staff and a Human Resources (HR) department that was very well paid. He suggested that when an investigation was needed, the County typically hired an outside investigator. He said the County paid \$55,000 to investigate the former head of the Cares Campus, which he felt was not the best or highest use of the County's funds, given that the County already employed attorneys, paralegals, and other employees with legal backgrounds. He wondered whether there was an agency that would have charged a lower fee to conduct the investigation, rather than using the same law firm to conduct County investigations. He questioned the rationale for the County having to pay an outrageous fee for an investigation. He requested information on how the County selected companies to conduct investigations, how pricing was evaluated for fairness, who was responsible for negotiating costs, and whether efforts were made to obtain the most cost-effective services for the public.

Commissioner Clark stated that the County hired someone to provide tours of the Cares Campus and paid that employee \$100 per hour. He questioned who approved the position. He said that the average wage in the County was approximately \$36 per hour. He questioned the justification for the \$100 hourly rate and whether it represented the most effective use of County funds. He stated that, in his view, those funds could have been used to provide housing for individuals at the Cares Campus. He surmised that the Chamber had done a great job of helping people earn their General Educational Development (GED) and improve their financial literacy, and added that he had contributed some of his discretionary funds to those programs. He thought the funds paid to the tour guide at the Cares Campus could have been used to support a different program. He said that the County employed thousands of individuals, and if a tour guide was needed, someone already on the payroll should be used. He questioned who determined that a Cares Campus tour guide was needed, who set the employee's rate of pay, and who approved the position.

Commissioner Clark addressed a third topic, which he found concerning and believed warranted media attention. He alleged that a local nonprofit had \$2 million in the bank and needed approximately \$1 million more to complete its project. He shared that the County gave the nonprofit \$980,000, and he suggested that, after receiving the County funds, the nonprofit expended both its existing reserves and the County funds but did not complete the project. He said the nonprofit had over encumbered the property and had liens against it due to unpaid sewer bills. He thought that the most egregious part was that the funding came from opioid settlement funds, for which people had suffered and died from opioid use. He stated that he believed opioid settlement funds were intended to help address harms related to opioid use, and alleged that the County funds provided to the nonprofit had been mishandled. He questioned the source of the initial \$2 million in funding for the nonprofit, suggesting it may have been used to secure additional funding from the County. He asked whether the initial funds were provided by the City of Reno, the City of Sparks,

or the State of Nevada. He said that an investigation was needed to determine how it had occurred, who oversaw the disbursement of funds, whether the nonprofit maintained financial records, and if background or credit checks had been conducted for the individuals running the nonprofit. He suggested that an individual in a leadership role at the nonprofit also held a leadership position within a data center group. He alleged that the spokesperson for the Data Center Coalition (DCC), which was involved in data center development, was the same individual associated with the nonprofit referenced. He recalled a comment by Vice Chair Garcia about identifying bad actors involved in misconduct across different massage parlors. He felt that something similar should apply to nonprofits and that if it was determined that someone was doing something wrong at one nonprofit, they should not be allowed to work at another. He believed that a lot of people were addicted to drugs and had suffered, and the opioid settlement funds had come from Big Pharma, which had been accused of harming the community. He thought those funds should have been used to help the community, but he felt they had not been.

Commissioner Clark referenced recent news reports that the District Attorney (DA) intended to seek the death penalty in the case involving the alleged murder of a child in the North Valleys. He recalled that, when the child's death initially occurred, he had asked how many interactions the County had with residents at the address in question, and he was informed that the information could not be disclosed because the case was closed. He mentioned that subsequent news reports and statements from neighbors indicated that the County and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) had been called to the residence on multiple occasions prior to the child's death. He expressed concern that warning signs might not have been adequately addressed and requested additional information regarding the County's awareness of prior reports, the number of reported incidents, and the extent of involvement by the WCSO and the DA's Office in the matter.

Commissioner Clark stated that the scenarios he had shared warranted significantly more scrutiny and attention than focusing on someone who had left a meeting for three minutes to use the restroom. He added that any reasonable person would agree that there were more important issues requiring solutions.

Chair Andriola stated for the record that she had never spoken to the media or made public statements regarding the allegations raised by Commissioner Clark. Commissioner Clark asked Chair Andriola to confirm if she had questioned him upon his return, noting that she had stated during the meeting that she would do so. Chair Andriola clarified that during the meeting, she stated she would inquire when Commissioner Clark returned. She reiterated that she had never spoken to the media regarding the matter.

Commissioner Clark said that he would not back down from what he believed to be the truth. He questioned the protocol for situations in which a member of the Board needed to leave the dais to use the restroom. He asked why Chair Andriola had specifically pointed out his absence but had not done so when other Commissioners left the dais for the same reason. He requested that his question be entered into the record.

Chair Andriola stated that she announced whenever anyone was absent during a vote and emphasized that she was not singling out Commissioner Clark. She explained that her intent was to ensure the record accurately reflected any absences. She said that she did not believe it was appropriate for her to establish the protocol. She shared that, during her more than 20 years of service on public bodies governed by the Open Meeting Law (OML), members would typically notify the Chair when they needed to leave the dais. She mentioned that, prior to becoming the Chair, she would communicate with the Chair if she needed to leave, particularly if she knew she would miss a vote. She noted that, regarding the protocol, she did not feel it was the appropriate time to discuss it.

Commissioner Clark requested that the proper protocol for a Commissioner needing to be excused to use the restroom without being ostracized be agendaized for discussion. Chair Andriola responded that no one was trying to ostracize him. Commissioner Clark stated that the matter could be added to a future agenda. Chair Andriola stated that she thought Commissioner Clark was requesting clarification.

Commissioner Hill referred to the public comment regarding the recommendation to the Library Board of Trustees (LBT). She stated that she believed the item concerning a BCC liaison to the LBT would be agendaized in June and asked Chair Andriola to confirm her understanding. Chair Andriola confirmed that it was her understanding.

Commissioner Hill mentioned that she had requested it be placed on a future agenda and noted that other Commissioners had made similar requests. She noted that CM Thomas had been tasked with training for all boards and commissions. She acknowledged prior public comments regarding training and added that she looked forward to the development of future training protocols.

Chair Andriola said she had also asked the Commission Support staff, CM Thomas, and Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Jennifer Gustafson to develop a training protocol not only for the Citizens Advisory Boards (CAB), but for all boards. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that all members understood the parameters and responsibilities of their service. She thanked CM Thomas for taking the initiative to implement the training and expressed appreciation for her efficiency and dedication.

PRESENTATION

26-0323 **AGENDA ITEM 7A1** Presentation and update on WOARF projects by Lauren Beal, Grants and Community Program Analyst, Washoe County. (All Commission Districts.)

Grants and Community Program Analyst Lauren Beal conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Washoe Opioid Abatement and Recovery Fund – Updates; Timeline; WOARF Snapshot; 2023 Needs Assessment; Dashboard; Sum of Award Amount by Project Name; Priority 1; Priority 2; Priority 3; Priority 4; Priority 5; Capacity Building and Training; 2026-27 Funding Plan;

Amount Available for FY 2027; Outreach; 2026 NOFO and RFP Process; Reapplication; Questions?.

Ms. Beal displayed the slide titled *Washoe Opioid Abatement and Recovery Fund – Updates* and introduced herself. She expressed appreciation to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for allowing her to present during the meeting and acknowledged that, in December, following the most recent needs assessment, a request was made for her to discuss the funding and operations of the Washoe Opioid Abatement and Recovery Fund (WOARF). She noted that she would attempt to complete her presentation within the ten-minute time limit. She showed the slide titled *Timeline*. She explained that the slide listed the WOARF timeline, which began in 2023, when the County first began receiving funding as a result of conducting the first needs assessment in response to the State of Nevada, which outlined that such action would be required every four years to qualify for that funding. She noted that the initial needs assessment was intended to cover the years 2023 to 2025. She reported that the County proceeded by issuing a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) in early 2024, with the first awards launched in September 2024 and ending on September 30, 2026. She stated that a year was spent developing a needs assessment process in 2025, with that process and the program's funding plan ultimately receiving BCC approval on December 9, 2025. She explained that staff had been working towards developing the next set of awards for the most recent NOFO, which she hoped would be completed in the following month.

Ms. Beal showed the *WOARF Snapshot* slide and noted that she would provide additional detail on the topics she had previously mentioned. She referred to the value listed beside the *Amount received to date* category and disclosed that her team had discovered earlier that morning that the State of Nevada had sent an additional \$93,000, meaning the listed figure was slightly inaccurate. She reported that the County had received \$11.43 million out of the \$40 million expected to be distributed. She noted that the County had allocated just over \$5 million to grants since July of 2024 and had spent \$2.97 million as of March 31, 2026. She displayed the *2023 Needs Assessment* slide. She stated that the 2023 needs assessment included five top priorities. She explained that staff wanted to ensure that they were getting access to care for uninsured and underinsured Washoe County residents, that the County's emergency departments were providing buprenorphine in emergency settings, that there was outreach and education on overdose prevention, that child welfare best practices were in place for supporting families impacted by substance use, and that there was increased access to detoxification and short-term rehabilitation resources.

