

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

MARCH 28, 2023

PRESENT:

**Alexis Hill, Chair**  
**Michael Clark, Commissioner**  
**Mariluz Garcia, Commissioner**  
**Jeanne Herman, Commissioner**  
**District 4, Vacant**

**Janis Galassini, County Clerk**  
**Eric Brown, County Manager**  
**Nathan Edwards, Assistant 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:

**23-0153**      **AGENDA ITEM 3** Presentation by Manager’s Office Commissioner Support, Program Assistant Alexandra Wilson, on an overview of Washoe County boards and commissions and the process of posting, recruiting, communicating with, interviewing, and appointing of candidates to boards and commissions by the Board of County Commissioners. Boards and commissions discussed under this item include all or some of the boards and commissions listed in Additional Meeting Resources as “Boards & Commissions - Website Listing”.

Commission Support Program Assistant Alex Wilson conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: The History; Strategic Planning – Innovative Services (2 slides); Types; Utilization of Granicus (2 Slides); Postings; Communication; “Interview” Process; Post Checklist; Flow Chart; Takeaways; Thank you.

Ms. Wilson stated the boards and commissions program had been worked on for about a year. She informed that with the new process, Washoe County took hold of its boards and commissions and identified its role within each of them. She displayed a book that had staff reports dating back to 2012 and 2013. The Commission Support Team moved from the book to Excel and hoped to implement a program to ensure information was better organized. She displayed the slide titled “The History” and informed there were many ways that boards and committees were presented throughout the website, which was confusing. She stated when the Commission Support Team started searching the website, it found there were 53 boards and committees listed and there were separate pages for board

and committee openings and volunteer opportunities. She declared the volunteer page was separate and listed opportunities where individuals could volunteer internally with the County. Boards and committees were focused on Open Meeting Law (OML) and advisory. The Commission Support Team found there was a lot of missing information on the website from each of the 53 boards and commissions. The missing information included the appointing authority, current rosters, whether the boards were paid or commissioned, and whether they were still active. The team discovered several boards that had not met since 2017 or 2019 and had since been disbanded. That information was not listed on the website and Commission Support wanted to ensure things were communicated clearly.

Ms. Wilson informed the deep dive was prompted by a request from the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). The BCC wanted to fully comprehend committee service and appointment, and potentially conduct an audit of the boards to determine effectiveness. Through the Commission's Strategic Plan and innovative services, strengthening culture of service was utilized to establish the Commission Support Team. Commission Support created a subcommittee along with different departments and divisions that were involved in boards and committees. Ms. Wilson referred to the "Strategic Planning – Innovative Services" slide which listed departments that were on the subcommittee. She declared new individuals were always welcome to be a part of the subcommittee. To obtain the best information moving forward, the team wanted to identify individuals who had experience with boards and committees or had their own boards and committees. She stated the team had started strategic planning six months prior. The team had gathered information about all the boards and committees, and the next step in the standardization process was the creation of the subcommittee.

Ms. Wilson explained it was very difficult for one person or team to manage more than 50 boards and committees. She explained that through the strategic planning subcommittee, liaisons to the boards and committees would be established who would understand the standardized process. This would include updating the website and ensuring pertinent information was available. The team also wanted to organize the information through a central system or software which the team identified to be Granicus; a software the Office of the County Manager (OCM) had already been using. The software was readily available for boards and committees and was designed specifically for tracking meeting information including dates, member attendance, rosters, and vacancies. She stated one goal was to transfer all the board and committee information to one webpage. Any time the team needed to open the application process, only the click of a button would be required as opposed to going through the Technology Services (TS) Department to post on the website and communicate the vacancy to the public. She asserted the new software would be a one-step process. Once an opening was posted, the team hoped to standardize the communication of posting and recruitment to get residents involved. The team would utilize district lists, word of mouth, and other types of communication. For future goals, the Commission Support Team desired to determine the effectiveness of the boards which would include looking into how they progressed throughout the year and evaluation would occur in the following fiscal year.

When looking at the 53 boards and committees that were found on the website, Ms. Wilson stated the Commission Support Team was able to break them down into four distinct categories. The first category was titled “BCC Member Of,” which were boards that met every January. These included the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN), the Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB), and conservation district boards that the Commission sat on directly. Ms. Wilson said the process for the “BCC Member Of” boards had been standardized. The second group was “BCC Appoints To,” which were boards that reported to the Commission. These included the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission, the Senior Services Advisory Board (SSAB), the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority (RTAA), and those alike. She informed the third category was “County Manager Appointed,” which were mostly internal boards such as the County Manager’s Advisory Council (CMAC) and other committees that needed to be formed quickly to make internal decisions. The fourth category was “Membership Outlined by Position Held/External Agency,” which were boards that Washoe County had a part in but did not organize or there were so many moving parts that membership on the board was defined by position. She provided the Local Emergency Planning Committee (LEPC) as an example, noting the County representative had to be the Washoe County Sheriff or a District Attorney. The roles on those boards were outlined by whoever held the position, not necessarily an appointed person.

Ms. Wilson spoke about finding a program that would be able to facilitate an organization like Washoe County. She reiterated the Commission Support Team looked at Granicus because it was software that was already being utilized. She stated Commission Support wanted to make Granicus the hub of information for boards and committees. She directed the Board to the “Recruitment for Vacancy” slide. She pointed out an example where there were 364 board seats, of which 167 were vacant. She declared the numbers were inaccurate because the program was not being used to its full potential. She indicated there was a module titled “terms expiring soon” that allowed the system to notify staff when there were upcoming vacancies. She mentioned that due to the County’s fiscal year, there would be a spike in July when positions needed to be re-appointed. On the bottom, right of the slide, she showed an example of a board the team was tracking and noted the team tracked boards by including the board information. Anytime anyone applied through the Granicus application form, their information could be directly imported into a specific board. She informed the system would provide information about member terms such as term limits, start and end dates, and the member’s position on the board. In addition, the chair and vice chair could be listed in Granicus. She declared the form had many different functions and the County could include more information such as the appointing authority. She informed Granicus had a built-in application form that could be customized to individual boards. For example, if a board had membership requirements, the County could tailor the form so the applicant would be prompted with questions they would be required to answer. Questions could be designed for each board with or without requirements and applications could be directly inserted into the board itself and be made available online or printed out. She directed the Board’s attention to the bottom, middle photo of the slide which depicted how applications would appear in the system. This would include the name of the applicant, how they answered every question, if they had submitted a resume or other

materials, and their basic information including name, phone number, and which board they applied to. She stated the software also had a search function for applications so staff could search for individuals by name or board type. She declared the software would inform staff if an applicant was eligible for the board they applied to, if they were appointed, and other additional material.

Ms. Wilson shared that a new feature to the board and committee process would be application deadlines. She mentioned a new goal was to post board and commission openings with clearly defined deadlines. She stated applications would be pushed out through social media and other outlets if the boards or commissions were not garnering enough applications. She reiterated the goal was to combine all board and committee information on one webpage. She indicated that users of the software could see vacancies, who the board members were, what type of board it was, a description of the board, and a button to apply for the board.

Ms. Wilson stated a big piece of the project was communication; the work would be ineffective if no one knew about it. She declared the Commission Support Team desired to use County email blasts which would be called “citizen involvement opportunities.” The emails could include clearly outlined application deadlines, information about the board, and a button to apply. The team hoped to bring more to the process by dedicating social media to board and commission openings. She reported the Commission Support Team employed the Nextdoor by Ring application, which was where the County garnered the most engagement. The team also utilized Facebook which allowed the team to target specific pages such as the Sun Valley Community page. She asserted the team was considering using Instagram, where it could post stories and highlight reels about the different openings for the month. Regarding video reels, she shared there was dedicated County staff to assist the team with video content. The team hoped to use that contract to create public service announcements (PSAs) to disseminate information. She spoke about physical postings, stating it would be important to post in places they would be seen such as the Senior Center or the County Complex. She thought the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission could use Quick Response (QR) codes at trailheads to reach individuals who were interested in serving parks. Another way to get the information out was through direct shares including word of mouth and engagement of interested groups. She suggested PSAs for different commission openings could be played while people were on hold with Washoe 311. She added that County Manager Eric Brown had recently begun announcing board and commission openings at the beginning of BCC meetings.

Ms. Wilson informed once applications were received there would be an interview process. Going forward, the applications and any supporting materials would be sent to each member of the Board by email. Applicants would be provided with a timeline via email so they would have a clear understanding of the process. She spoke about the different interview options. The options included in-person or virtual one-on-one interviews, or public meeting interviews before the Board. The second option would only appeal to a small group of participants as not many individuals would be available at 10:00 a.m. on a Tuesday. She provided the example of the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission, noting 17 applications were received. If each of the 17 applicants spoke for

3 minutes, the Board would have to dedicate 51 minutes of the meeting to interviews. Ms. Wilson recommended the Board conduct phone interviews. She reiterated the Commission Support Team would send application information to the Board, including points of contact, and the members of the Board could reach out to applicants at their leisure. After applicant selection, she thought it would be important to follow up with the individual by sending a congratulatory email to the selected candidate. The email should include the staff liaison for the board, the chair of the board, and provide onboarding information. She felt it was also imperative to send an appreciation email to candidates who were not selected so they would be encouraged to apply in the future. She informed the emails to non-selected candidates would consist of standardized language that could be sent directly from Commission Support. She pointed out that candidate applications remained on file for one year so they would not need to reapply if there was another vacancy during that time. She stated incumbents were included in the process. If an individual had been in their position for four years, they would be asked to fill out a new application in case any of their information had changed, or if the Board wanted to go in a different direction. She reassured that everyone was encouraged to apply and be engaged.

Ms. Wilson explained that the flow chart in the PowerPoint was a breakdown of the appointment process in a more condensed form. When a vacancy occurred, staff was notified either by Granicus or by other staff coordinating that board. The information would be posted on the webpage; the application would be linked and printed copies would be provided for those who wanted to apply in person. She reminded the opening would be communicated through email blasts, social media, physical postings, or direct shares. The BCC would then receive the applications and the interview process would begin. She reiterated that phone or virtual interviews were recommended. Finally, the selection process would occur, and follow-up emails would be sent.

Ms. Wilson informed the primary takeaway was the need for a standardized process. She stated there was a lot of confusion regarding boards and committees which the County wanted to alleviate. She mentioned the process would only apply to the boards and commissions that the BCC made direct appointments to. The boards the Commissioners were members of, as well as the County Manager appointed and external agency boards, already had standardized processes. She asserted continued support from the Board and the subcommittee would be the catalyst to implement the changes throughout the organization. Commission Support desired to develop Countywide guidelines for best practices. The County wanted to ensure this process would be the best practice to ensure it was garnering the best engagement and communicating effectively. Ms. Wilson outlined the next steps and stated that the Commission Support Team would update Granicus with the County liaisons and transition the boards and committees over to the Granicus embedded page.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Wilson for her presentation. She asked that as a thank you, a certificate be given to an incumbent when they completed their term on a board. She thought the certificate could be signed by the chair of that board. She stated Commissioner Clark had asked for this agenda item and deferred to him for further comments.

Commissioner Clark thanked Ms. Wilson for her well-thought-out presentation and said it answered a lot of his questions. He asked if applicants could do video interviews as opposed to phone interviews and asserted it was important to observe facial expressions and voice inflection. He suggested applicants give three-to-five-minute presentations about themselves and declared time may not be as restricted if each applicant had five minutes to share why they wanted to serve on a board and the Commission had a recorded video to refer to. Ms. Wilson responded that video interviews were a good idea. She recalled Commission Support had discussed virtual interviews since the County utilized Microsoft Teams. She thought it would be a great use of the product, either in-person or virtual, depending on the availability of the Board members. She stated two Commissioners could be paired up to look at the different applicants and pick the top two or three. Commissioner Clark added if the interviews were recorded, the members of the Board could look at the videos at their convenience and then get back to the County without having OML violations. Ms. Wilson responded there was potential for Commission Support to conduct an interview, record the information, and send it over to the Commission.