Ms. Beal introduced the slide titled *Dashboard*. She explained that there was a very detailed dashboard on the WOARF website that included a list of all the efforts the program had funded thus far, reports on all funding received each year from various pharmaceutical companies or distributors that were sued, and product descriptions. She noted that those categories could be sorted to list additional detailed information by clicking a button on the website. She explained that the website screenshot on the slide provided an overview of the original needs assessment and some of WOARF's initial awards. She showed the *Sum of Award Amount by Project Name* slide and explained that

the image was a screenshot of another page on the WOARF website that provided information on how that funding was spent and where it was invested. She reported that nearly 900 people had been connected to treatment or services by the program's grantees, over 5,000 doses of naloxone had been distributed, over 100 participants had been connected to peer recovery support services, and the program ensured that people could transition into treatment. She explained that those statistics were major performance measures that WOARF used across multiple projects. She noted that additional details demonstrating the differences between the projects and their impacts on the community were available on the website.

Ms. Beal displayed the *Priority 1* slide. She explained that the program's first priority was ensuring that uninsured and underinsured residents had access to treatment. She expressed her intent to tell the Board a story that had been shared with her about a client with Opioid Use Disorder (OUD) seeking treatment after having recently relapsed, as they were experiencing a significant financial loss of \$20,000 due to their co-occurring gambling addiction. She reported that the client was connected to a behavioral health walk-in clinic through the justice system, which enabled rapid access to care without additional barriers. She noted that, following that initial connection, the client was enrolled in medication-assisted treatment and intensive outpatient program services. She disclosed that the client had remained actively engaged in treatment throughout their time using both of those services and had graduated from them in March of 2026 with perfect attendance. She reported that the client had only one same-day cancellation across all behavioral health appointments, had since obtained employment, and had successfully maintained their job while participating in their OUD services. She noted that the client had some unique services provided to them in consideration of the lack of counseling services for gambling addictions in the community, which had resulted in additional recognition of the need for those resources locally. She reported that the client was currently transitioning out of transitional living accommodations and was moving into permanent housing. She explained that the story she had provided illustrated that one way rapid access to treatment could impact a person's life.

Ms. Beal showed the slide titled *Priority 2*. She noted that the second priority of the program was to provide buprenorphine and care navigators in emergency departments. She reported that she initially did not receive any interest from the local emergency departments for that priority, but she subsequently began conducting meetings with staff from those facilities in an attempt to build connections and encourage more participation towards the goal in order to identify methods those departments could use to fulfill the community need within their own models. She introduced the *Priority 3* slide by explaining that the third priority was for overdose prevention and education. She reported that the program funded the two listed projects to address that priority, and she described the experience of one individual who was particularly impacted by outreach navigators for the projects. She explained that those outreach navigators successfully connected that individual to a recovery housing program, which they were eventually able to graduate from after connecting with outreach staff who had initially acted in an attempt to simply ensure that the person would not die. She elaborated that the outreach navigators' intention shifted from the immediate need to ensure the individual would not die to the ability to

support them so they would thrive. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that people could connect with follow-up services, as that served as the pathway between the two goals.

Ms. Beal displayed the slide titled *Priority 4*. She described the fourth priority of the program as child welfare best practices, represented by the Crossroads Families program, which expanded the Crossroads model to account for family units. She noted that the program had facilitated the reunification of a father and his infant child. She explained that the support the program provided enabled the father to transition from living at Crossroads Families into an at-home safety plan with Child Protective Services (CPS). She reported that the father was set to close his safe baby CPS case in July of 2026, and the infant was currently in his custody during all hours of the day, every day of the week. She stated that the father was a single dad and was learning to balance his responsibilities and set aside time to bond with his family. She noted that, without Crossroads Families, there would have been no option for that father to maintain his recovery in a supportive environment while pursuing reunification with his child. She showed the *Priority 5* slide and explained that the fifth priority was associated with the Bristlecone Family Resources project for the construction of a detoxification facility.

Ms. Beal introduced the *Capacity Building and Training* slide. She explained that the program provided capacity building and training services, as the County had received many requests for support from both program grantees and community partners. She reported that those groups expressed interest in learning more about how to holistically support pregnant and parenting people who use substances, as well as how to ensure that peers could get training free of charge to become peer recovery support specialists. She explained that staff wanted to ensure scholarships were provided for local conferences relevant to the services and programs the County was operating. She displayed the slide titled *2026-27 Funding Plan* and noted that she had previously presented on the 2026 to 2027 WOARF funding plan for the 2026 through 2029 needs assessment. She noted that staff wanted to continue two program priorities, as well as five new major priorities. She explained that those priorities were to ensure outreach and connection to services, expand housing services, establish mobile health care clinics, provide overdose prevention outreach and education, implement child welfare best practices, conduct evaluations of existing programs and services, and support peer-led mental health support for behavioral health workers. She stated that there were many more details regarding the funding plan and needs assessment on the website, in a 200-page document with summaries and synopses for each category.

Ms. Beal showed the slide titled *Amount Available for FY 2027*. She reported that the current amount of available funding for the program was approximately \$5.6 million and had nearly reached \$5.7 million. She referred to the table on the slide and noted that the goals associated with capacity building and community support were allocated separate funds and listed in different categories. She explained that \$5.5 million of the available funds were allocated towards the program's 2026 priorities. She acknowledged the category titled *Emerging Needs Fund* and explained that its purpose was to ensure the program could meet community needs by having immediate access to the necessary funds if anything unexpected were to happen between funding plan cycles. She

displayed the *Outreach* slide and recalled that the BCC had approved \$1 million towards the Human Services Agency (HSA) Housing and Homeless Services (HHS) in December of 2025 to conduct a Request for Proposal (RFP) and develop a contract for outreach services. She referred to the slide titled *2026 NOFO and RFP Process*, noting that staff were currently conducting the program's NOFO and RFP processes. She explained that the RFP process was being undertaken to conduct a program evaluation of Crossroads, and the NOFO was being done to provide additional services. She expressed hope that the related awards would begin on July 1, 2026. She showed the *Reapplication* slide and reported that the Crossroads Families project was eligible for reapplication due to its outstanding success.

Chair Andriola thanked Ms. Beal and commended her for balancing the various matters she handled simultaneously.

Commissioner Clark referred to the comments he had made previously during Agenda Item 6, noting that the intensity he expressed during those statements he intended to continue would not be directed towards Ms. Beal, whom he opined was doing a great job. He clarified that the intensity of his statements was directed entirely at those he had previously alluded to, as he suspected they knew what they were doing when the undisclosed event occurred. He expressed belief that Ms. Beal was uninvolved in those matters and clarified that he felt no animosity towards her. He noted that he hoped Ms. Beal did not feel as though he felt that about her. He requested that Ms. Beal revisit the slide titled *Priority 5* regarding the Bristlecone Family Resources project, which he disclosed as the nonprofit he had previously discussed. He asked Ms. Beal to discuss that project and inquired whether that organization had claimed it had \$2 million in funds available but needed more money from the County to complete it.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large requested a brief five-minute recess, which Chair Andriola agreed to.

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

11:13 a.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

Commissioner Clark clarified that his statements were allegations and stated that the situation he had described gave the appearance of funds being used as an inducement to get the County to add funds in order for that organization to do something. He asked whether his statement was correct, which Ms. Beal confirmed. He asked whether it was fair to say that such actions had not materialized, and Ms. Beal affirmed that was the case. He stated that the meaning he was trying to convey was not exclusively about that particular case, but rather to express that he wanted to ensure there were safeguards in the future for the County. He noted that he did not want Ms. Beal to become involved in such a situation and clarified that he was attempting to protect her and Washoe County. He acknowledged that while it might sound as though he was attacking the unnamed individual he had mentioned previously, there was a reason for him doing so. He stated that, in reality, he wanted to ensure that measures were instituted to prevent such events from recurring.

and that the WOARF funds were being best utilized to help people. He expressed hope that his statements would be considered with the intention of protecting Ms. Beal so she could do her job and achieve the good work she wanted to accomplish with the WOARF funds.

Commissioner Clark indicated that events similar to those he had alleged had occurred throughout the United States (US), with losses of funds in California and Minnesota. He recommended that the same not be allowed to occur in Washoe County by implementing safeguards that would protect those whom the funds were intended to help, which were people who were actively addicted to substances, had suffered from that in the past, or were family members who had lost loved ones to addiction. He stated that his outrage stemmed from other parties receiving those funds only to ultimately fail to use them for their intended purpose, which he hoped people could understand and not think he was intentionally trying to unfairly criticize anyone. He explained that he wanted to ask how protective measures could be implemented in the future to ensure that such alleged actions did not happen again, and he hoped this would be understood and not taken personally, as it was not meant to be perceived that way. He thanked Ms. Beal, and she stated that staff had changed a lot of the protocols for such matters, which would be instituted for the most recent round of funding. She stated that she sincerely hoped and believed that such events would not happen again. Commissioner Clark noted that he had one final comment and indicated that many problems could arise when money and people were involved. He believed that one could ask those who ran casinos, owned their own businesses, or were part of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO). He indicated that safeguards were important to prepare for potential concerns.

Vice Chair Garcia thanked everyone involved in addiction prevention, treatment, and recovery for their hard work. She stated that the community would not be the same without those individuals and commended Ms. Beal for establishing many connections with various organizations to build lasting, trusting relationships with many people. She noted that Ms. Beal had done an excellent job. She acknowledged that everyone was aware that substance use disorders intersect across all areas of society and impact families regardless of wealth, the neighborhood they live in, or occupation. She stated that the WOARF settlement dollars represented a second chance for people to recover and find stability. She opined that the most beautiful aspect of the program was its complete nonpartisanship and that it should not be politicized, as substance use was impacting communities throughout the Nation, especially in Washoe County. She explained that substance use impacted the County's child welfare system, the jail, and so many different aspects of services provided by Washoe County. She noted that she had a question about how Ms. Beal collected the data she presented. She referred to the slide titled *Sum of Award Amount by Project Name* and noted that Ms. Beal had reported that 900 people were connected to treatment or services by grantees. She asked Ms. Beal to remind her of her data collection policy and communication process with the different grantee agencies. She noted that she was aware the WOARF dashboard was functional and doing well, but she said it would be great if Ms. Beal could explain more about the nuances of that website and the related data collection.

Ms. Beal noted that each grantee was required to submit a quarterly report with any funding reimbursement requests showing their results for each quarter, which included the requirement for a short narrative piece that described the grantee's actions, how that impacted people, and the story behind the reported figures. She noted that a required dashboard spreadsheet was created for each grantee to include the different people they served without identifying information, and that they would subsequently have to answer questions about those individuals, such as how many were connected to services and how many stayed in services for a certain number of days. She explained that there were many different factors associated with that process, which were slightly unique to each program, as no service was exactly the same. She acknowledged that the exact same service could not be expected of someone providing medication-assisted treatment as of someone doing outreach to vulnerable populations for service connection, as those services addressed different needs. She explained that staff tried to collect data on the same measure for the major functions shared by all grantees, while implementing more nuanced methods for each project that could be revisited to determine whether they were meeting performance measures, identify trends, and ensure that conversations were proactively held when adjustments were needed.

Vice Chair Garcia asked Ms. Beal at what point the Commissioners might know how much progress had been made towards particular goal areas. She recalled a presentation conducted by the Washoe County Regional Medical Examiner's Office (WCRMEO) several weeks prior regarding the emphasis on upstream services and preventing certain events related to substance use. She explained that Chief Medical Examiner Laura Knight had provided the Board with statistics on overdoses in Washoe County. Vice Chair Garcia asked what point in the data collection process the Board and the community would be notified if the amount of overdoses in Washoe County was decreasing. She noted that her question also extended to child welfare and the jail, and whether there were other key indicators to collect that information aside from the quarterly reports.

Ms. Beal noted that she was working on developing additional dashboard pages to report those community-level measures. She reported that there had been a reduction in the number of people who were overdosing, which she acknowledged Ms. Knight had already reported to the Board. She explained that she wanted to partner with local emergency departments to determine how many people were being diverted from those facilities through WOARF's mobile health initiative, which provided care and community as an alternative to the highly expensive emergency medical care. She noted that work was underway to identify performance measures for each of the newly developed priorities and focuses, which would have a separate area on the dashboard. She expressed hope that the initial data for those matters would be ready for the Board within six months. Vice Chair Garcia thanked Ms. Beal for her hard work. She opined that it was nice to know that the County could put funding behind actual recovery efforts, which had not always been the case.

Chair Andriola thanked Ms. Beal and noted that the Board would anticipate future presentations from her. She noted that her question had been similar to Vice Chair

Garcia's. She thanked Ms. Beal again for her hard work and for everything she did. She acknowledged that Ms. Beal and her staff comprised a small team, and she opined that the results of the community collaboration efforts had shown.

26-0324 **AGENDA ITEM 7B1** Presentation and program updates by the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, Human Services Agency and Pretrial Services Division of the Second Judicial District Court on the pretrial services, post-sentence supervision and STAR (Support in Treatment, Accountability and Recovery) programs. (All Commission Districts.)

Washoe County Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Abbe Yacoben, Pretrial Services Program Manager Angelina Wencke, Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Lieutenant Jason Phillips, and Division Director with the Washoe County Human Services Agency (HSA) Cara Paoli, conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Alternative Sentencing Update; Agenda; SJDC Pretrial Services Update; Pretrial Initiatives; WCSO Alternative Sentencing Update; Stakeholder Appreciation; HSA CrossRoads STAR Program (2 slides); Thank you & Questions.

Abbe Yacoben shared the slide titled *Alternative Sentencing Update* and explained she would be delivering a quick update on the dissolution of the Department of Alternative Sentencing (DAS) and where the three functions the department served had been redirected.

Ms. Yacoben shared the slide titled *Agenda* and laid out the update's agenda, which included first setting the stage for what her fellow speakers would be covering in their portions, as they were the experts on those topics. She stated that two points her fellow speakers wanted her to make were that, as they dissolved the DAS and moved the employees into different departments of the Second Judicial District Court (SJDC), the WCSO, and the HSA, there was some natural staff turnover. She called out that the teams had worked seamlessly to keep pretrial services, post-sentence supervision, and the Support in Treatment, Accountability and Recovery (STAR) program running, and felt they should be commended. She noted that there were turnovers and some new training was needed. She mentioned that while they were dissolving Chapter 11 and moving those functions into new areas, they learned that funding for the personnel portion of the STAR grant had been removed. She attested that the team had done a great deal of work to keep that program up and running, including working with all its stakeholders.

Ms. Wencke shared the slide titled *SJDC Pretrial Services Update* and stated that pretrial services had moved intentionally in accordance with the Board's vote and the Reno Justice Court's administrative order filed on December 31, 2025. She expressed that integrating the approximately 400 defendants from the DAS caseload into the pretrial caseload was daunting. She explained that to ensure they were prioritizing community safety and putting their efforts in the right place, they split the 400-person caseload into three groups to improve efficiency. She added that after onboarding the original 400 individuals, their caseload had essentially doubled, and they were still adjusting to the increase. To explain how the transition affected the jail or assessment team,

she first explained that since December 31, they had immediately begun executing release acknowledgments for all defendants released from the Reno Justice Court, effectively doubling the contracts they would have originally completed for stakeholders in December. She noted that from January 1, the team had immediately begun working with stakeholders, including booking staff, to help them transition into the new system as well. She described it as a fast-and-furious transition that required them to make changes, including adding new release documents and implementing new systems.

Ms. Wencke shared the slide *Pretrial Initiatives* and stated that they had worked very hard with all stakeholders, including council and booking staff, to create efficient systems for the transition. She added that they continued to have productive, cooperative meetings with the Reno Justice Court to work out those systems and ensure they were intentional. She noted that one of the initiatives they were working on with the Reno Justice Court was completing the Driving Under the Influence - Risk and Needs Assessment Triage (DUI-RANT) at the earliest stages of the process. She hoped to facilitate a meaningful conversation with the court on what metrics of data they were interested in moving forward. She stated that they remained open and committed to meeting the needs of their stakeholders and the Board.

Lieutenant Phillips shared the slide titled *WCSO Alternative Sentencing Update* and stated that on January 1, the WCSO had absorbed seven commission personnel, including two sergeants and five officers. He explained that during the transition phase from the DAS, they did not absorb case managers, and that since January 1, they had received the commission's staff specific training for the WCSO in accordance with their policies, which also included specific backgrounds for them all. He noted that, while the officers and the sergeants were completing the training in those backgrounds, they continued to serve the community through the probationary methodologies that could be afforded at the time, based on the number of officer hours and their limited capacity to be in the field.

Lieutenant Phillips noted that one of the things he wanted to commend was the cooperation between the different agencies and the courts, adding that the SJDC with Ms. Wencke and the Reno Justice Court with Judge Kendra Bertschy had been instrumental in the process due to the fact that the WCSO had to develop an entirely new program based on past practices. He stated that they were currently trying to hire one full-time intermittent staff member to assist with administrative investigators, and to also include a funded position for Fiscal Year (FY) 2027 for a case manager. He added that it would allow them to have civilian staff handle case management, as well as reporting with the courts and follow up with community programs. He noted that this would alleviate the responsibilities for the commission staff to return to the field where they were needed, and would enable them to do their best work.

Lieutenant Phillips noted they had also been working with Averhealth, which other stakeholders had already been using for testing. He stated they were hoping to open up regulatory testing for the probationers they currently had. He explained that, as a result of the transition for the seven personnel they had, they were also looking to fill a

commission position for what was lost during the transition. He noted that it would alleviate some of the burden on officers' caseloads, which currently averaged 267 probationers. He explained that, with the four officers he had assigned to him, that number broke down to about 66 individuals per probation officer.

Ms. Paoli announced that her portion of the presentation focused on the STAR program, which stood for Supportive Treatment, Accountability, and Recovery. She felt this was exactly what the diversion program encompassed, giving individuals a chance to become productive, be part of a community, and, hopefully, to give back as they moved forward. She explained that they currently had three people in the STAR program and had been focusing on developing new policies and procedures as a team and on maintaining the program model's fidelity. She noted this team was in attendance in the back of the room. She stated they worked with many community partners and continued to maintain those relationships. She shared the slide titled *HSA CrossRoads STAR Program (Slide 1)* and explained that the two grants they had switched over were the Fund for a Resilient Nevada (FRN) and the Bureau of Justice grant, which had been put under the HSA. Now, she added, they were working with that organization to put all the budget and grant notifications and modifications in place. She shared the slide titled *HSA CrossRoads STAR Program (Slide 2)* and stated they were ready for any questions.

Vice Chair Garcia asked how the caseload size of 66 cases per probation officer compared nationally. Lieutenant Phillips stated that what had been afforded to him with their sister agency, specifically in Las Vegas, who oversaw pretrial and probationary clientele under a similar management system, currently had a very large staff, which reduced the caseload to approximately 24 to 26 cases per probationary officer.

Vice Chair Garcia asked how many participants were currently in the STAR program. Ms. Paoli stated they currently had three participants and were staffing another that afternoon, so they were growing steadily and wanted to make sure all of their standard operating procedures were working well. She added that this meant intentionally not moving at top speed, instead being intentional about how individuals were brought into the program and making sure they had the support they needed. Vice Chair Garcia clarified that she thought the number three, when first stated, referred to the number of staff, but now assumed it meant actual clients. Ms. Paoli confirmed it meant the number of clients.