Commissioner Clark inquired about the minimum time requirements for application postings. He clarified the Board's job was to notify people, but it was up to the people to respond. He did not want to be in a position where individuals could say they did not know something was available. He declared he wanted to be able to look people in the eye and say they had three weeks, it was posted in various locations, and the deadline had passed. He wanted to ensure the Board had done its job by casting a wide net to decrease the chance of people claiming they did not know there was an opening. Ms. Wilson confirmed three weeks would be the minimum standard. She recounted Commission Support used to have a two-week standard, but the team thought three weeks was a good amount of time for individuals to be notified of openings and decide if they wanted to apply. If individuals started an application and did not finish it, the system would notify them they had an application in process. Commissioner Clark expressed appreciation that individuals would be notified and asked if Commission Support would be continuing with that process. Ms. Wilson responded yes.

Commissioner Clark asked if applications were kept on file for one year and Ms. Wilson replied yes. Commissioner Clark inquired about what happened with the applications after that year. He wondered if the County could keep a database and reach out to previous applicants on a regular basis. Ms. Wilson reiterated applications were kept on file for one year. The database was cloud-based and once that year was up, the applications were disabled but were still in the system. If any individual was interested a year later, they would have to reapply. In addition, anyone who wanted to become involved in citizen opportunities could be added to an email distribution list as well as district-specific lists for jurisdictional messaging. She provided the example of the SSAB, as it was looking for a District 3 member, so the County would communicate to District 3 and the areas within District 3 on Nextdoor. Commissioner Clark inquired if the names of the people who applied and the boards they applied to were part of the public record. He asked if the other Commissioners could at least see who was applying for which board to which Ms. Wilson responded yes. She explained that any time someone applied for a public board

it became part of the record. The application notified applicants that their information would become part of the public record and when people applied, they were essentially agreeing to that notion. In addition, when the Commissioners were sent all the board and committee applications, the applications would not be redacted. If anyone were to request the information, Granicus had a redacted application built-in that could be downloaded to protect private information; it would only include the name of the applicant and the answers they provided. Commissioner Clark affirmed the Board wanted to protect everyone's privacy, but it was important for the community to know who was applying for positions as it may spur someone else to apply.

Commissioner Herman thanked Ms. Wilson for doing such a thorough job and opined the County gave Ms. Wilson all the difficult jobs.

Commissioner Garcia stated Ms. Wilson had been referred to as a human encyclopedia during agenda review to which she agreed. She observed Ms. Wilson inherited an outdated binder and created a program for the Board. Commissioner Garcia asserted that as a new Commissioner, she appreciated such a thoughtful, thorough, streamlined process. She opined using technology and social media to increase community engagement was critical and it was necessary to have all the vacancies live in one place, so they were easily accessible. She applauded Ms. Wilson for her efforts. Ms. Wilson thanked Commissioner Garcia.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Wilson and looked forward to seeing who would apply for the open board seats.

**23-0154      AGENDA ITEM 4 Public Comment.**

Ms. Elise Weatherly spoke about the public comment time limit, her former band, being unpopular, and telling the truth. She asserted people had to sign in to speak at the Sun Valley board meetings. She pointed out that by doing so her address was on the public record and she wondered if that had anything to do with people sneaking onto her property. She spoke about scriptures, White Snake, the truth, accountability, and God. She informed she applied for a Citizen Advisory Board (CAB). She expressed frustration with bumps in the road on Sun Valley Boulevard and wanted them to be fixed.

Mr. William Puchert declared he was the president of the Sons and Daughters of Erin, which had been Northern Nevada's non-profit Irish heritage organization for more than 50 years. He introduced Michael Del Ostia who was one of the organization's Irish Persons of the Year and informed that Doyle Stewart, who was the resident musician of the organization, performed in the lobby before the meeting. Mr. Puchert was appreciative of the opportunity to display Irish culture. He expressed gratitude for the generous donation requested by Commissioner Herman. He stated the funds would assist in presenting the Northern Nevada Celtic Ceilidh which would be held in the City of Reno brewery district on May 20, 2023. This would continue the legacy of the Celtic celebration that was formerly held at Bartley Ranch Park until the pandemic forced its cancellation. He informed the Sons and Daughters of Erin were proud to celebrate the 40th

anniversary of Rancho San Rafael Park the previous year, noting the organization had planted trees there in the mid-90s. The organization established an area on the eastern edge of the park called St. Patrick's Grove. He displayed a photo of the park which was placed on file with the Clerk. He declared the organization had engaged in other public service projects such as restoring 30 Irish family graves at Hillside Cemetery which bore the namesake of familiar streets in the area such as Mayberry and Plumb. He informed the Blanchfield Memorial Ceremony, where the organization spread shamrocks from Ireland on the grave of the Irish American air mail pilot William Blanchfield, was a tradition that would reach its century mark the following year. The organization also participated in community events and was one of the winners of the Sparks Hometown Christmas Parade for Best Community Group. The organization also won the Best Parade Formation award along with its fellow Celtic community members in the Nevada Day Parade a few years prior. He declared the group had supported charities over the years, particularly those that assisted vulnerable populations, like the Assistant League and the Domestic Violence Resource Center (DVRC). The organization also assisted in discovering people's ancestry and he encouraged people to utilize the Truckee Meadows Community College (TMCC) library genealogy lab, noting that was where two members of the organization had discovered they were distant cousins. He shared people could find out more about the organization and upcoming events by visiting [irishnevada.org](http://irishnevada.org) or finding the organization on Facebook.

Mr. Mark Neumann offered special thanks to County staff and recalled that the previous month he had spoken about Sun Valley residents being charged for flood control. He reported County staff got in touch with him and explained how everything worked. He stated that back in 1986 or 1987 there was flooding on Pyramid Highway. He said as a result of additional flooding, Washoe County performed work in the area including putting in dams and retention areas. He asserted this led to residents in unincorporated Washoe County being charged extra fees to pay for the work that was done. He stated the 5 Ridges subdivision had just put in a huge dam. He asked the Board to look into quarterly payment relief for senior citizens.

Ms. Tracey Thomas quoted Benjamin Franklin. She referred to Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 244.194 which related to the utilization of voting and counting devices. She stated Item 15's Staff Report acknowledged Washoe County's equipment had reached its end of life. She believed this was further affirmed by the end-of-life parameters defined in the County's Technology Services (TS) Department. Rather than blindly re-ordering more of the same devices, she suggested at least two Commissioners request an agenda item to discuss selling the County's current equipment and exploring other devices and solutions available. If the solution was a machine, she requested consideration of the systems used by Carson City. She opined those provided voters with more confidence and allowed them to insert their own paper ballots into the tabulators which then returned a paper receipt with the date and time that their ballot was cast. She thought it also reduced the need for adjudication as the voter would be present to affirm any discrepancies. She declared this would allow Washoe County to migrate to a fully paper ballot system and remove the inequitable processes of ballots currently in place, which she alleged violated several election laws. She asserted paper ballots would contribute to a more transparent

audit when invoked. She referred to NRS 244.330 which related to the printing of ballots. She inquired what efforts Washoe County was taking to ensure ballots and election materials were printed within the County. She suggested a future agenda item regarding the clean-up of Washoe County voter records. She declared postcards should be mailed to every registered, active voter to verify their residential address, party affiliation, citizenship, and mail ballot preference. She asserted the postcards should notify the voter that failure to return the pre-paid postage postcard with their signature may place their voter record in an inactive status. She added that a second postcard should be sent by the end of September to all voters in danger of being declared inactive. She claimed this process would reduce unnecessary waste and costs associated with the volume of undeliverable election materials and ensure only eligible voters were receiving ballots. She thought all postcards returned with valid signatures should be compared against Assessor records to ensure the property was a valid residential property. She declared all addresses that were not residential should require contact with the voter to procure a correct, residential address to determine the voter's appropriate precinct.

Chair Hill asked members of the audience not to applaud.

Mr. Michael Smith stated it was his first time appearing before the Board. He said he would not be present for Item 15, but he was opposed to any recommendations moving forward and had a lot of questions. He thought the phrase "operational view" was vague. In the military, he understood operational, tactical, and strategic. He shared he had done military and operational tests and knew what operational effectiveness was and it was not defined well enough in the Staff Report for him to grasp what the issues were. He wondered about the problems regarding elections. The County was having an outside organization conduct an operational review and he wondered what the organization was reviewing. He inquired if there was a defined statement of the scope of the problem which he asserted should articulate exactly what the issue was. He pointed out a comment about accuracy in the Staff Report which raised alarm bells. He declared he had a lot of other questions and had more homework to do. He did not want to waste the Board's time, but he wanted it on the record that he opposed Item 15.

Ms. Nichelle Hull stated she lived in precinct 6103. She informed she had recently attended a library board meeting at the Spanish Springs branch. During that meeting, staff provided a presentation highlighting the library's programs. Ms. Hull thought most of the programs were excellent and she enthusiastically supported those such as the First Lego League and a crafting day. She believed libraries should provide wholesome activities to elevate learning, enrich life, and encourage civic society. She strongly opposed drag queen story hour (DQSH) because she did not believe it was wholesome or appropriate for children. She believed drag was a non-normative, sexually based performance that occurred in adult entertainment venues and did not belong or have any kind of natural association with children. She opined when constituents showed up to library board meetings, due to the public meeting laws, it was as though their opinions and desires were ignored. She added she had emailed the entire Commission in addition to Library Director Jeff Scott, from whom she received an automatic email response, but she did not hear back from any of the Commissioners on the topic, which she did not appreciate.

She stated people were told to email their concerns to Mr. Scott, but there was no type of two-way conversation to address those concerns and she felt the people were being ignored. She spoke about literature at the libraries regarding diversity, acceptance, and tolerance.

Mr. Gary Butcher stated his comments were his own and that he was not associated with any group or organization. He acknowledged the following suggestion had been made to the Commissioners before. He said there were Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs) and asked if the Commission could investigate creating an election advisory board. That board would handle the audits and identify and remedy the processes and deficiencies if needed. He declared the citizens of Washoe County were stakeholders in elections. He thought the County had the propensity to hire outside of the community for poll workers and printing companies. He implored the Board to vote against retaining the Elections Group.

Chair Hill asked members of the audience not to applaud and read from a document regarding restrictions and orderly conduct. She provided examples of speech that may be reasonably limited, which included clapping.

Ms. Pam Roberts stated she was in attendance to hear the presentation on Item 3 regarding boards and commissions and the appointment process. She shared she served on the Senior Services Advisory Board (SSAB) as a regular member and served as an alternate on the CAB for her area. She disclosed she was not speaking on behalf of either of those boards and was acting in an individual capacity. She declared she conducted her own review of the boards and commissions because she knew there had been some problems with the posting, recruitment, and appointment processes as well as follow-up with candidates. She appreciated the work that had been done but still had questions and concerns. She inquired when the one-year retention of applications began. She noted some of the boards and commissions were able to amend their own bylaws while others could only be amended by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). She thought there were still improvements that could be made. She spoke about voter issues and believed people wanted to ensure that every eligible voter could vote. She expressed concern that the process would become so problematic that eligible voters would not vote. She thought some of the commenters were encouraging voter suppression, which she did not think the Board wanted. She addressed Item 22 regarding a parcel map review. She encouraged the Commission to look at the Warm Springs area plan. She stated she lived in rural Washoe County which she thought was beautiful. She hoped the Board would continue to keep the area as rural as possible.

Chair Hill asked members of the audience not to applaud.

Ms. Cindy Martinez displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. She stated that over the years, she had the opportunity to not only be engaged in the process but also independently evaluate the information on both sides of the issue of election integrity. She shared that she had also read voluminous articles and posts on the internet and was a poll observer in 2020 and 2022. She spoke about an aggregation of cases she had been called to investigate and related them to her experience as a poll observer.

She read the statement, “Do not assume facts not in evidence,” from the document she provided. She looked forward to Item 15 and hearing how the Board expected the Elections Group to responsibly review the County’s policies and procedures.

Mr. Thomas Daly stated he was unable to stay for the entire meeting, so he wanted to speak about Item 17, the extension of the forensic agreement between the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office (WCSO) and the City of Reno. He stated there was no staff presentation or report to the Board and there had not been an audit of the agreement. He declared there was a \$1 million payment from Reno to the County, but it was unknown how much money the WCSO expended by providing those services. Then Reno Police Department (RPD) Chief Jason Soto testified before the Reno City Council in August 2021 that Reno would use \$1,615,000 worth of services from the WCSO but would only pay the County \$1 million. Mr. Daly wondered who was picking up the tab for the \$615,000 difference. He stated there was no audit provision in the contract extension before the Board. He declared the Board could independently order an audit of the contract to be conducted by the County auditor. Mr. Daly wanted to see an audit requirement in the agreement so Reno knew it was going to be audited and the County taxpayers would know there was some financial accountability.

Mr. Roger Edwards informed he was retired military and had served his Country, community, and neighborhood for about 60 years. He stated he would provide an update on the Golden Valley recharge program. He asserted there was over \$1 million of overcharges to the 630 residents in his community. He wondered what it would take to stop charging the community for a system that had been shut down for seven years. He asserted the community was charged \$14,400 per month and opined it made the Incline Village overcharge look like nothing. He declared the Commission had been aware of the issue for two years. He opined the Board should have already stopped the charges as the service was not being offered. Regarding Item 15, he looked into the staff of the Elections Group and asserted they had backgrounds the County would not hire, yet the Commission was considering giving the group a contract. He believed the elections program was flawed and there had been 40,000 illegal or inappropriate votes. He claimed it was important to hire adequate people to investigate the County’s program. He encouraged members of the Board to investigate the backgrounds of the people involved with the Elections Group and realize the group could not fix the County’s problems.

Chair Hill asked members of the audience not to applaud.

Ms. Sandee Tibbett displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. She said she resided in District 5 and reminded that the people were requesting that DQSH be placed on an agenda for discussion and action be taken to eliminate it from Washoe County libraries. She opined war was being waged against American family values. She declared children were being confused about gender. She thought the Board could help by terminating DQSH at all taxpayer-funded libraries. She recalled the late City of Sparks Mayor Ron Smith advocated cancelling the event in 2019 by reaching out to then Commissioner Vaughn Hartung and Washoe County Library Director Jeff Scott. She stated Mayor Smith was ignored. She wondered who would be offended when a Washoe County

child was harmed by a drag queen and she asked why the chance should be taken. She shared she attended the last library board meeting in Spanish Springs. She applauded the programs that were highlighted in the staff presentation and declared those were the types of programs that all citizens of Washoe County would stand behind.

Ms. Renee Rezendes spoke about DQSH. She claimed drag queen readers were grooming children. She recalled some people had said that if individuals wanted to teach their children about God, they could do it in their own home. She felt the same way about DQSH. She believed children were curious and intrigued by something new and entertaining, which made them easy prey. She asserted it needed to stop. She spoke about Chloe Cole and expressed sadness for Ms. Cole's situation. Ms. Rezendes concurred with Ms. Thomas' comments about voter integrity. She reported she was called to be interviewed by the Elections Group.

Mr. J.S. McElhinney wanted to discuss three items. He reiterated his opposition to DQSH and did not think it was appropriate for children under 18 years of age. He had attended a library board meeting and observed the Library Director was very proud of the inclusion of DQSH. He asserted if he had the power, he would fire the Library Director because he did not represent the community's values. More than 100 people were speaking in opposition to DQSH and he declared it only belonged in a cabaret where adults were the only people allowed. He addressed Item 15, stating he opposed the approval of the contract with the Elections Group as three of the top officials were known, left-leaning individuals. He thought the County Manager had authorized \$100,000 without the authority to do so and had assumed that the Board would approve the expense. He suggested conducting a search for an executive with an outstanding track record of organizational skills to re-organize the Registrar of Voters (ROV) Office. He asserted a non-partisan executive could be hired to do the job for \$150,000. He discussed Item 19 and thought the Washoe County School District (WCSD), the County Commission, and every other State-run organization kept adding layers of administration. He declared half of the school administrators were not needed and the extra money from eliminating the positions could be put toward teachers. He asked why the County was adding deputies when it could hire one strong executive to re-organize the system. He thought the County did not need outside consultants and asked why it was sending its jobs outside the State of Nevada or the County. He declared people within the County should be hired.

Mr. Nicholas St. Jon discussed Item 15. He declared that the Board spoke about transparency but could not be transparent about the very document that initiated the review and hiring of an outside firm. He stated the Elections Group had already been working for two weeks without a signed contract because a contract had not been approved by the Board. He asserted there could be a split vote and the Elections Group would work for an additional two weeks until the next Board meeting before it had a signed contract. He asked the Board to stop the review and consider the recommendations from the public. He declared the Board members were elected servants of the people. He observed the Board allowed applause for things such as awards and opined that telling the audience it could not applaud in agreement with public commenters was tyrannical. He asserted the Board had already stopped people from bringing in signs and was now threatening to have people

removed from Chambers if the Board did not like what a person said. He recalled he had asked for a way for the community to have a dialogue with the Board. He stated people only had three minutes to share their opinion and then they were ignored. He asked the Board to place a resolution on an agenda requiring the Board to hold a minimum of six town hall meetings for each of the Commissioners. The Commissioners would visit the communities and have a dialogue to work through some of the issues. He applauded all the people who had entered the Chambers.

Ms. Donna Clontz provided a document that was distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She stated she was a long-time citizen volunteer for Washoe County boards and commissions and thanked staff for their work on the report. She provided an update, stating the seniors were working on a senior day at the Legislature which would take place on Friday, April 7, 2023, in Carson City. She informed that seniors from the Senior Center would participate, and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) would transport the seniors to Carson City. She wanted to let the community at large know about the event and said people were welcome to join either down in Carson City or ride with the seniors from the Senior Center. She shared she was also doing a short advocacy training on March 29, 2023, at the Senior Center about the legislative process and how everyone could be involved. She announced she sang with a group called Tahoe Symphony Orchestra & Chorus (TOCCATA) that had been in the area for 18 years and every Easter the group performed Bach's Passions. She stated the group had two free concerts in Reno, one in Incline Village, and another in Carson City. She invited the whole community to come. She informed that the group would be at the Trinity Episcopal Church and St. John's Presbyterian on Easter Sunday. She spoke about Item 15 and applauded the County Manager for hiring an expert group to help the County strengthen the election system. She appreciated everyone's comments; however, the facts showed that the County's elections went well, but could be made better. She thanked the Board for its time.

Mr. Emiliano Pasillas shared he was a local pastor in Reno, Nevada, and it was his first time addressing the Commission. As a pastor, he believed everyone was created in God's image and that as sons and daughters of God people had a responsibility not only to the creator but to their families and children. He discussed DQSH at the libraries and believed it should not be happening under the Board's watch. He believed that as a pastor, he could teach his children at home and in his church. If the Board opened the door for the LGBTQ community or DQSH at the libraries, he thought it should also open the door for him to go to the library and read bible stories. He believed that as the gatekeepers of the community, the Board was responsible for whatever it was permitting in libraries and public settings of Washoe County buildings. He reiterated he was opposed to DQSH and thought homosexuality was a sin. He thought DQSH created anxiety in children. He claimed DQSH was looked at as entertainment, but it was not.

Chair Hill asked members of the audience not to applaud.

Ms. Penny Brock informed she lived in Reno and was opposed to Agenda Item 15. She asked the Board to place Commissioner Herman's election integrity proposal on an agenda. She thought the proposal was still relevant and there was new information.

She said the Commission received a letter from Robert Beadles about the new findings which needed to be heard publicly so the people could provide their input. She asked about the Elections Group and wondered where it was located. She spoke about Chris Piper and opined he did not have the necessary qualifications to oversee elections. She asked why an outside group was needed as the County already had the Secretary of State (SOS), the ROV, and County staff. She suggested the County hire a consultant from Reno, such as Ms. Thomas, who had worked in the ROV Office for years. She declared there was much talent in the County that could advise if the Board needed it. She asserted if the current staff were not doing their jobs, perhaps they needed to be replaced by competent people. She believed centralization was the communist word for communism and declared the people did not want anything to be centralized. She asserted the people wanted their free, constitutional rights in elections.

Chair Hill asked members of the audience not to applaud and said she would ask people to leave.

Ms. Suzie Cooper opined members of the Board probably had their minds made up about a lot of different things, but they might need to reconsider. She believed in transparent elections and thought every real vote should count. She did not think the elections were fair and she opposed Item 15. She wanted Commissioner Herman's proposal to be reinstated because she believed it was still relevant. She expressed concern about machine technology. She claimed some areas of the County did have a red wave. She mentioned the comments about drag queens and asserted everyone wanted their children to be normal. She declared none of the Board members wanted cheating to occur in elections, even if they would not admit it. She postulated why the votes were quietly announced on a Friday night. She believed the machines had been the death of the elections. She declared smaller elections were needed where votes were counted at the location by the people in Washoe County. She opined people who were selected, not elected, did a poor job because they knew they would be selected again. She asserted billions of people across the globe thought the same way she did.

Chair Hill asked a member of the audience who was clapping to leave Chambers. The gentleman did not want to leave. Chair Hill reiterated that she had asked those in attendance not to applaud. Others present in Chambers expressed consternation about being asked not to applaud.

**11:30 a.m.**    **The Board recessed.**

**11:37 a.m.**    **The Board reconvened.**

Chair Hill hoped the recess had given everyone an opportunity to calm down. She declared she did not want anyone to be removed from the meeting, but she wanted everyone to follow the rules. She asked for no disruptions, or she would recess the meeting until 1:00 p.m. She thanked everyone for complying.

Mr. Donald Fossum was not present when called to speak.

Mr. Mac Rossi thought the board and commission presentation was great. He thanked Commissioner Clark. He suggested notifying the homeowners' associations (HOAs) as a lot of people may want to step up.

Ms. Val White displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. She observed the document regarded the Center for Civic Design (CCD), the Center for Technology and Civic Life (CTCL), the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA), the Democracy Fund, the National Vote at Home Institute (NVAHI), U.S. Digital Response (USDR), and the U.S. Election Assistance Commission (EAC). She declared the majority of those organizations were leftist, progressive organizations. She claimed the funding was backward as the County Manager should have gotten approval from the Commission, which had not happened and was a violation of the NRS. She wondered if Manager Brown was going to be written up. She asserted it would be irresponsible for the Board to approve the funding Manager Brown was asking for to pay the Elections Group because things had not been done legally. She thought the Elections Group had reached out to Washoe County and volunteered. She believed the group had a leftist, progressive agenda. She urged the Commission not to approve the funding. She expressed frustration about Chair Hill and asserted that clapping after a person had spoken did not interrupt the decorum of the meeting.

Mr. George Lee shared he lived in the City of Sparks and discussed Item 15. He declared the Board was supposed to agree on something and then pay it, not pay it after the fact. He claimed an attempt was being made to silence the findings of the Nye County paper ballot counting in the previous election. He asserted the members of the Board needed to fight for the people of Washoe County and not abdicate their responsibility to the State or the Legislature. He stated the SOS was supposed to oversee elections, but it was not supposed to tell the counties how to do things. He believed the Board operated under Robert's Rules of Order. According to Robert's Rules, if the Board had an even vote, the motion would fail. If the Board had even votes, it would not get anything done.