Commissioner Hill thanked the presenters and complimented them for their efforts at the end of the year. She asked what the steps were for a judge who decided to ensure that someone was under supervision. She added that she knew the prior processes but wanted to know what they were currently and whether there were any communication issues, as there were concerns from both the Reno Justice Court and the Sparks Justice Court about ensuring connections were being made. Lieutenant Phillips asked whether Commissioner Hill was referring to probation or pretrial. Commissioner Hill clarified that she was referencing probation. Lieutenant Phillips stated that they were working with the courts and understood that their staffing levels would limit their ability to monitor individuals. So, he noted, they were working with the courts to adhere to recommendations on what monitoring and supervision needed to occur. He added that, ultimately, the orders

judges issued required them to decide how those individuals would be supervised. He stated that his team utilized an assessment and orientation tool to determine what level of supervision they needed based on risk to the community and status as a reoffender.

Commissioner Hill asked, regarding drug testing, what they were hearing from the participants. She noted this was another concern that had been raised.

Lieutenant Phillips stated that there had been some significant challenges with the testing. He explained that the DAS used to do all of its testing in-house, which created significant cost challenges for them. He noted that one of the assessments and evaluations was how they would best manage the testing costs. He added that based on the assessment, they decided to outsource their regulatory testing through Averhealth. He felt that one of the biggest challenges officers in the field faced with spot testing and similar methods was that, whenever they were making home visits or contacts, they were often alone. This, he noted, created significant safety considerations for them regarding entering the house and standing by while the testing occurred. He explained that they had discovered their best option was to outsource that testing so that a regulatory amount happened throughout the week for participants, every week, as their assessment needs required.

Commissioner Hill said she was trying to remember all the issues that the judge had brought up to her, but asked if Averhealth was able to accommodate a judge who wanted a participant to test at different times. Lieutenant Phillips stated that Averhealth currently had a similar model to what the DAS had, and that individuals were not required to have a specific time, but that they had to go to Averhealth in person. He thought the business hours were Monday through Friday.

Commissioner Hill asked if they were open on weekends. Lieutenant Phillips thought they were not, but another individual in attendance confirmed that they were open on the weekends.

Commissioner Hill asked Ms. Paoli if there was a waiting list for the STAR program, and assumed that more people needed to get into the program than the number they were currently serving. Ms. Paoli noted that there was no official waiting list, but that they were intentionally moving slowly to make sure they had everything in place that was needed, and that all the appropriate contracts were put together. She thought that the rate of new additions would increase once they were sure they had everything the program needed.

Commissioner Clark expressed thanks to the various divisions and departments for working together to ensure a smooth, quick turnaround. He thought they had shown good forward momentum and that they could solve any issues that might arise.

Chair Andriola expressed thanks to the presenters for being nimble, pivoting, figuring things out as they went along, and, more importantly, being cognizant of previous, current, and future stakeholders. She felt the STAR program was great. She thought that the DAS and all of the work they did was important. She stated that many of

her questions had already been asked, and so she would not repeat them. She expressed that the Board recognized the transition had a history and that, for example, she and Ms. Wencke had met to review and revise some forms. Chair Andriola added that a number of concerns about the STAR program and how they administered testing had come up then, and that it appeared the teams had all delivered on the plan. She asked whether, regarding Averhealth, anything was needed besides people and money.

Lieutenant Phillips stated they had received a quote from Averhealth for the prospective clientele, and that they would pursue that further once they had assessed it through their internal accounting. He suspected that, based on the number of individuals each court was sending to Averhealth with whatever funding they had, the presumptive number he could come up with would likely change, and he wanted to prepare the Board for that.

Chair Andriola stated that was what she was wondering, because she thought there might be additional items the Board would see again. She asked Ms. Wencke how the process was going with the forms and some of the transitions that occurred, from how it was in the past to how it was currently.

Ms. Wencke felt things were going well and that the rest of the staff agreed. She expressed that the bumps they had encountered had been overcome, but that some issues had continued to be communication problems and nomenclature issues between the courts. She stated they continued to have relationships with their clerks, administrative staff, and judges, and then communicated any information received to her supervision staff and her assessment staff. She reiterated that overall, she felt it was going well.

Chair Andriola thought that the benefit of the transition was that everyone had learned a good amount, and the streamlining was a positive outcome of the changes. She thanked County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas for her leadership in the transitions.

DONATIONS

26-0325 8A1 Recommendation to accept \$4,000.00 in donations from Russell Horning to the District Attorney's Office for the benefit of the Children's Advocacy Centers of Nevada travel operational costs; and direct Finance to make necessary budget amendments. District Attorney. (All Commission Districts.)

26-0326 8B1 Recommendation to accept a donation of audio-visual equipment [total estimated value of \$36,235.11] from the Washoe County Honorary Deputy Sheriff's Association to be used in the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Conference/Situation Room for meetings and critical incident oversight within the Special Operations Division. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Items 8A1 through 8B1 be accepted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 9A1 THROUGH 9J3

- 26-0327** **9A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of April 14, 2026, and April 28, 2026, and the workshop of April 21, 2026. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0328** **9A2** Acknowledge the communications and reports received by the Clerk on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, including the following categories: Communications, Monthly Statements/Reports, and Annual Statements/Reports. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0329** **9B1** Recommendation to 1) approve roll change requests, pursuant to NRS 361.765 and/or NRS 361.768, for errors discovered on the 2022/2023, 2023/2024, 2024/2025 and 2025/2026 secured and unsecured tax rolls 2) authorize Chair to execute the changes described in Exhibits A and Band 3) direct the Washoe County Treasurer to correct the error(s). [cumulative amount of decrease to all taxing entities \$162,166.65]. Assessor. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0330** **9C1** Recommendation to approve a Grant of Access and Utility Easement between Washoe County, a political subdivision of the State of Nevada ("Grantor"), and Incline Village Crystal Bay Association, a Domestic Nonprofit Corporation ("Grantee"), totaling ±8,196 square feet, on Washoe County Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 124-032-36 in support of "The Gateway to Lake Tahoe" roundabout improvements in SR431 and SR28 NDOT right-of-way. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)
- 26-0331** **9C2** Acknowledgement by the Board of County Commissioners and County Manager of the Washoe County Agency Pledge supporting Nevada's 2026-2030 Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) and the goal of Zero Fatalities on Nevada's public roadways. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0332** **9C3** Recommendation to approve: 1) Amendment No. 1 to Interlocal Agreement No. NM467-16-015 dated September 8, 2016 between Nevada Department of Transportation and Washoe County allowing for additional parking, a connecting shared use path and pedestrian crossing along SR 28 right-of-way and the continued operation and maintenance by the County for said improvements; and 2) approve the Fourth Addendum to SR28 Corridor Operations and Maintenance Interlocal Agreement dated August 1, 2015, adding the responsibilities for Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) and Washoe County associated with the new improvements along SR28.

The Fourth Addendum is between TTD and Washoe County and all Washoe County's expenses are reimbursed by TTD through parking revenue from the Parking Management Program. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

- 26-0333** 9C4 Recommendation to approve a Grant of Non-Exclusive Easement between Washoe County (Grantor) and BI CDLP LLC (Grantee) for the non-exclusive use of land for the construction, operation, maintenance, and repair for access and utility facilities under a portion of Washoe County property located within properties associated with Assessor's Parcel Numbers 534-561-06 and 534-561-07, located south of Calle de la Plata and approximately 675 feet east of the intersection of Calle de la Plata with Pyramid Way in the Spanish Springs Valley, Nevada. Community Services. (Commission District 4.)
- 26-0334** 9D1 Recommendation to accept a renewed National Children's Alliance {NCA} Chapter Grant to the District Attorney's Office in the amount of [\$136,488, no match required], from the U.S. Department of Justice through the National Children's Alliance to fund chapter activities including professional services, supplies, registrations, dues, and travel retroactive from January 1, 2026 through December 31, 2026; direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments and retroactively authorize the District Attorney or his designees to sign the cooperative agreement. District Attorney. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0335** 9D2 Recommendation to accept a renewed Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant to the District Attorney's Office in the amount of [\$220,881; \$55,220 required in-kind match], from the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services Division of Child & Family Services {DCFS} to provide funding to retain three temporary Victim Witness Advocates {via Marathon Staffing} retroactive from July 1, 2025 through June 30, 2026; direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments and retroactively authorize the District Attorney or his designees to sign the grant agreement. District Attorney. {All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0336** 9D3 Recommendation to accept a renewed Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant to the District Attorney's Office in the amount of [\$250,580; \$88,885 required in-kind match], from the State of Nevada Attorney General's Office to provide funding for a Deputy District Attorney III retroactive from January 1, 2026 through December 31, 2026, with an estimated \$55,571 in position costs to be absorbed within existing District Attorney departmental budget authority, and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments and retroactively authorize the District Attorney or his designees to sign the grant agreement. District Attorney. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0337** **9E1** Request that the Board of County Commissioners retroactively acknowledge the grant award of \$2,000.00, [no County match required], awarded to the Washoe County Law Library, Second Judicial District Court, by the Institute of Museum and Library Services through the Library Services and Technology Act, administered by the Nevada State Library, Archives and Public Records for the grant period July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026, and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0338** **9F1** Recommendation to accept an FFY26 Nutrition Services Incentive Program (NSIP) subgrant award from the State of Nevada, Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD) in the amount of [\$209,293.00; no county match] retroactive from October 1, 2025 to September 30, 2026 to supplement food costs for the Older Americans Act Title III congregate and home-delivered meal programs which address the food and nutrition needs of seniors; authorize the Division Director of Finance & Administration of the Human Services Agency to execute the grant award and related documents; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0339** **9G1** Recommendation to approve Organizational Agreement for Service-Learning, Internships or Field Study Placements between the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada System of Higher Education (University of Nevada, Reno) and Washoe County, through its Department of Juvenile Services, to establish a cooperative program for students to earn school credit and enhance their career development. The Agreement shall be effective from July 1, 2026, through February 28, 2031; and if approved, authorize the Division Director - Purchasing to execute the Agreement. Juvenile Services. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0340** **9H1** Recommendation to accept a FFY 2025 Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) from the State of Nevada, Office of Emergency Management (OEM) awarding [\$84,469.52, \$84,469.52 County match required] for FFY 2025. The EMPG provides funding to assist local governments to sustain and enhance all hazards emergency management activities. Grant term is retroactive from October 1, 2024, through September 30, 2026. If approved, authorize the County Manager or her designee to sign the grant award documents when received; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0341** **9H2** Recommendation to approve the expenditure of [\$12,400] for the purchase of prepaid cards/gift cards by the County Managers Office for use by HSA to incentivize litter clean-up activities to support safer, cleaner streets and provide specialized populations opportunities for dignity and