Mr. Scott Johnston declared Item 15 was important to him. He researched the Elections Group and its staff. He spoke about Jennifer Morrell, Noah Praetz, and Chris Piper. Mr. Johnston quoted a John Fredericks interview with Virginia Governor Glenn Youngkin. Mr. Johnston inquired why the Board would consider allowing the Elections Group to make recommendations and set the agenda.

Ms. Darla Lee asserted the Washoe County ROV had struggled during the last couple of elections. She declared the County needed some kind of review and reform in the ROV to ensure free and fair elections. She wondered why the people were not informed about the groups that were being considered or notified that the County had already contracted with one group. She thought there was a lack of transparency. She spoke about the legislative session and pointed out there were numerous election bills. She stated people did not know which bills would pass; however, there were plenty of bills that would affect the election system in Washoe County. She suggested the County delay the item until it could review some of the new bills that would affect the election and avoid spending money on something that may need to be changed in the near future.

Ms. Jean Kramer declared she had lived in Nevada for 52 years and had seen a lot of negative changes. She said she also had a home in Texas which was where she voted. She challenged the Board to find a group that would look at other states that were fair. She declared Nevada was not a fair state, but Texas was because it turned down the Dominion voting machine. She said when she voted in Texas, she usually called the SOS within an hour to make sure her vote had been recorded. She claimed Texas was on top of everything despite being a much bigger state than Nevada. She thought it would benefit the Board to visit other states that did not have fraudulent voting machines and fraudulent voting desires. She recalled the only fraud in Texas occurred in Harris County, which was Houston. She mentioned Texas had some issues, but nothing like the issues in Nevada. She urged the Board to clean up Nevada and make it a fair state. She opined fraud had only occurred in the last two or three elections.

County Clerk Jan Galassini advised the Board she received emailed public comments which she placed on the record.

**23-0155**      **AGENDA ITEM 5** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager Eric Brown thanked Irish musician Doyle Stewart for playing in the atrium before the meeting as part of Irish American heritage month. He encouraged all County employees and the community to contact the County if they would like to share a piece of their heritage or information about a culture that they were interested in. He informed the County had a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) group led by Human Resources (HR) Manager of Organizational Effectiveness Elizabeth Jourdin. People could contact Ms. Jourdin or send information to Washoe 311.

Commissioner Clark declared he had several items to discuss. He reminded that during a previous meeting, he had asked for Roger Edwards' issue to be placed on an agenda. He pointed out Mr. Edwards was a senior citizen and a veteran and thanked Mr. Edwards for his service. Commissioner Clark reiterated he wanted the item to be placed on an agenda so the Board could get to the bottom of the issue. He declared Mr. Edwards had been appearing before the Board for a number of years, claiming that the County was overcharging him. Commissioner Clark did not know if that was true, but he wanted to look into it.

Commissioner Clark asked if the County was still accepting applications for the third Assistant County Manager (ACM) position and where the County was in that process.

Commissioner Clark recalled the Board approved additional funds on February 14, 2023, for indigent defense conflict counsel and stated that ten days prior to the present meeting, all but two of the conflict counsel resigned. He thought the Board needed to be extremely transparent about the issue. He noted the County had 28 cases that were waiting for representation in court, and he wanted to make sure the issue was resolved sooner rather than later.

Commissioner Clark spoke about the Karma Box Project and Safe Camp. He recalled that during a Community Homelessness Advisory Board (CHAB) meeting it was indicated that Karma Box would have its 501(c)(3) status reinstated by March 15, 2023. He later learned that Division Director of Housing and Homeless Services Dana Searcy thought Karma Box had submitted the necessary documents to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). The documents were not accepted as the IRS needed hard copies, thus extending the timeline. Commissioner Clark stated he would have liked to have known this or had the steps explained to him. He asserted submitting something and having it approved were two different things. He observed he learned about the documentation lapse from the newspaper and thought it had occurred sometime back in September.

Commissioner Clark discussed an article in “This is Reno” about the Downtown Reno Partnership (DRP) and an audit that mentioned unfavorable occurrences. He addressed Commissioner Garcia, stating she was a principal liaison for the group, and he was the alternate. He asked her to inquire about the article because he did not want to step on her toes, but he knew a number of businesspeople downtown, primarily from the mini marts, who were paying into the DRP and were concerned. He wanted to know how the Board could find out more about the issue.

Commissioner Clark mentioned fall 2022 when former Commissioners Bob Lucey and Kitty Jung chose to step away from their boards and commissions. He observed the Board made appointments the same day. With the departure of Commissioner Vaughn Hartung, he wondered why the Board was not making the assignments that day and re-assigning when the new Commissioner was appointed. Chair Hill interjected to inform Commissioner Clark that she was waiting for the new appointment from Governor Joe Lombardo which she hoped would happen in April. Commissioner Clark suggested the Board could make new assignments after the new Commissioner was appointed, as he did not know when the appointment would occur. He asked if the Board had to wait until a new Commissioner was appointed to choose the new Vice Chair. He wanted it on the record that Commissioner Herman, who was going into her ninth year as a Commissioner, was often overlooked. He opined that when the Board overlooked her, all the residents in District 5 were overlooked. He asserted she had served the longest on the Commission and should be the only choice for Vice Chair. Chair Hill responded that the appointment of the Chair and Vice Chair would be placed on an agenda when there was a new Board member.

Commissioner Herman seconded Commissioner Clark’s comments about the Golden Valley water issue. She wanted to know if her election integrity resolution could be placed back on an agenda for a second chance. She agreed with the people who commented about drag queen story hour (DQSH) and said she was old-fashioned and did not like the idea. She informed she had differences with Library Director Jeff Scott on another issue as well and had mentioned it before.

Commissioner Garcia provided an update from the Washoe County Regional Animal Services (WCRAS) Advisory Board. On March 10, 2023, WCRAS issued a critical capacity notice to show that the County’s shelter was dangerously full. WCRAS was urging people to reclaim their lost pets, foster, adopt, and use the

microchipping scanning stations that were located at all the Pet Station stores throughout the County. She informed the situation was better, but the shelter was bracing itself for a very challenging summer and fall. She relayed that the shelter offered free microchipping during business hours and no appointment was needed. She stated it was a collaborative effort and everyone needed to come together to ensure the dangerously high-capacity issues for the shelter were not reached. She observed she had just finished her third month as a new County Commissioner and reflected on her three months of service. She wanted to acknowledge and thank the Commission Support Team and the Communications team, stating they had been wonderful to work with and she wanted those in the audience to know how much those teams did to keep things moving. She declared the teams were always willing to meet with her about ideas for community engagement, were supportive at Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) meetings and were wonderful at following up about specific constituent concerns. She wanted to publicly acknowledge all their work in helping make her first three months an incredible experience.

Commissioner Clark reiterated he wanted Mr. Edwards' issue to be placed on an agenda. He acknowledged comments made by Tracey Thomas, Nichelle Hull, Gary Butcher, and Cindy Martinez. He stated he wanted things to run smoothly and fairly for everyone at all times, not just when one group was in power versus when another group was in power. He said people needed to think about the long game instead of who was in charge at that moment. He remarked he had been on the Board for a short time, and he believed in treating everyone fairly, inclusion for everyone, and hearing from everyone. He declared there was no need for special committees on inclusion if everyone was treated fairly from the beginning. He addressed DQSH and informed he did not care what people did, but his constituents did, and they did not want to see it done on public property. He believed the issue was people were unhappy with their tax dollars being used to promote DQSH. If the other side wanted to hold DQSH, he thought it should find a way to do so that accommodated everyone which would eliminate a lot of the anger in the community. He acknowledged comments made by Nicholas St. Jon, Penny Brock, and Mac Rossi. He thought it was a good idea to hold a town hall with the Commissioners a few times a year where the Board could actually communicate with constituents.

Commissioner Clark thanked Program Assistant Alex Wilson for ensuring people would be notified about board openings. He declared the Board's job was to notify people when something was happening, and it was the citizens' job to decide whether they wanted to partake in anything available to them.

Commissioner Clark acknowledged comments made by Val White about the Elections Group and shared the group was selected by Manager Brown, Communications Director Nancy Leuenhagen, and a new member of the finance staff. Chair Hill interjected to inform Commissioner Clark that the Board would review the Elections Group selection at a later portion of the meeting. Commissioner Clark continued and responded to Darla Lee's comment, stating the County needed clean voter rolls. He opined all the election bills were secondary if the County did not have clean voter rolls. He asserted that was the foundational basis for the whole system of democracy which he declared he would discuss later in the meeting.

Chair Hill wanted to see how much of the agenda the Board could get through and then take a break from 12:30 to 1:00 p.m.

### **DONATIONS – 6A1 THROUGH 6B2**

- 23-0156**      **6A1** Recommendation to acknowledge retroactively various one-time gift card donations at a value of [\$4,000.00] from the Washoe Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) Foundation and a one-time cash donation at a value of [\$200.00] from Susan J. Krump accepted by the Second Judicial District Court, CASA Program, and direct the Comptroller’s Office to make the necessary budget amendments. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0157**      **6A2** Recommendation to acknowledge one-time gift card donations at a value of [\$1320.00] from Tru Vista accepted by Second Judicial District Court (SJDC) in support of Minor Guardianship Program during FY 2023. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0158**      **6B1** Recommendation to accept a donation of [\$300.00] from Fire Shows West to the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office for the Citizen Corps Program (CCP), these funds are to be used to support the CCP teams, including but not limited to the purchase or repair of equipment, supplies, food and beverage to be used in emergency response, training, drills, support events or rehab during disasters, in support the Citizen Corps if approved, authorize Comptroller’s Office to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0159**      **6B2** Recommendation to accept a one time cash donation of [\$500.00] from private citizens, Frank and Linda Groseclose to the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office to be used for operating costs, and, if approved, authorize Comptroller’s Office to make appropriate budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Items 6A1 through 6B2 be acknowledged, accepted, authorized, and directed.

### **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 7A1 THROUGH 7H1**

- 23-0160**      **7A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' special meeting of January 25, 2023. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

- 23-0161**      **7A2** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of February 14, 2023, and February 21, 2023. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0162**      **7A3** Acknowledge the communications and reports received by the Clerk on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, including the following categories: Monthly Statements/Reports; Annual Statements/Reports; and Executed Contracts. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0163**      **7B1** Recommendation to 1) approve roll change requests, pursuant to NRS 361.765 and/or NRS 361.768, for errors discovered on the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 secured and unsecured tax rolls 2) authorize Chair to execute the changes described in Exhibits A and B and 3) direct the Washoe County Treasurer to correct the error(s). [cumulative amount of decrease to all taxing entities \$18,588.20]. Assessor. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0164**      **7C1** Recommendation to accept the Regional Street Naming Committee's recommendation and approve the renaming of Gary Hall Way to Green Street located within unincorporated Washoe County north of Eagle Canyon Drive and west of Neighborhood Way. Affected Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) are APN 532-031-18, 532-041-03, 532-041-02, and 532-041-01. Community Services. (Commission District 4.)
- 23-0165**      **7C2** Recommendation to accept the Regional Street Naming Committee's recommendation and approve the renaming of Hawco Court to Clasen Court located within unincorporated Washoe County north of Ingenuity Avenue and west of Pyramid Way. Affected Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) is APN 538-171-15. Community Services. (Commission District 4.)
- 23-0167**      **7D1** Recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners to retroactively acknowledge a grant of [\$20,000, no County match required], awarded to the Second Judicial District Court from the Lee F. Del Grande Foundation, retroactively for Family Peace Center operating expenses; and direct the Comptroller to make the necessary budget amendments. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0168**      **7D2** Recommendation to request that the Board of County Commissioners retroactively acknowledge the grant award from the State of Nevada, Administrative Office of the Courts to the Second Judicial District Court, in the amount of \$199,664.64 (no match required), to purchase audio-visual carts for evidence display in courtroom to allow remote and in-person court proceedings by all applicable updated courtrooms effective June 1, 2022 through December 31, 2024, and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)