service, retroactive beginning April 1, 2026 and ending June 30, 2027. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

- 26-0342** **9H3** Recommendation to appoint Chris Wood to serve as Washoe County's alternate member on the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board, thereby replacing Vice Chair Mariluz Garcia as the County's alternate member. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts)
- 26-0343** **9I1** Recommendation to approve budget amendments totaling an increase of [\$16,882.00; \$2,065.40 in county match] in both revenue and expense to the FY25 PHP Carryforward Subaward, retroactive to July 1, 2025, through June 30, 2026, for the Population Health (PHD) Division to support demonstration of achievement in the program domains and capabilities according to the Public Health Emergency Preparedness Program (PHEP) domain according to the PHEP Cooperative Agreement, and direct Finance to make the appropriate budget amendments. Northern Nevada Public Health. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0344** **9J1** Recommendation to accept additional fiscal year 2025 High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Northern Nevada Drug Task Force grant award funding [increase of \$30,000.00, no County match required, for a total of \$40,000.00] as administered from the Las Vegas Metro Police Department, Federal project number HID1825G0495, for overtime and investigative expenses from HIDTA for the retroactive grant period of January 01, 2025 through December 31, 2026; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0345** **9J2** Recommendation to accept a Justice Assistance Grant award [amount not to exceed \$18,391.00, no County match required] as administered through the State of Nevada Department of Public Safety Office, Office of Criminal Justice Assistance, project number 22-JAG-54, to enhance remote operational capabilities of the Consolidated Bomb Squad, Special Operations Division during hazardous device responses, for the retroactive grant period of April 1, 2026 through August 31, 2026; authorize the Sheriff to retroactively execute the award document; and if approved, direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 26-0346** **9J3** Recommendation to retroactively approve the Funding Agreement between the Andelin Family Farm and Washoe County, on behalf of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office to provide reimbursement for extra staffing/patrol services [up to \$6,000.00 estimated total reimbursement] needed in the Sparks, Nevada area during the annual Andelin Family Farm events beginning March 01, 2026, and ending December 31, 2027 as invoiced per event. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

Vice Chair Garcia disclosed that for Item 9G1, she was an employee of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), but that she had no affiliation or pecuniary interest in that agenda item, so she would be voting on it.

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

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 9A1 through 9J3 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 9A1 through 9J3 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

BLOCK VOTE – 10 THROUGH 16, 18, AND 22 THROUGH 24

26-0347 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to approve the contract to purchase of NCTech street level imagery, one-year subscription effective upon signage of the VR.World platform, and professional services in the amount of \$318,745.45 with provision to renew the VR.World subscription for up to four years at \$31,200/year [project funded by Washoe County Assessor's Office Technology Fund as authorized by Nevada State Legislature] and if approved authorize Division Director of Purchasing and Contracts to execute the NCTech Statement of Work and License Agreement attached hereto. Assessor. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be approved and authorized.

26-0348 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to 1) approve roll change requests, pursuant to NRS 361.765 and/or NRS 361.768, for errors discovered on the 2025/2026, 2024/2025, 2023/2024, and 2022/2023 unsecured tax roll 2) authorize Chair to execute the changes described in Exhibit A and 3) direct the Washoe County Treasurer to correct the error(s). [cumulative amount of decrease to all taxing entities \$930,501.68]. Assessor. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

26-0349 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to award and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the 2026/2027

Slurry Seal for Selected Streets in Washoe County, PWP-WA-2026-265, including the Base Bid and Bid Alternate 1 (additional micro and chip seal) [staff recommends Sierra Nevada Construction in the amount of \$3,002,982.00]; and approve a separate project contingency fund [in the amount of \$200,000.00]. Slurry seal is defined as the application of water, asphalt emulsion, aggregate, and additives to an existing asphaltic concrete surface as a preventative maintenance treatment to extend pavement service life while providing a safe riding surface for the traveling public. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

26-0350 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the 911 Parr Boulevard Housing 2b -035C) Units 3 and 7 Roof Replacements Project, PWP-WA-2026-286 [staff recommends D & D Roofing and Sheet Metal, Inc., in the amount of \$617,970.00]; (2) approve the purchase of roofing materials from Garland, DBS [in the amount of \$550,388.11], utilizing Racine County, Wisconsin Contract# PW1925 pursuant to the joinder provision of Nevada Revised Statute 332.195; (3) approve a separate project contingency fund [in the amount of \$40,000.00, for a total project cost not to exceed \$1,208,358.11]. This capital project will remove and replace failing roofing materials with a modified bituminous membrane roofing system, reducing maintenance and preserving the lifespan of the Washoe County Regional Detention Center, located at 911 Parr Boulevard, Reno. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

26-0351 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to approve Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement for Professional Consulting Services between Sierra Nevada Construction, Inc. and Washoe County to provide Construction Manager-At-Risk (CMAR) preconstruction services in support of the Pleasant Valley Interceptor Reach 3 Project [in the amount of \$31,750.00 for a total contract amount of \$330,631.00]. This amendment allows for supplemental preconstruction services for the additional development of dewatering design and analysis for more complex than anticipated groundwater conditions and the procurement of polymer precast lift station components

to support the Pleasant Valley Interceptor Reach 3 Project. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be approved.

26-0352 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Recommendation to authorize the Guaranteed Maximum Price 2 (GMP 2) Agreement for the Pleasant Valley Interceptor Reach 3 Project (Project) with Sierra Nevada Construction, Inc., the Construction Manager-At-Risk (CMAR), [in the amount of \$5,111,861.86] for the implementation of a dewatering system to facilitate the installation of recycled water pipelines, gravity sewer pipelines, sewer force main pipelines, and associated appurtenances for the Project. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 15 be authorized.

26-0353 **AGENDA ITEM 16** Recommendation to approve Construction Change Order No. 05, for the Senior Services Phase 1 Remodel Project - PWP WA 2024-144 between Washoe County and Houston Smith Construction, Incorporated [in the not to exceed amount of \$19,891.73, for a total contract amount not to exceed \$889,956.35] and extend the project timeline to June 30, 2026. This request conforms to Nevada Revised Statutes and Washoe County policy requirements for project cost increases exceeding \$25,000.00 or 5%, whichever is greater, of the original approved contract amount. Change Order No. 05 is required due to unforeseen work not identified in the original contract award. Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be approved and extended.

26-0354 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Recommendation to accept additional incentive funds for the District Attorney's Family Support Program from the State of Nevada, Child Support Enforcement Program (CSEP) in the amount of [\$706,553.68] based on our performance during Federal Fiscal Years 2022 and 2023 for the purpose of benefiting the Child Support Enforcement Program and direct Finance to make the necessary budget amendment. District Attorney. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 18 be accepted and directed.

26-0355 **AGENDA ITEM 22** Recommendation to deobligate previously approved allocations of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds through the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) in the amount of [\$633,308.60] for projects that have been completed under budget, cancelled, or no longer need the previously approved levels of funding:

HSA Tenancy Support - \$311,603.51
Washoe County Sheriff's Office Security Upgrade - \$109,502.40
Cybersecurity - \$100,000.00
Golden Eagle Shooting Range - \$41,320.00
Raise the Future - \$20,457.11
PLPT - Gerlach Fire Services - \$7,643.01
Empowerment Center - \$5,748.77
Behavioral Health Crisis Response - \$5,426.51
Generator-Arts - \$4,312.60
Friends of Black Rock High Rock - \$3,664.57
Permanent Housing - Study - \$3,076.47
HSA GenArate - \$1,250.00
Nevada Legal Services - \$80.48
Total: \$614,085.43

Approve increased allocations to following approved project in the amount of [\$614,085.43]:

Reallocate funds to Future of Work - \$393,085.43
Reallocate funds to PD Paralegal - \$156,000.00
Reallocate Grant Proposal - Infrastructure - \$65,000.00

Further, it is requested that the Board authorize the County Manager to approve deobligation and reallocation of grant funding through December 31, 2026, because funds must be expended by the end of the year. Reobligations can only be made for ARPA-SLFRF Projects approved prior to January 1, 2025, so no new projects or agreements can be created. Community Reinvestment staff will return to the Board with periodic updates to account for any deobligation and reallocation.