- 23-0169**      **7D3** Recommendation to request that the Board of County Commissioners retroactively acknowledge the grant award from the State of Nevada, Administrative Office of the Courts to the Second Judicial District Court, in the amount of \$25,000.00 (no match required), to support the Timely Permanency and Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) backlog effective November 1, 2022 through September 30, 2023, and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0170**      **7D4** Recommendation to request that the Board of County Commissioners retroactively acknowledge the grant award from the State of Nevada, Administrative Office of the Courts to the Second Judicial District Court, in the amount of \$1,650.00 [50% cash match required], to assist Nevada Courts to establish Courthouse Lactation Rooms effective September 15, 2022 through June 30, 2023, and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. District Court. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0171**      **7E1** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$2,000.00] for Fiscal Year 2022-2023; District 5 Commissioner Jeanne Herman recommends a [\$2,000.00] grant to The Sons and Daughters of Erin -- a non-profit organization created for religious, charitable or educational purposes -- to support the program's efforts to promote Irish heritage and culture; approve Resolution necessary for same; and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary disbursement of funds. Manager's Office. (Commission District 5.)
- 23-0172**      **7E2** Recommendation to approve, pursuant to NRS 244.1505, Commission District Special Fund disbursement in the amount of [\$2,900.00] for Fiscal Year 2022-2023; District 3 Commissioner Mariluz Garcia recommends a [\$2,900.00] grant to the Washoe County Green Team -- a government entity -- to support costs associated with the 2023 Earth Day tree planting at the Rancho San Rafael Regional Park; approve Resolution necessary for same and direct Comptroller to make the necessary net zero cross fund and/or cross function budget appropriation transfers. Manager's Office. (Commission District 3.)
- 23-0173**      **7F1** Recommendation to approve a pass-through grant award from the State of Nevada Department of Public Safety, Office of Criminal Justice Assistance 2022 Paul Coverdell Forensic Science Improvement (FSI), Project No. 22-FSI-03 for [\$90,379.00, no County match requirement] to provide for continued education and training and associated travel for staff members and a new computer with software upgrade for the current Seized Drugs Gas Chromatography Mass Spectrometry (GC/MS) instrument for the retroactive grant period of January 1, 2023 through September 30, 2024

and if approved, authorize Sheriff Balaam to execute grant award documents and direct Comptroller's Office to make necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

- 23-0174**      **7F2** Recommendation to approve a direct grant award [\$266,448.00, no match required] from the William N. Pennington Foundation to the Washoe County Sheriff's Search and Rescue Unit for the purchase of equipment from the grant dated January 24, 2023 and if approved, direct Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0175**      **7F3** Recommendation to approve the 2022 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Award (15PBJA-22-GG-02180-JAGX), Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance through the City of Reno, Reno Police Department [\$80,704.80, no County match required] for purchase of Law Enforcement equipment and supplies, Law Enforcement related training and travel and seek approval of non-county personnel training and travel for the retroactive grant term of October 1, 2021 - September 30, 2025 and if approved, authorize the Sheriff Darin Balaam to sign all award documents and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0176**      **7F4** Recommendation to accept the State of Nevada Department of Health and Human Services Grant Management Unit [amount not to exceed \$107,400.00] to be used to pay for one Regional Human Exploitation and Trafficking (HEAT) Unit Victim Advocate - Sheriff's Office as evaluated by the Job Evaluation Committee (JEC), on March 8, 2023, for the retroactive grant period of January 1, 2023 - December 1, 2023, and if approved authorize Sheriff Balaam to execute grant award documents; direct Human Resources to create one (1) Victim Witness Advocate - Sheriff's Office position direct Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0177**      **7G1** Recommendation to approve the Child Welfare Collaborative Agreement with Casey Family Programs in the amount of [\$67,000.00; no county match] retroactive from January 1, 2023 through December 31, 2025, to facilitate family reunification and permanency for children and reduce foster care reentries; and authorize the Director of Human Services Agency to retroactively execute agreement documents; and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)
- 23-0178**      **7H1** Recommendation to accept Treasurer's status report for the period ending February 28, 2023, of payment of refunds and interest since last update in the amount of \$491,257.37 on certain property tax overpayments for residential properties at Incline Village/Crystal Bay, in compliance with

the October 21, 2019 Order issued by the District Court in Village League to Save Incline Assets, Inc., et.al. vs. State of Nevada, et.al., Case No. CV03-06922, as modified and clarified by the settlement agreement regarding the processing of refunds. Treasurer. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill expressed appreciation for community support of the County's programs.

Commissioner Clark stated he would like to pull Items 7C3 and 7E3 for discussion.

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

On motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7H1, with the exclusion of Items 7C3 and 7E3, be approved. Any and all Resolutions pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7H1, with the exclusion of Items 7C3 and 7E3, are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**23-0166**      **7C3** Recommendation to approve Lease Agreements, pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute 244.284 to 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations, with Washoe County (as lessor) for park concession buildings located at: 1) South Valleys Regional Park, 16050 Wedge Parkway, Reno, (Washoe Little League, lessee); 2) Eagle Canyon Park, 400 Eagle Canyon Drive, Sparks (Spanish Springs Cal Ripken, lessee); 3) Lemmon Valley Park, 325 Patrician Drive, Reno (Valley Providence Little League, lessee); for 60-month terms commencing April 1, 2023 through March 31, 2028 with two 12-month renewal options; 4) North Valleys Regional Park, 8085 Silver Lake Drive, Reno, (Silver State Cal Ripken, lessee); for 60-month terms commencing April 1, 2023 through March 31, 2028 with two 12-month renewal options; and 5) approve a lease agreement for a park storage building at South Valleys Regional Park (Washoe Little League lessee) for a 60-month term commencing April 1, 2023 through March 31, 2028, with two 12-month renewal options, in exchange for monthly payments of 5% of the lessees' gross sales revenue at their respective concession buildings; and authorize the Director of the Community Services Department to sign the agreements on behalf of Washoe County. Community Services. (Commission Districts 2, 4 and 5.)

Commissioner Clark asked how the leases were advertised, who knew about them, how long they were advertised, and how the County communicated to the public that the leases were available. Regarding the 5 percent collected for the rent, he wondered how it was audited, and how the Board knew what was taking place. He asked for an explanation of the audit procedure for verifying gross sales.

Division Director of Operations Eric Crump informed each of the leases was associated with youth sports leagues that played at the specific fields. Many of the leagues participated in the construction of the facilities. He observed that at South Valleys Regional Park, Washoe Little League helped construct the concession stand as it was the primary user of the field. He informed there were other groups in the agreement that could utilize the concession if they held events such as tournaments, but the leagues were the primary users of the concession facilities. He indicated the leases were not really advertised; they were given to the leagues that were the primary users of the specific areas.

Chair Hill reminded that Commissioner Clark had also asked how the County audited the 5 percent. Mr. Crump responded the leagues were required to open their books to the County. The 5 percent was to keep the leagues honest and paid for utilities and overhead costs; it was not a big revenue source and there was no specific audit in place. If things were questionable, the County had the right to audit the leagues.

Commissioner Clark recounted that the leases were not advertised, so no one else got a chance to bid on them and the leagues were not audited until something appeared to be incorrect. He opined that at least once per year there were reports that someone raided a Parent Teacher Association (PTA) fund or a youth football league's funds, so the question of the audit was understandable. He wanted to see some type of audit in place. Mr. Crump responded the County could certainly do an audit. He asserted it was an issue with the league and its representatives, not necessarily with the County, but there could be a gross sale audit. Commissioner Clark clarified he wanted to know how the County would know if the leagues were being honest in their books. He stated absconding of funds was a whole different issue for the leagues to deal with. Mr. Crump reiterated the County could perform an audit on the leagues.

Chair Hill followed up on the advertising question from Commissioner Clark. She asked if people should reach out to the Community Services Department (CSD) if they wanted to be part of the process to which Mr. Crump responded yes. Chair Hill inquired if something should be listed on the County website indicating whom people could contact if they were interested in being a concessionary partner. Mr. Crump replied that the Board should keep in mind the athletics groups communicated with each other and they all had homes. He noted the Cities of Reno and Sparks did similar things. South Valleys was the home to Washoe Little League and Lemmon Valley was the home to Valley Providence, so Washoe Little League did not have an interest in operating a concession stand in a place it was not playing. That was the nexus piece. Commissioner Clark understood but expressed concern for taxpayers who heard a contract was awarded that they did not know was available. He suggested that maybe 90 days before the lease expired, the County should advertise that the leases were coming up for bid. Mr. Crump responded the leases were not formally bid, the County had discretion through the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) to enter into leases with 501(c)(3)s without the bid process and that was what this agenda item was. Commissioner Clark opined another 501(c)(3) might have been interested, but it would not have known about it. He asserted if he had a 501(c)(3) and heard about the lease and he thought he wanted to be involved, he would want to know why he was not made aware of it.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 7C3 be approved and authorized.

**23-0179**      **7E3** Recommendation to adopt Resolution R23-32 to execute a Lease Agreement between Washoe County and Accessible Space Inc. (ASI), a corporation for public benefit pursuant to NRS 82.021, for the development of approximately 120 units of affordable supported housing to support individuals transitioning out of homelessness for a term of 30 years [in the amount of \$1 per year] located on a portion of the Nevada Cares Campus [APN 008-211-50]. NRS 244.284 gives the Board authority to lease any of the real property of the county for a term not exceeding 99 years if such real property is not needed for the public purposes of the county and is leased to a corporation for public benefit, and the property is used for charitable or civic purposes. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Clark inquired about audits on this item. He asserted the property was hastily purchased for about \$5.5 million in less than 90 days. He declared it appeared that the purchase was pushed through and now the County was taking a \$5.5-million-dollar asset and leasing it for \$30. He wanted to know exactly what would take place, how the entity was going to recoup whatever it was going to try to recoup or how it was making money, and he wanted more transparency. He reiterated that the County taxpayers bought an asset for \$5.5 million, and the County was leasing it out for \$30.

Division Director of Housing and Homeless Services Dana Searcy informed the property was approximately five acres of land, two of which remained with the Cares Campus, and three were being carved off and leased through this agenda item. When the County purchased the property, it was the County's intent to pursue affordable housing, specifically supportive housing, in the area. After the land was purchased, the County conducted a request for qualifications (RFQ) process. Ms. Searcy observed Accessible Space Inc. (ASI) was the only developer that made it through as a qualified vendor under supportive housing, which ASI had an extensive background in. After the RFQ process, ASI submitted an application with Home Means Nevada and was awarded just over \$16 million for the project. ASI had since started to layer in other types of funding including the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), Home Investment Partnership Program (HOME) dollars, and some Home Investment Partnerships American Rescue Plan Program (HOME-ARP) dollars. She stated the lease was for 30 years and the County would make sure that the details spelled out in the lease, which included supportive housing, were adhered to. Otherwise, the property would transfer back over to the County.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Commissioner Clark moved, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, to approve Agenda Item 7E3. The motion failed on a 2-2 vote with Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Herman voting no.