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

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large noted that on Agenda Item 22, there was a line in the motion that discussed the reallocation of funds to the Public Defender (PD) Paralegal, but that this should be the Alternative PD Paralegal. He thanked PD Evelyn Grosenick and Alternative PD Kate Hickman for bringing it to his attention, and suggested modifying the motion to include that change.

Chair Andriola asked Commissioner Herman whether she was fine with the motion modification. Commissioner Herman agreed that she was.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 22 be deobligated, approved, authorized, and directed.

26-0356 **AGENDA ITEM 23** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of the annual report of the Recorder Technology Fund (IN20014), a fund created pursuant to NRS 247.305(2) for the acquisition and improvement of technology in the Recorder's Office, which has projected proceeds in the amount of (\$452,087.00) and projected expenditures in the amount of [\$413,226.00] for FY27. Recorder's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 23 be acknowledged.

26-0357 **AGENDA ITEM 24** Recommendation to (1) approve a new FY26 Capital Improvement Project - FY26 OTS FSD LC MS MS Replacement approved by the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) committee March 30, 2026; (2) accept the FY 2026 Office of Traffic Safety award from the State of Nevada Department of Public Safety, Office of Traffic Safety [\$400,000.00, 25% In-Kind county match required] as administered through the State of Nevada Department of Public Safety Office of Traffic Safety, to support the purchase and replacement of an LC-MS-MS, for the purpose to provide drug screening on 100% of DUI cases for the agencies we serve for one year and share that data with the State. This is for the retroactive grant term of October 1, 2025, through September 30, 2026, and if approved, direct Finance to make the necessary net zero budget appropriation transfer and budget amendments [net impact to the general fund \$0.00] and authorize Sheriff Balaam to retroactively execute grant award documents. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 24 be approved, accepted, directed, and authorized.

26-0358 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Article 336 housing incentives, to establish a density bonus for attainable housing that scales to the underlying regulatory zone, providing for higher attainable densities in more intense regulatory zones; to establish a density bonus for attainable senior housing above the bonus for non-age restricted attainable; to prohibit the stacking of multiple density bonuses; to set the minimum period of affordability at 30 years for rental projects and 9 years for sale products; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and relating thereto;
And if supported, set a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for June 16, 2026. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Board Records and Minutes Manager EYonne Strickland read the title for Bill No. 1953.

Bill No. 1953 was introduced by Vice Chair Garcia, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

Chair Andriola asked for public comment, and Ms. Strickland stated there was none. Chair Andriola closed Agenda Item 17.

Ms. Strickland noted that a public commenter was missed.

Chair Andriola reopened Agenda Item 17.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Pat Davison stated she was a resident of District 5. She noted it was strange speaking without a staff presentation having been done. She thanked Senior Planner Dr. Eric Young for developing the approach on density bonuses. She felt that it was simple, but consequential. She stated that it did not apply to the rural and low-density suburban zones, but did apply to the other residential zones and three commercial zones. She thought that it allowed flexibility for the developer with housing types, and made the bonus calculation easy for the public to understand. She declared that it was voluntary, but had strings attached. She explained that it hit up to the 150 percent area median income level, but might depend on above market rate-units to subsidize it. She added that it did not require rezoning paperwork, but did require additional impacts to be analyzed and addressed. She stated that offering the bonus as motivation started a process to consider added traffic, noise, parking, drainage, and other elements for a parcel with development rights. She noted that adding units might come with a significant price tag. She clarified that if the added price was not offset by the remaining 20 percent of market rate units, the bonus would probably not be utilized. She thought this could result

in what may have looked appealing at first glance, but instead would become a hard no. She stated that was why, at the Planning Commission (PC) meeting, she had said that the tool deserved a place in the County's toolbox, but might not be used very frequently. She explained that the deed restrictions on qualified household income were guarantees of attainability for County residents. She expressed that in her opinion, the 9-year and 30-year time frames were fitting and reasonable in exchange for the up-zoning they were giving to developers. She felt that if units were built, the desired outcome and balance would have been achieved. She stated that the significant change was being proposed as the County appropriately responded to the lack of attainable housing. She declared that doing the same old thing would not get them where they needed to go. She asked the Commissioners to take the bold step and support the proposed code amendment before them.

26-0359 **AGENDA ITEM 19** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 5 (Administration and Personnel) to increase the departmental allowance for employee service awards from \$25.00 to \$50.00 per award, and to increase the departmental allowance for employee retirement awards from \$50.00 to \$75.00 per award; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. If supported, set the public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for June 23, 2026. Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.)

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Bill No. 1954.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Bill No. 1954 was introduced by Commissioner Hill, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

26-0360 **AGENDA ITEM 20** Recommendation and possible action to adopt amended Resolutions for the Citizens Advisory Boards ("CAB") to re-affirm the creation of each CAB, specify the specific purpose(s) for their creation, set the number of CAB members and the categories of their membership, and define each CAB's geographical area of responsibility, as required by Washoe County Code ("WCC") Section 5.427. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Andriola commended Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Jennifer Gustafson for her hard work, as well as everyone involved in organizing Agenda Item 20. DDA Gustafson conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Adopting Amended Resolutions for the Citizens Advisory Boards; CAB Resolutions Update; CAB Resolutions Update - Purpose; CAB Resolutions Update - Members; CAB Boundary Maps; CAB Boundary Map – District 1; CAB Boundary Map – District 2; CAB Boundary Map – District 3; CAB Boundary Map – District 4; CAB Boundary Map – District 5; Thank you. She recalled that last year, Washoe County Code

(WCC) amendments occurred, and that Agenda Item 20 continued the amendment process. She said that the amendments were a multi-step process because the documents needed to be updated for all the Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs). She referred to the *CAB Resolutions Update* slide and explained that WCC Section 5.427 was updated the previous year, which required the resolutions to specify the purpose for the CABs' creation, to set the number of CAB members and the categories of membership, and to define the CABs' geographical areas of responsibility, which were performed through Geographical Information Systems (GIS) mapping. She said that there were nine CABs in the region, which would not change; however, the resolutions needed to be updated to ensure the CABs followed WCC.

DDA Gustafson indicated that there was an amended purpose section of the resolution that was consistent with the general purpose of the CAB set forth in the WCC. She pointed out that the purpose language was summarized on the *CAB Resolutions Update – Purpose* slide. She said that since 2021, the CAB's function was to act as a general advisory board rather than being limited to a specific subject; therefore, the purpose section was intentionally written broadly and inclusively to reflect that the CABs were unlike other advisory boards, such as the Animal Services Advisory Board or Senior Advisory Board (SAB). She referred to the *CAB Resolutions Update – Members* slide and said that the resolutions had to specify the membership and its categories; therefore, the resolution was amended to state that there were five regular members and no more than two alternates. She read from the *CAB Boundary Maps* slide and noted that the boundaries were adjusted where needed so that each CAB was located within a single Commissioner District, which was required by WCC. She thanked Senior Developer Analyst Ellen Guiberson from Technology Services (TS), who organized a new GIS map in conjunction with the Commissioner Support Team.

DDA Gustafson noted that the CAB boundary map illustrations were attached to each relevant CAB resolution, and if the Board approved Agenda Item 20, the detailed maps would be displayed online in the Washoe County Regional Mapping System. She explained that if an individual was researching the boundaries, they could type their address into the mapping system, which would display the CAB district they belonged to. She said the boundary maps were designed so that no residential properties were left uncovered by a CAB. She referred to the *CAB Boundary Map – District 1* slide and pointed out an uncolored area with no CAB coverage. She said she was told there were no residences in that area. She indicated that within District 1, the Incline Village Crystal Bay CAB and the West Truckee Meadows Verdi CAB existed. She said the main changes to the boundaries affected Districts 2, 3, and 4 due to their expansion, resulting in the CABs becoming district-wide. She relayed that the names of the CABs also changed to include the district they were in. She pointed out the slides titled: *CAB Boundary Map – District 2*; *CAB Boundary Map – District 3*; *CAB Boundary Map – District 4*, and noted that their CAB names would follow the same naming convention, such as the *South Truckee Meadows Washoe Valley District 2 CAB*. She referred to the *CAB Boundary Map – District 5* slide and said that there were four CABs within the district, which were expanded to encompass the entire boundaries of District 5. She mentioned that District 5 would still

contain the Gerlach Empire CAB, North Valleys CAB, Warm Springs Rural CAB, and East Truckee Canyon CAB.

Chair Andriola recalled that the CABs had not been updated since 2021 and that individuals had applied to join the CAB but lived in areas without coverage. She believed that realigning the maps to expand coverage for the entire district was important to give the whole community the ability to represent their district, have a voice, and participate. She opined that the lack of representation and ineligibility to be on the CAB was why she had raised the concern with the Board. She thanked DDA Gustafson for her hard work.

Vice Chair Garcia thanked Chair Andriola for her leadership and noted that she had several unrepresented areas within District 3, which limited residents' participation in the CABs. She said the areas of concern were El Rancho Drive, Wedekind Road, Isle of Skye Drive, and Ponderosa Drive, which had since been identified as areas with a lack of coverage. She recalled that the previous year, she advocated for a one-mile amendment to the CABs because there were areas that overlapped between two districts with the same concerns, such as Commissioner Herman's southern area of District 5. She noted that with the one-mile amendment, those living within a one-mile radius, such as those in Highland Ranch, were eligible to serve on the Sun Valley CAB. She believed that Sun Valley CAB Chair Heidi Soper did a great job with CAB advertising and engagement, but wondered what the County's plan was to communicate the amendments to the larger districts.