**12:28 p.m.**    **The Board recessed.**

**1:00 p.m.**    **The Board reconvened.**

**BLOCK VOTE – 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, AND 18**

**23-0180**    **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to: 1) approve Fiscal Year 2024 Street and Highway Projects Interlocal Cooperative Agreement between Washoe County, the City of Reno and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC); and 2) approve the Fiscal Year 2024 Street and Highway Projects Interlocal Cooperative Agreement between Washoe County, the City of Sparks and the RTC; for the approval of the RTC’s Fiscal Year 2024 Program of Projects that were identified and approved in the RTC Fiscal Year 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Update. The agreements identify regional roadway projects, their priorities, and their funding sources. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 8 be approved. The Interlocal Contract for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**23-0181**    **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the 2023/2024 Encroachment/Excavation Repair Project for Truckee Meadows for the period of April 11, 2023 through December 31, 2024, to perform street cut pavement repairs as needed in the Truckee Meadows pursuant to Washoe County’s Street Cut Ordinance at WCC 85.058, et. seq., [staff recommends Sierra Nevada Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$367,007.00]. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be awarded and approved.

**23-0182**    **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to approve the use of General Fund Contingency in the total amount of [\$1,500,000] for fiscal year 2023 in accordance with Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005 to increase expenditure authority for the 2023 Lemmon Valley and Swan Lake Flood

Prevention Measures and Response due to the heavy 2022/2023 winter precipitation and the March 2023 atmospheric river; and direct the Comptroller to make the appropriate budget appropriation transfers. [Total fiscal year 2023 impact \$1,500,000; net fiscal impact \$-0-]. Finance. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

**23-0183**      **AGENDA ITEM 12**      Recommendation to retroactively approve Amendment #1 to the current Interlocal Contract Between Public Agencies, Nevada Department of Health and Human Services Division of Health Care Financing and Policy and Washoe County, decreasing the total amount contributed by Washoe County from [\$3,000,000.00] to [\$1,500,000.00], retroactive for the period July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2023 for the Disproportionate Share Program which allocates Nevada Medicaid Program funds to hospital providers that serve a disproportionate share of Medicaid patients. Renown Medical Center is the only northern Nevada hospital provider that is eligible to receive these payments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be approved.

**23-0184**      **AGENDA ITEM 13**      Recommendation to accept the resignation of John Arrascada, Public Defender, effective April 14, 2023, and to accept and approve the County Manager's recommendation to appoint Chief Deputy Public Defender, Evelyn Grosenick, to the position of Interim Public Defender, effective April 14, 2023, and to remain effective until either the appointee resigns or the Public Defender is appointed by the Board pursuant to NRS 260.010(5), Washoe County Code 5.439(2), via the recruitment process approved by the Board on February 28, 2023. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 13 be accepted and approved.

**23-0185**      **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to approve amended allocation of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds through the Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Fund and Coronavirus Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) for the following projects: Our Place Enhancements project in a total amount of \$1,015,441 (an increase of \$88,964 over the \$926,477 allocated and approved by the Board on May 10, 2022), and direct the Comptroller's Office to make necessary net zero cross-fund and/or cross-functional budget appropriation transfers. The Our Place campus provides shelter and connection to services for women and families who are experiencing homelessness. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be approved and directed.

**23-0186**      **AGENDA ITEM 16** Recommendation to approve the Interlocal Contract between Public Agencies: Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office Forensic Science Division and the State of Nevada, Department of Public Safety, Office of the Director for Forensic Services – Scope of the agreement includes training, maintenance and implementation of Breath Alcohol Program the retroactive term of July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2026, with an annual income of \$411,519 for FY 2023 through FY 2026 not to exceed [\$1,646,076.00]. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be approved. The Interlocal Contract for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**23-0187**      **AGENDA ITEM 17** Recommendation to approve the Interlocal Agreement between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and the City of Reno on behalf of the Reno Police Department for Forensic Laboratory Analysis Services, performed by the Washoe County Sheriff's Office Forensic Science Division, fees for the retroactive term of July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023 with a total income of [\$1,000,000.00] payable in two installments of \$500,000. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 17 be approved. The Interlocal Contract for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**23-0188**      **AGENDA ITEM 18** Recommendation to approve the Forensic Support Services Agreements between Washoe County on behalf of Washoe County Sheriff's Office and various Local Law Enforcement Agencies: Airport Authority \$4,322; BLM Nevada State Office \$2,000; Carson City SO \$127,079; Elko County SO \$78,883; Elko PD \$100,280; Eureka County SO \$12,967; Humboldt County SO \$52,949; Lyon County SO \$110,221; Mono County (CA) DA's Office \$30,000; Pershing County SO \$54,030; Sparks PD \$800,000; Storey County SO \$54,462; Walker River Paiute Tribal PD \$3,458; Washoe County School District PD \$7,780; West Wendover PD \$25,934; White Pine County SO \$17,290 for Forensic Laboratory Analysis Service fees for the retroactive term of July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023 with a total income of [\$1,481,655.00]. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 18 be approved. The Interlocal Contracts for same are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

**23-0189**      **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to authorize the Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) 2 Agreement for the NV Cares Campus Phase 3 Intake Center Project (Intake Center Project) with Clark/Sullivan Constructors, Inc., doing business as Clark Sullivan Construction, the project Construction-Manager-At-Risk (CMAR). The Intake Center Project, located at 1800 Threlkel Street, includes supporting infrastructure such as a security check point, a nurse's station, case management, counseling and staff offices, a break room, as well as other necessary infrastructure such as perimeter fencing, landscaping, roadways, parking lots, and underground utilities. The Phase 3 Project also includes the remodel of an existing storage building into a Resource Center with capacity for overflow sleeping and includes restrooms, showers, laundry facilities and storage as well as other supporting elements. Budget for the GMP 2 construction agreement has been previously approved [in the amount of \$28,274,566.00] and work is anticipated to commence on or about March 29, 2023. Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

Commissioner Clark declared he did not want to receive graphs, he wanted to see the outcomes of the Cares Campus. He did not think he could vote in favor of anything until he could see some outcomes. He wanted to know how many of the 40 people who had been placed in housing were still in that housing. He informed he would vote no on anything associated with the Cares Campus until he received more information. He relayed that constituents asked him about the expense of the Cares Campus every day and asked about the outcomes, but he had nothing to tell them.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Commissioner Garcia moved, seconded by Chair Hill, to approve Agenda Item 10. The motion failed on a 2-2 vote with Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Herman voting no.

**23-0190**      **AGENDA ITEM 15** Recommendation to approve 1) a contract with the Elections Group for an operational review of the 2022 election processes and staffing and make recommendations to the County Manager to improve the operational effectiveness and accuracy of the Washoe County election process; effective upon execution through December 31, 2023 (extensions may be allowable under certain circumstances) and; 2) if approved, approve the use of General Fund Contingency in the amount of \$100,000 needed to support Phase I of the Elections Group contract in accordance with Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354.598005 and; 3) if approved, direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget appropriation transfers and to authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the agreement. [Total Fiscal Impact \$600,000; Fiscal Years 2023 of approximately \$100,000 for Phase I and up to a maximum of \$500,000 for Fiscal Year 2024 for Phase II.] Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Clark commented he reviewed the cover page for the Elections Group and interviewed the group to discuss what he thought the County needed. He stated there were maybe 100 words on the cover page and not one of them had to do with his main focus. He declared he ran on the premise that the County needed the foundational integrity of the voter rolls to be brought up to the level of other County-maintained rolls. He thought there were some good comments about forming local groups to research the voter rolls. He listed recommendations from the Elections Group. He asserted the ballot did not mean anything if the County did not have accurate records. Until the County could fix the foundation, he was not interested in hiring outside consultants who did not hear the constituents' concerns.

Commissioner Clark shared an email exchange he had with Media and Communications Program Manager Bethany Drysdale in which he asked what committee was used to pick the Elections Group. Ms. Drysdale responded that internal staff reviewed the proposals and independently scored them. Commissioner Clark said he was told that each Commissioner was also briefed on the process results and offered the opportunity to provide feedback, and the results were provided to the Secretary of State's Office (SOS). He asserted he was not asked for any feedback. He expressed concern about how the committee was selected. He pointed out that County Manager Eric Brown and Communications Director Nancy Leuenhagen were on that committee. Commissioner Clark wondered about Ms. Leuenhagen's expertise on voting, and what she brought to the table. He said he was not picking on her, but pointed out that two people who worked under Manager Brown were on the committee to select the group. He observed that as the former Assessor, there were probably 500 interviews conducted in that department over the past eight years and he did not sit in on a single one because his staff did not want it to look like he was pressuring them to hire someone. He opined this applied to Item 15. If Manager

Brown and two of his subordinates made up the committee, Commissioner Clark wondered how the two subordinates would argue with their boss. He speculated that even if they did not like the idea, they would probably agree with whatever decision their boss made. Out of half a million people in the County, those three people picked the Elections Group. He declared it did not make a lot of sense.

Commissioner Herman said she was not talked to about the selection of the Elections Group or given any opportunity to comment on it. It was just added to the agenda, and she could not vote for it.

Commissioner Garcia stated she had an opportunity to meet with staff during her agenda review and she asked about the process. From her understanding, a couple of organizations were recommended by partners such as the International City/County Management Association (ICMA), and an internal body of three received, reviewed, and scored the applications. She had asked if that was under the purview of the County Manager and was told it was. She thought the process started back in December and continued through January and March. Having asked those questions, she felt more comfortable with this item.

Manager Brown reminded that since the December 2022 meeting after the election, he had shared in public meetings that the County planned to retain an outside resource to look at its election operations. He noted that in late January 2023, he and Registrar of Voters (ROV) Jamie Rodriguez walked the Board through a presentation to ensure that the scope of work given to the bidders addressed the key issues that the Board and the community felt were important, which included the voter rolls. It also included other items such as people in rural areas not receiving their ballots, people not getting their ballots in a timely fashion, the coordination between operational stakeholders such as the United States Postal Service (USPS), printers, and other touch points the County had to interact with to successfully execute a mail-in ballot election. He pointed out this item had not been a secret; he had been talking about it for three months.

Manager Brown informed that on December 28, 2022, he sent a message to the Board with the scope of work, indicating that the County was going to move forward with selecting one of the two firms. For those who were not sworn into office, he sent the messages to their private email so they could receive the information before taking office. He mentioned that the County arrived at the two potential companies because there were not a lot of credible firms doing this kind of work on elections. The County received recommendations from talking with the ICMA, the SOS, and other counties that had experience with the two bidders the County was considering.

Manager Brown shared the County generally did not go through a request for proposal (RFP) process for a professional services agreement, particularly if it was a specialty type of assignment such as the operational review of an election, as there were not a lot of firms that did that kind of work. It was very different from picking an accounting firm or a more standard type of professional service. There was no need to go through an RFP and Manager Brown thought time was of the essence; the County did not have long

to get its act together if it was going to improve the election process in Washoe County in the manner that the community had demanded, and the Board had asked. Staff had to invoke the right resources to get that started. It was for that reason that staff proceeded with selecting a firm and scheduling the firm to begin work the week of March 13, 2023, as that should have been the same week the approval of hiring the firm would have gone before the Board. As the Board knew, that meeting was subsequently cancelled, so Manager Brown made the decision in consultation with his finance and accounting procurement staff to move forward and limit the County's exposure in terms of monies being spent.

Manager Brown stated staff did allow the Elections Group to be on site the week of March 14, 2023. He explained the Elections Group was retained before the matter came before the Board because the Board had not met for three or four weeks, and he felt the County needed to show a sense of urgency and get things started. Regarding the accusations about Chris Piper or other principals within the firm, he stated staff saw those on social media and in their research, and they did not have any real basis for concern that those allegations would impact the Elections Group's assignment with the County. He reminded that the group was not doing election policy work for the County, it was helping the County understand what the best practices were for the handling of mail in an all-mail election, and for maintaining voter rolls. He asserted that was the kind of expertise the County needed to bring in if it was going to get where it needed to go.