Media and Communications Program Manager Candee Ramos reported that her team would work closely with the Communications Department to ensure that everyone throughout the County knew that they had the opportunity to have a voice and participate on the CABs. She explained that the communication would involve mass emails, social media such as Facebook, the Washoe County website, Spanish-language informational websites, and platforms like Nextdoor. Vice Chair Garcia asked whether the Commissioners could advertise new CAB positions. Ms. Ramos confirmed the new positions could be broadcast. She noted that the Communications Department and Sосу.TV were producing a new video to promote the CABs, with some footage planned for display at the June 1 Sun Valley CAB meeting to explain how to get involved. She said that in addition to attending the CAB meetings, the County wanted people to consider applying to the CABs, which would be advertised through press releases. She mentioned that the County had a new Social Media Coordinator and was doing more outreach across platforms to reach a wider audience.

Commissioner Herman noted that many people participated in the CABs and many more would like to participate. She recalled that over the years, she had begged and attempted to reinstate developer presentations. She said she wanted all developers to come before the County because citizens should be able to comment on or raise concerns with the Commissioners. Ms. Ramos indicated that every CAB meeting included announcements about neighborhood development hubs, giving individuals the opportunity to get involved earlier in the development process. She said that any development of interest presented to the CAB was welcome, as it could receive input from the CAB and

the public. She asserted that if development presentations were something the Board would like to entertain or revisit, that was at the discretion of the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). Commissioner Herman asked who decided the frequency of CAB meetings. Ms. Ramos stated that the meeting frequency was at the discretion of the CABs and believed that four of the CABs met every other month, some met 10 times a year, and others met every month. Chair Andriola pointed out that Agenda Item 21 pertained to the CAB bylaws. She said she did not want to detract from Commissioner Herman's questions; however, she opined that Agenda Item 21 was better suited for the discussion. Commissioner Herman indicated that she was only making a comment and wished to represent the CAB members.

On motion by Chair Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 20 be adopted.

* * * * *

Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large asked if there was any public comment regarding Agenda Item 20. Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland indicated that there was no public comment for Agenda Item 20.

* * * * *

26-0361 **AGENDA ITEM 21** Recommendation and possible action to adopt updated Citizens Advisory Board Bylaws and General Provisions, in accordance with Washoe County Code ("WCC") Section 5.431. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Jennifer Gustafson indicated that the Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) bylaws were last updated in 2015 and needed to reflect current functions and processes. She reported that a draft was organized and that the Office of the County Manager (OCM) posted the material online to solicit public feedback. She mentioned that if the Board had any questions regarding public input, the Media and Communications Program Manager, Candee Ramos, was available. She said there was a robust public response and that the verbatim responses were attached to the Staff Report. She thanked the 84 individuals who took the time to provide comments on the draft bylaws. She said that some responses led to changes to the draft, which were noted in red ink in the *Citizens Advisory Boards Bylaws and General Provisions* document. She explained that other responses were more appropriate for reference and inclusion in the CAB Handbook, which contained the CAB Training Manual. She said that the updating of the CAB Handbook was the next step in the process. She relayed that she included a summary of the proposed amendments to the CAB bylaws on Pages 2 through 4 of the Staff Report.

Chair Andriola thanked DDA Gustafson for her and the staff's hard work. She recalled reading all 84 responses and found them great. She opined that the comments were well thought out and displayed how everyone valued the CABs. She asserted that the CABs were important. She asked Commissioner Herman whether she would like to address

the questions she had posed during Agenda Item 20 regarding the bylaws. Commissioner Herman declined.

Vice Chair Garcia indicated that taxpayer dollars were used to pay for County staff to attend the CABs. She asked if the County paid for the space used for the meetings. DDA Gustafson said she was unsure and invited Ms. Ramos to the podium to answer. Ms. Ramos noted that most of the CAB meetings were held at County libraries, along with the Gerlach Community Center, Hobey's Casino, and another at the Reno Stead Airport, all for free. Vice Chair Garcia asked Ms. Ramos to clarify if the County had the budget for food or beverages. Ms. Ramos confirmed that the County did not spend money on food or beverages; however, staff attended the meetings, but with very few hard costs.

Vice Chair Garcia asked if the City of Reno Neighborhood Advisory Boards (NABs) had recently resumed after a pause. Ms. Ramos noted that the NABs had resumed. She said that the CABs worked with the NABs to organize a recurring agenda item for each entity. Vice Chair Garcia asked what the City of Sparks did for their advisory boards. Ms. Ramos indicated that she was unsure how they conduct their boards or how often, but knew they had an advisory board. Chair Andriola said the City of Sparks consolidated its advisory boards into a single board rather than specialized ones. Vice Chair Garcia indicated that the budget was housed under the Office of the County Manager (OCM) and emphasized the importance of prioritizing the CABs and opportunities to increase access across jurisdictions. Ms. Ramos reported that the County would allocate funding to advertise the CABs because Washoe County wanted the community to know when the meetings were scheduled. Chair Andriola noted that Agenda Item 21 required significant effort and believed it was important to revisit the CAB Handbook. She thanked the staff for their work.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 21 be adopted.

PUBLIC HEARING

26-0362 **AGENDA ITEM 25** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an Ordinance repealing and replacing Ordinance No. 1552, to decrease stormwater management fees effective July 1, 2026, from \$9.31 to \$2.00 per residential parcel or equivalent residential unit (ERU) for non-residential parcels, and other matters properly relating thereto. Community Services. (Commission Districts 4 & 5.)

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Ordinance No. 1756, Bill No. 1950.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Hill, seconded by Vice Chair Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1756, Bill No. 1950, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

26-0363 **AGENDA ITEM 26** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 approving a development agreement between Washoe County and Lansing-Arcus, LLC, for Prado Ranch North, a residential subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM18-002). The purpose of the development agreement is to extend the deadline for recording the next final map from September 9, 2026, to September 9, 2030. The project is located adjacent to Lemmon Drive, north of Nectar Street and adjacent to Chickadee Drive and Sand Pit Road. The project encompasses a total of approximately ±246.6 acres, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 490 lots, with 7 lots recorded and 483 lots remaining to be recorded . The parcels are located within the North Valleys Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District 5. (APNs: 540-051-01, 080-721-03, 080-721-04, & 080-721-05). If approved, authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to sign the Development Agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Ordinance No. 1757, Bill No. 1947.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Commissioner Herman voting no, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1757, Bill No. 1947, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

26-0364 **AGENDA ITEM 27** Public Hearing: Second Reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending the Regional Road Impact Fee (RRIF) General Administrative Manual (GAM) and the RRIF Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with revised fees. The RRIF is a NRS Chapter 278B impact fee designed to generate revenue for the construction of regional roads and associated improvements in the community that was first passed in 1996 and has since been periodically amended upon the adoption by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) of Washoe County, Nevada. The amount of the fees is based on the most recent version of the CIP in effect and is calculated according to the formula set forth in the GAM. The current amendments to the GAM consist of the 8th Edition RRIF GAM that has been approved by RTC for recommendation to governing bodies of the county and cities, as well as associated updates to the CIP and fees. Overall, the revised fee schedule reflects an average decrease of approximately

2.3%, although individual land use categories may vary; and for other matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Board Records and Minutes Manager Evonne Strickland read the title for Ordinance No. 1758, Bill No. 1949.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1758, Bill No. 1949, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

26-0365 **AGENDA ITEM 28** Public Hearing: Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0003 and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA25-0004 (SOI Rollback and Regional Plan Conformance.) Consideration of Planning Commission's recommendation to:

(1) Adopt a series of master plan text amendments to bring the Washoe County Master Plan into conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan,

(2) Adopt master plan map amendments to the Cold Springs, North Valleys, Northwest, Southwest Truckee Meadows and Verdi Master Plan Land Use Maps in order to apply the Open Space (OS) master plan category to 40 parcels, which were released from the City of Reno Sphere of Influence,

(3) 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, adopt regulatory zone amendments to the Cold Springs, North Valleys, Southwest Truckee Meadows and Verdi Regulatory Zone maps in order to apply the Open Space regulatory zone to a subset of 20 of those above referenced parcels including parcels that are located outside of the adopted Washoe County regulatory zone map areas; and

(4) if approved, authorize the chair to sign Master Plan and regulatory zone amendment resolutions to this effect. The 40 parcels proposed to receive the Open Space master plan category are assessor's parcels numbers:

003-020-10, 038-150-14, 038-150-21, 038-530-29, 038-530-42, 049-450-06, 049-450-07, 049-450-10, 049-450-59, 049-450-60, 081-010-16, 081-010-20, 081-010-21, 081-023-23, 081-023-25, 081-024-09, 081-024-10, 081-024-11, 081-024-12, 082-180-63, 082-180-64, 082-180-74, 082-180-75, 082-180-76, 082-361-04, 082-361-20, 082-361-23, 087-010-18, 087-010-19, 087-010-30, 087-021-08, 087-340-01, 087-340-05, 087-350-11, 087-350-26, 087-381-04, 087-381-05, 090-030-03, and 234-021-05.

The subset of 20 of the above parcels proposed to receive the Open Space

regulatory zone are assessor's parcel Numbers:

082-361-04, 003-020-10, 082-361-20, 082-361-23, 038-150-14, 038-150-21, 038-530-29, 038-530-42, 082-180-63, 082-180-64, 087-350-11, 087-350-26, 090-030-03, 082-180-76, 082-180-75, 082-180-74, 049-450-10, 049-450-06, 049-450-07, and 234-021-05.