Chair Hill thought Commissioner Herman might remember one of the audit committee meetings they attended in December where the Board asked for this item because it wanted to find out how the County could move forward with its elections, find out what happened in the last election, streamline processes, help staff, and support technology. Chair Hill had met with the Elections Group, and she was blown away by the staff's expertise. She informed the group was comprised of former ROVs both at the state and local county level and brought a wealth of knowledge from all over the Country, which a lot of the public commenters said they wanted to see. She felt strongly this was the right move because the County could not know what it did not know and that was what the group would help it understand. She thought having Communications staff on the team was very important. She believed communication was lacking during the elections. She thought the team that reviewed the proposals made sense and she was prepared to support this item.

Commissioner Clark reiterated he looked at the scope of work and there was nothing about cleaning up the voter rolls. He declared nothing else mattered unless the County cleared up the foundational basis. He stated Manager Brown mentioned several deficiencies and he wanted to see those in writing. He opined the County could fix some of the issues for a lot less than \$600,000. He wanted the County to fix what it could by itself and clean up the voter rolls. He declared it was premature to worry about what the County was mailing out. If the County could clean up the voter rolls, he thought it might not have to mail out so many ballots. Manager Brown directed Commissioner Clark to the bottom of the document where "technology infrastructure" was listed and informed that referred to voter rolls. He observed the County's software was antiquated and no longer supported, and the County was working on a separate tract to put in place a new voter registration system that the Board would hear about in April. Commissioner Clark thanked

Manager Brown for the explanation. He expressed frustration about the terminology that was used rather than stating “Clean up the voter rolls.”

On the call for public comment, Ms. Tracey Thomas displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. She referenced Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 245.070. She asserted Manager Brown had engaged with the Elections Group without authorization and had already begun implementation of the group’s solution which was evident in Item 19. She wondered if staff pursued the vendor or if there were any open RFPs and noted Manager Brown had already answered that question. She inquired how many vendors were considered or researched and if two were enough. She asked about the scope of work, noting there was an attachment to the agenda that she would review. She questioned who funded the vendors and why there was no option to have input from two vendors to remove bias. She referenced NRS 244.1615. While the vendor had met with a few residents to gain insight into current operations within the ROV Office, there was no inclusion of the development of the policies and procedures. She declared there was an abundance of residents wanting to be part of the process; however, the opportunity had been provided inequitably across the spectrum. She requested that the Board obtain buy-in from its primary stakeholders, the residents of Washoe County, before approving any phase of the recommended plan. She suggested that community meetings be held to discuss solutions. She claimed staff had established a pattern of withholding information from the Commissioners and the public until the last minute to place the Board in a position where it had to approve whatever was being requested. She declared the antic must change and could only do so when the Board started to push back.

Mr. Michael Smith and Mr. Gary Butcher were not present when called to speak.

Ms. Stacey Piro shared she had been a resident of Washoe County since 1972 and she had concerns about this agenda item. She thought it should alarm the Board that the Manager solicited and selected the group to provide an overview of the County’s 2020 election. She asserted the group had been working for two months without a contract. If this agenda item did not pass, she wondered who would pay for the two months of work the Elections Group had already done. She wanted to know if there was a bid maximum and thought \$600,000 sounded like a lot of money. She declared this item was an evaluation of a procedure, not an evaluation of an election, and the County did not need election-specific people to evaluate its program. She thought the ROV Office and its new staff were more than qualified. She informed there were people in the community who were more than willing to work with the ROV to figure things out. She declared someone in her group made the flow chart that the ROV had been using to show people how the ballots proceeded. She asserted the County did not need to spend \$600,000. She said if the Board really wanted to spend that much money, she would take it and work with the ROV to get the situation figured out.

Ms. Cindy Martinez informed that when she was preparing an alert to send out to her broadcast group, she read the agenda and the supporting documents. She expressed concern that the Elections Group conducted a preliminary investigation or

interview with people. She watched the January presentation given by ROV Jamie Rodriguez and viewed the proposed organizational chart and the stated goals and objectives. She observed that all five Commissioners were present at that meeting. She thanked Manager Brown for the background and Chair Hill for providing additional information. She declared she was comfortable and confident in the Elections Group; she looked at it in the scope of elections management and examining policies and procedures. She wanted a better explanation of the funds that could be spent. She reiterated she felt comfortable and confident in supporting this item and urged the Board to vote in favor of retaining the firm.

Mr. Cliff Nellis claimed the Elections Group was a leftist organization. He declared he spent a lot of time observing elections and he would do it for \$50,000 and save the County \$550,000. He stated no meaningful observation occurred in the observation area, known as the fishbowl, as there was no way to really see what was going on. He opined there was no way to verify that the ballots were valid because the observers could not see the signature verification. He declared that during the 2020 election, observers only saw the back of the monitors, they were not allowed to see the signatures. He described the observation process and opined staff could have easily put the monitors in front of the fishbowl so people could see. He thought observers should be able to move around the room and look at what was going on without disturbing things. He opposed this item and thought the Elections Group would waste County money, was a leftist organization, and would not make any improvements. He recalled saying that the County needed a Republican ROV to actually make some changes. He asked the Board to vote against this item.

Ms. Sandee Tibbett displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. She expressed appreciation for Commissioner Clark's comments and disliked Manager Brown's comments. She said she did her own research online and concluded that the Elections Group was an organization that was formed to help counties conduct voter fraud under the guise of improving the operational effectiveness and accuracy of the county election process. She spoke about articles she found during her research. She wondered about Washoe County entering into a contract with this group as the 2024 presidential election approached. She asked if the Board had visited the Elections Group's website and declared she could not take it seriously. She spoke about Jennifer Morrell and Noah Praetz and asserted the group had contracts with counties that were epicenters of rampant voter fraud. She did not think Washoe County needed out-of-state consulting services from the Elections Group. She stated the people of Washoe County already provided the solutions to the failing election process, such as cleaning the voter rolls, ensuring all eligible Washoe County residents registered to vote, having everyone vote at their precinct using paper ballots on the same day, and counting the votes at the precinct level. She asserted this would save the County \$600,000. She declared the machines needed to be eliminated to rebuild the trust of the Washoe County voters. She asked Manager Brown if he was putting the cart before the horse by allowing the Elections Group to start Phase 1 before the Board voted to approve the contract. She claimed this was a violation and Manager Brown needed to be held accountable.

Chair Hill requested that commenters address their statements to the Board as a whole.

Ms. Renee Rezendes informed she was one of the community members who was interviewed by the Elections Group. She reported the group vetted the people it interviewed and informed the interviewees it had done so. The Elections Group watched all the Commission meetings where people had given their testimonies and opinions, but Ms. Rezendes knew nothing about the group or its purpose in advance. She expressed frustration that she was unable to vet the Elections Group. She declared she opposed this item. She thanked Commissioner Clark for asking questions. She read a letter she received from Janet Butcher that indicated Ms. Butcher's desire for the Board to vote no on funding the group until it was fully investigated and to pursue other solutions. Ms. Rezendes stated she had a lot of questions and she had approached Manager Brown with several of them. She felt she received a lot of excuses, and nothing was settled. She declared the County did have to make things better but not by doing this or by spending so much money.

Mr. Nicholas St. Jon responded to Chair Hill's comment, "We do not know what we do not know," and opined she was mistaken. He observed people had been appearing before the Board for two years to discuss election issues and suggestions and they had been ignored. He declared there had been a resolution that was voted down and while he understood there was talk about another resolution, he did not know when that would happen. He thanked Commissioner Clark for his comments. He shared he had been working on election integrity issues with some of the top people in the County. He opined that if the County had reached out to Mike Lindell's group, Mr. Lindell could have put together a stellar team that would have discovered the root of the problems and created solutions. He mentioned the Heritage Foundation and guessed it probably was not approached either. He expressed frustration that only two groups were identified, and the selected group was chosen by a team of one or two people from the Office of the County Manager (OCM). He recommended the Board vote no on the contract. He noted the Elections Group had been working in the County for two weeks and thought the group would be upset that it did not get paid, but it did not have a contract. He asserted the people were kept in the dark about this item when he inquired about it the Monday before people were interviewed by the Elections Group. He declared it was not that the Board did not know, it was just that the Board was not listening.

Ms. Penny Brock asked what references the County received for the Elections Group and noted she looked over the contract and did not see any. She expressed concern about Mr. Piper. She asked if there were contracts for the Elections Group in other counties and how the County could justify \$600,000 for the scope of work. She inquired about bids from other vendors. She discussed the elections item from the January 2023 workshop. She displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. She asserted the retention of the group should have gone before the Commission at a public meeting so the people could provide input. She stated Phase 1 of the project was the on-site assessment which was currently underway and noted the group would tentatively be paid \$10,000 on March 17, 2023, for that work. She wanted to know who made that commitment to the Elections Group. She expressed concern that the Elections Group wanted to connect the

ROV with resources from partner organizations she had provided a list of to the Board that morning. She declared the partner organizations were leftist, communist organizations.

Mr. Alan Munson stated he was a resident of the City of Sparks. Due to the comments he had heard that day, he thought it would be wise for the Board not to move forward with Item 15. He read the County's mission statement and said it did not seem like the County was working together on this item. He recalled Program Assistant Alex Wilson's presentation and asked why it was imperative to hear whom the Board would appoint to a committee or commission, but it was not imperative to hear whom the Board would have look at the County's election process. He hoped the Board would vote no on this item and try to find something that worked for the entire community. He informed he had a master's degree in social policy and claimed society was falling apart because people were not listening to each other, they were fighting. He liked Gary Butcher's suggestion about having an elections advisory board. Mr. Munson hoped the Board heard his words and that his words made sense.

Mr. Marshall Todd disclosed he was the chairman of the Warm Springs Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) but was not present in an official capacity. He recommended the Board approve Item 15 because the people who were hired were experts and were studying processes, not pushing the election one way or the other. He declared a person's politics did not matter if they were hired by the County and contracted to do something. He asserted the people who complained and demanded this level of oversight were the ones who lost the election. He informed he had been a voter for 58 years and had heard of almost no voter fraud in the entire Country, but he had heard of voter suppression everywhere. He opined bringing in an outside consultant to do the work ensured that the process was fair. He urged the Board to pass this item, bring the group on board, and complete the study to remove the idea from public discussion that elections were stolen. He declared there were no stolen elections, there were lost elections because people had bad ideas.

Ms. Val White claimed that the Center for Tech and Civic Life (CTCL), which was funded by Mark Zuckerberg, did a lot of meaningful work for the Democrats to make the previous elections unfair. She mentioned Elon Musk's comments about the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) being a propaganda platform that colluded with federal law enforcement. She opined that the previous speaker did not receive a wide range of news. She spoke about deomcracyfund.org, the National Vote at Home Institute (NVAHI), U.S. Digital Response (USDR), and CISA. She quoted Chris Krebs from CISA regarding the 2020 election being secure and she asserted the people knew that was a lie. She suggested the previous speaker do some research. She expressed concern about the Elections Group being given access to any spaces in the County Complex. She implored the Board not to approve the execution of the agreement and declared there had been zero transparency for constituents. She asked about the Elections Group's complete scope and believed it was not being shared with anyone. She recalled Manager Brown stated it was standard operating procedure not to go through an RFP and expressed concern about his level of control. She claimed there was zero faith in the integrity and honesty of the entire elections department. She declared she could address

her comments to any of the Board members she wished, and reminded Chair Hill that she could not control her speech.

Mr. Emiliano Pasillas declared the 2020 election was his first time voting in the United States (U.S.). Mr. Pasillas stated democracy and voting transparency were very important to him. He did not want to vote because he thought his vote did not count. He suggested the County use paper ballots and signature verification. He believed Texas and Florida had excellent voting systems and Nevada did not. He expressed frustration about the length of time it took for Nevada to submit its election results. He did not know who the Elections Group was and thought the Board had a responsibility to find out who the group was and if it had any bias. He thought the Board also had a responsibility to the citizens of Washoe County to provide results. He reiterated the Board needed to find out who the group was and thought the Board should consider looking at other options.