The applicant is Washoe County. 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. (All Commission Districts.)

County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas read the item's language aloud, and Senior Planner Eric Young thanked her. CM Thomas thanked those in attendance for their patience as staff worked through technological difficulties while attempting to load Mr. Young's presentation. Chair Andriola called for a five-minute recess due to technical issues.

12:20 p.m. The Board recessed.

12:27 p.m. The Board reconvened with all members present.

Mr. Young conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WMPA25-0003 (Regional Plan conformance and SOI rollback designations) and WRZA25-0004 (SOI rollback designations); Master Plan and Zoning Amendments for Regional Plan Conformance (3 slides); Scheduled Amendments; Regional Plan Policy NR 4; Regional Plan Policy NR 11; Regional Plan Policy NR 15; Regional Plan Policy RC 2; Natural and Scenic Resource Preservation; Regional Form and Coordination Principle; Master Plan Amendment Motion; Regulatory Zone Amendment Motion; Thank you.

Mr. Young displayed the first slide titled *Master Plan and Zoning Amendments for Regional Plan Conformance*. He explained that Agenda Item 28 requested that the Board consider three separate actions. He noted that the first action was to implement amendments to the Envision Washoe 2040 Master Plan (Master Plan) to bring it into conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan (Regional Plan). He stated that the second action involved creating map amendments to the Master Plan that would provide designations for a group of 40 publicly owned properties that the City of Reno had released. He explained that the third action was intended to address the need to provide the required zoning designations to 20 of those properties. He displayed the second *Master Plan and Zoning Amendments for Regional Plan Conformance* slide and explained that the proposed text amendments for the Master Plan could be divided into two categories. He

stated that the scheduled amendments were those requested as an update following the original adoption of the Master Plan. He recalled that when the Master Plan was updated several years prior, a list of desired amendments had been provided, with the intent that they be revisited when time permitted. He explained that new policies had been adopted in the Regional Plan since the adoption of the Master Plan, including new tools that the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) wanted local jurisdictions to adopt.

Mr. Young showed the slide titled *Scheduled Amendments*. He opined that the scheduled amendments brought forward under Agenda Item 28 were generally minor, ranging from adding language about the Resort Services Area to removing references to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. He noted that a few other minuscule scheduled amendments were brought forward by staff, as requested by the TMRPA, to better organize the Master Plan's language. He introduced the *Regional Plan Policy NR 4* slide by explaining that there were some new policies for deliberation, including the Natural Resource Consideration Areas (NRCA) policy, which he described as a good tool developed by the TMRPA to help developers and staff understand what natural resources were in any given area and whether those resources were associated with any special designations. He displayed the *Regional Plan Policy NR 11* slide and reported that another of the requested policies was associated with the Truckee Meadows Regional Trails Plan (TMRTP), which was the result of an ongoing attempt by all the local jurisdictions to ensure the region's trails would align with each other to create a complete regional trails network. He opined that the proposed requirement and tool for the TMRTP would assist the County in achieving that goal. He showed the slide titled *Regional Plan Policy NR 15* and explained that the listed policy pertained to source water protection and watershed management and would require a policy in the County's development review process to reference the Integrated Source Water and Watershed Management Protection Plan.

Mr. Young displayed the *Regional Plan Policy RC 2* slide. He referred to the amendments that were associated with the 40 parcels released from the City of Reno's *Sphere of Influence* (SOI). He described an SOI as the area into which a city planned to expand within the following 20 years based on population projections and growth capacities. He explained that an SOI could not exist outside the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA) and that a change to the City of Reno's SOI constituted an amendment to the Regional Plan. He reported that the SOI changed when the City of Reno determined it no longer wanted to annex any of the impacted parcels. He reiterated that those parcels had been included in the SOI when the City of Reno intended to annex them within 20 years, but after considering development and growth, the City of Reno determined that the parcels should not be in its SOI and released them. He explained that the release of those parcels from the SOI constituted the implementation of a Regional Plan amendment and removed the Master Plan designation from the impacted parcels, thereby making the County responsible for establishing the required designation.

Mr. Young showed the third slide titled *Master Plan and Zoning Amendments for Regional Plan Conformance*. He explained that the 40 parcels that were planned to receive the new Master Plan designation were all owned by the federal or State

government. He elaborated that the majority of the 40 parcels were owned by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), while the United States Forest Service (USFS) owned a few, and the State of Nevada owned just one. He noted that the parcels were spread across the region and that most were north of the Truckee River. He explained that, because of the scattered distribution, it was difficult to provide a single large map that depicted exactly where each of the 40 parcels was located, though individual maps had been included in the Staff Report. He reported that 20 parcels would require a zoning designation in addition to the previously described Master Plan designation. He disclosed that those 20 parcels were publicly owned and that one of the reasons they had been released by the City of Reno's SOI was that they all had significant development constraints. He stated that the majority of the limitations for those parcels were due to very steep slopes, though some parcels were associated with other constraints. He noted that staff determined that all 20 parcels should receive both an Open Space Regulatory Zone designation and an Open Space Master Plan Category designation. He explained that the decision from staff came after reviewing the County's definitions for those two designations.

Mr. Young introduced the slide titled *Natural and Scenic Resource Preservation*. He explained that the items listed on the slide demonstrate the metrics used by the Washoe County Code (WCC) and the Master Plan to define an Open Space Regulatory Zone and an Open Space Master Plan Category, and to determine when those designations should be used. He recited the list aloud and noted that the federal government did not intend to dispose of any of the parcels. He explained that the federal government wanted to continue managing the parcels as open space and had not discussed disposal, which meant the County would implement an open space designation for the parcels as an appropriate decision.

Mr. Young displayed the *Regional Form and Coordination Principle* slide. He explained that the Master Plan and zoning code amendments for conformance with the Regional Plan were varied. He reported that several items in the Master Plan demonstrated that the recommended parcel designations were appropriate, and that the tools the County was being asked to use by the TMRPA would assist in furthering Washoe County's goals and policies described within the Master Plan. He showed the slide titled *Master Plan Amendment Motion* and noted that he had provided a variety of motions regarding the Master Plan amendments and the zoning amendments for the Board's consideration. He noted that he would be happy to answer any questions. Chair Andriola asked whether there were any questions or comments from the Board, and none were raised.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was moved to (1) adopt Master Plan Case Number WMPA25-0003, a series of master plan text amendments to bring the Washoe County Master Plan into conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan; and, to adopt master plan map amendments to the Cold Springs, North Valleys, Northwest, Southwest Truckee Meadows and Verdi Master Plan Land Use Maps in order to apply the Open Space (OS) master plan category to 40 parcels, which were released from the City of Reno Sphere

of Influence, and authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained in Attachment A of the Staff Report to that effect. The adoption is based on the Board's ability to make all the findings required by Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d).

It was further moved to (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, adopt regulatory zone amendments to the Cold Springs, North Valleys, Southwest Truckee Meadows and Verdi Regulatory Zone maps in order to apply the Open Space regulatory zone to a subset of 20 of those above referenced parcels including parcels that are located outside of the adopted Washoe County regulatory zone map areas; and authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained in Attachment B to the Staff Report to that effect, as outlined in the Staff Report. In making this motion, the Board is affirming the Planning Commission's findings of fact required for the regulatory zone amendment as required by Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15(d).

26-0366 **AGENDA ITEM 29** Public Comment.

Robby Williams said that at a time when the public wanted the County's voting process to be as transparent as possible, many observers felt ignored, ridiculed, and dismissed. She mentioned that in 2022, observers could take questions directly to the desk in the lobby of the Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office and receive answers. She shared that in 2024, during the general election, observers were instructed to submit written questions and wait for an answer. She assumed the questions would be answered the same day, which was usually the case. She explained that on one occasion, observers noticed that an active ballot-counting scanner was missing from the counting room. She noted that the observers submitted a question about the missing scanner around 11:00 a.m., but it went unanswered throughout the day, which they found frustrating. She recalled that it had taken 12 hours to locate ROV Andrew McDonald and County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas to ask them what had happened to scanner number 11. She said the interaction occurred without advanced notice, independent observation, or camera coverage. She noted that the building on Rock Boulevard was unsecured and that observers had photographed traffic coming and going. She questioned whether those changes were improvements or whether they reduced transparency. She shared that in 2026, observers were required to submit questions to the ROV's Office, which had 72 hours to respond, even when a question arose in real time. She explained that the live and YouTube streams were removed after 24 hours, which made it difficult to review when there were questions. She again wondered whether those policies provided greater transparency. She felt that the 2026 changes made it difficult to get questions answered, particularly when something was unclear, because observers could no longer receive immediate responses.

26-0367 **AGENDA ITEM 30** Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Clark stated that the information raised by public commenter Robby Williams should be investigated. He felt that any questions that could be answered in real time should be addressed immediately, not later. He emphasized the importance of building trust with citizens by providing timely responses to their questions. He requested

a meeting with County Manager (CM) Kate Thomas and Chief Deputy District Attorney (CDDA) Michael Large as soon as possible.

Chair Andriola requested a review of the annexation process, specifically regarding the fiscal impacts when another jurisdiction annexed territory within its sphere of influence. She expressed interest in understanding the effects on public safety costs and potential funding mechanisms, as well as the applicable legal parameters. She thought the information would be helpful to learn more about when the time was appropriate for action.

* * * * *

12:41 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:
Andrew Garnand, Deputy County Clerk
Elizabeth Tietjen, Deputy County Clerk
Brooke Koerner, Deputy County Clerk
Jessica Melka, Deputy County Clerk*