Commissioner Garcia moved, seconded by Chair Hill, to approve Agenda Item 15. The motion failed on a 2-2 vote with Commissioner Clark and Commissioner Herman voting no.

Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nate Edwards stated he did not have commentary on the outcome of the vote, the Board made the decisions. He did want to comment on the record that there were questions brought up about Manager Brown's authority to engage the Elections Group on a preliminary basis before the Board approved. Regardless of whether the Board supported or did not support the engagement of the group under the contract, Manager Brown did have the authority under the Purchasing Chapter in the Washoe County Code (WCC). Chair Hill thanked ADA Edwards for the clarification.

**23-0191**      **AGENDA ITEM 19** Recommendation to approve a job classification title change from Assistant Registrar of Voters to Deputy Registrar of Voters; and to approve the creation of one new full-time Deputy Registrar of Voters position, pay grade P (\$132,785); the creation of one new full-time Administrative Assistant I position, pay grade K(\$102,329); and one new full-time Department Systems Specialist position, pay grade KL(\$108,688) (Registrar of Voters) as reviewed and evaluated by the Job Evaluation Committee (JEC); and authorize Human Resources to make the necessary changes. [Total fiscal impact \$343,802; Fiscal Year 2023 impact \$85,951]. Registrar of Voters. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill asked the members of the Board if they wanted a staff presentation to which they responded no.

Chair Hill indicated she had a few questions regarding the second deputy and asked for clarification about how the duties would be split. Registrar of Voters (ROV) Jamie Rodriguez informed the proposed organizational chart was included with the Staff Report. She directed the Board to the third page to view a breakdown of the positions and observed each of the bullet points was an individual. Chair Hill said she did not see what the second deputy would do. Ms. Rodriguez opined that when looking at the department

as a whole, there were really two divisions, voter registration and operations, and election centers. She said the department was looking to separate the divisions so it could have more resources available, noting that the department did have a very small full-time staff. For an election season, the department could have up to 20 temporary employees inside the actual ROV Office who needed to have resources and educational information made available to them. The vote center side included all in-person voting and management of the equipment and sites. The department averaged about 500 poll workers per election. She shared the department received a lot of feedback from poll workers during the primary regarding training inconsistencies which the department made some adjustments for. A lot of the complaints she heard during the general election related to a lack of resources or a lack of clarity and communication. Having more staff dedicated to each side of the department, rather than people being expected to understand everything, would allow for the development of teams as well as cross-training. She opined turnover was happening nationwide and she did not know if it would stop any time soon, so more people were needed who really understood the processes and procedures to be able to manage the department.

Ms. Rodriguez observed the reason she was asking for this outside of the budget cycle was because if she waited the department would be hiring people a couple months before the first election in the 2024 cycle. As the department was creating better policies and procedures and transitioning to new voter registration equipment management systems, she thought it would be beneficial to have those people on board now so they could help create those policies and procedures. Chair Hill stated that information was helpful because the document said Assistant ROV and it had the two bullet points, but it did not say what they would do. Now she had a better understanding of what Ms. Rodriguez wanted. Ms. Rodriguez informed bullet points were also used to identify the responsibilities of each of the Department Systems Specialists.

Commissioner Clark asked who was on the job evaluation committee (JEC). Ms. Rodriguez deferred the question to the Human Resources (HR) Department. HR Manager of Compensation and Recruitment Julie Paholke informed the JEC was made up of a number of representatives of the different bargaining units and a department head, noting this was per the contract and pursuant to the Washoe County Handbook. Commissioner Clark asked for the names of the people on the committee. Ms. Paholke stated she did not know all of them off the top of her head, but she would be happy to provide them to Commissioner Clark later. Commissioner Clark asked how someone could get on the committee. Ms. Paholke informed each of the associations were able to appoint someone to the committee and if that person needed to leave for some reason, they could be replaced. Commissioner Clark asked for a list of the names of people who had been placed on the committee. Ms. Paholke stated as long as the information was public knowledge, she would provide the information.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Tracey Thomas referenced Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 245.070. She thought it was apparent staff had already received a portion of the recommendation the vendor was making before the Commissioners had even authorized the contract. She declared Commissioners were entitled to an opportunity to

review all the information before making a decision. She did not think Commissioners could be expected to make prudent decisions on behalf of taxpayers if they were not provided ample time to consult with the community and research the information for themselves. She declared Commissioners could not be expected to approve the implementation of recommendations when they had not been provided with the report of recommendations. She opined there was also no justification for the starting salaries of the requested positions, and staff was not being transparent about why those positions might have been challenging to fill. She believed Commissioners needed to hear directly from former staff as to the reasons for their departures and opined it was not because of the positions themselves but rather the supervision of the positions. She observed current salaries for an Administrative Assistant I (AAI) position on the County's website showed a range of \$60,632 to \$78,894.40 which was quite a difference from the figure shown in the Staff Report. She wondered if people were supposed to assume that the figure included health benefits. She asked which position would send the postcards she mentioned previously, and which position would work with the Assessor's Office to validate residential addresses listed on voter rolls.

Ms. Cindy Martinez displayed an image, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She declared the Kool-Aid only worked if everyone drank it. She spoke about a cease-and-desist letter she received from Robert Beadles. She indicated she received the letter because she challenged Mr. Beadles' presentations in January and February. Based on the County's presentation and what the ROV was trying to accomplish, she believed the County needed to assemble a competent staff to execute and implement elections. She declared she would follow the evidence wherever it led even if it contradicted her own beliefs, desires, and biases. She wanted to see the ROV equipped with the supplies, resources, and staffing that it needed. She informed she was on the campaign trail the previous year and had spoken to many voters who were disillusioned, disappointed, and fearful of whether it would make an impact to show up at the polls. She asserted people had to stop injecting chaos and distrust into the system. She supported the Board in doing what it needed to do to assist Ms. Rodriguez.

Mr. J.S. McElhinney was not present when called to speak.

Ms. Penny Brock expressed concern about the proposed salaries for the requested positions. She looked through the Staff Report and did not find anything about qualifications or requirements. She asked the Board to vote no on this item as proposed and to take another look at the salaries. She asked if there were additional benefits on top of those salaries. She thought the positions were in the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) and questioned if the taxpayers would have to pay for any of the benefits a County employee received. She spoke about taxes and indicated there was a bill in the Legislature to raise the cap from 3 percent to 8 percent. She asserted this was the age of heavy inflation, the banks were collapsing, people were beginning to be laid off, and the County needed to spend tax dollars wisely.

Ms. Renee Rezendes wanted to address the positions in this item. She informed she was a poll worker and thought some of the money could be spent to train the poll workers so they knew what was actually going on in the processing room. She stated they could not see anything in the room. She reiterated some of the money could be used to train poll workers to use the experience they already had to make the process better for the voters and the counting of votes. She did not think there was another group of people that was more abused than the poll watchers. She observed she was told to go to Manpower to apply to be a poll worker in the ROV Office. She declared if the County did not follow policies and procedures there would be chaos. She asserted Mr. Beadles offered \$80,000 to anyone who could dispute his facts about the machines and voter integrity, and no one had been able to claim it.

Ms. Val White addressed previous comments. As far as she knew, cease-and-desist orders were only delivered when a law had been broken. She informed she worked in public schools and had seen the same thing there that she saw happening in the County. She opined managers of a department or a district needed to surround themselves with Colonels, in this case, Deputy ROVs, to keep them safe from reports of poor job performance. She opposed the recommendation for additional employees, but if it passed, she would like to know that they were local residents. Regarding the claims that evidence was followed by individuals with law enforcement experience, she declared that was false and provided an example of accusations made against former Commissioner Vaughn Hartung. Ms. White urged the Commission not to fund the new positions and asserted it was a lot of money to give to a department that was not truly active all year long. She believed the Electronic Registration Information Center (ERIC) system needed to be eliminated.

Mr. Cliff Nellis stated he was a 47-year resident of Washoe County, and he had a suggestion for the Board. He thought it appeared that the Board was up to about \$1 million in recurring expenses for the new employees. He observed the system was complex and there were hundreds of precincts in the County. All those ballots had to go to one central location to be sorted and verified, which created a massive amount of work. He opined this could be solved by using paper ballots, voting at the precinct level, and hand counting the ballots on Election Day only. He stated there were approximately 300,000 voters in the County. He asserted the County only needed 100 polling places and each person should be assigned one place to go. He explained how the hand-counting process would work and who could count the ballots. He suggested declaring Election Day as a national or State holiday so employers had to let people off work so they could vote. He also suggested opening the Saturday prior to Election Day for early voting if people had to vote on the weekends. He thought his ideas would save a lot of money.

Commissioner Herman mentioned she had been through a lot of elections, and they used to be simple. She praised Mr. Nellis' comment.

Commissioner Garcia moved, seconded by Chair Hill, to approve Agenda Item 19. The motion failed on a 2-2 vote, with Commissioner Herman and Commissioner Clark voting no.

**23-0192**      **AGENDA ITEM 20** Discussion and direction to staff regarding legislation or legislative issues proposed by legislators, by Washoe County, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District, or by other entities permitted by the Nevada State Legislature to submit bill draft requests, or such legislative issues as may be deemed by the Chair or the Board to be of critical significance to Washoe County. Pending legislative bills can be located here: <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/82nd2023>. Current bills the County is tracking that may be reported on or discussed are listed under Government Affairs at [www.washoecounty.gov](http://www.washoecounty.gov). Due to time constraints inherent in the legislative process, a list of specific bills that staff will seek direction from the Commission on during this item will be posted on the web site under Government Affairs at [www.washoecounty.gov](http://www.washoecounty.gov) by 6:00 p.m. the Friday before the meeting. Due to the rapid pace of the legislative session, additional bills upon which comment may be sought from the Board of County Commissioners will be posted as soon as known. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Government Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevich expressed appreciation for the opportunity to participate remotely as it was a busy week at the Legislature. She said the Board had been provided with a report and said a list of the bills the County was tracking was available on the County's website. Additionally, the County was seeking an official policy position from the Commission on six bills. She indicated she would be happy to review the general report, provide an overview of the bills, and take questions on each of them.

Commissioner Clark commented he wanted to receive additional information and clarification regarding Assembly Bill (AB) 92 which dealt with the appointment of a County attorney and AB175 regarding appointing non-voting members to the school board. He suggested these items be agendized for the next meeting. Chair Hill inquired whether Commissioner Clark preferred to wait until the Board could take action on these items at the next meeting to which Commissioner Clark replied yes.

Ms. Matijevich stated AB298, sponsored by Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, would revise provisions governing housing. Section 3 of the bill would exempt the real property transfer tax between the time period of July 1, 2023, and December 31, 2024. Ms. Matijevich explained the County collected real-property transfer tax which was administered by the Recorder's Office. Washoe County collected roughly 13 percent of the real-property transfer tax collected statewide and in fiscal year (FY) 2022 the total collections were \$45 million, \$16.5 million of which was distributed to governmental entities in Washoe County. The Recorder's Office had analyzed the bill and estimated that 70 percent of that \$16.5 million was for primary residences that would be exempt under the bill. A net impact to entities in Washoe County would be approximately \$11.6 million for the full year, with half of that in the second half of the current year from the period of July 1, 2023, to December 31, 2023. Additionally, some of those monies were distributed to the State general fund and allocated to low-income housing. Staff believed that those distributions would be impacted by the bill as well.

Chair Hill expressed concern and thought the Commission should weigh in on the bill as a Board. She did not see the nexus and why people should be excused from the tax since it would affect the County's general fund greatly.

Commissioner Clark clarified that AB298 would reduce some income to the County and since the Board was in favor of affordable housing, he wanted to look at ways to save people money. He said there was an opportunity to capture sales tax from those who spent money in the community which would be regenerated over time. He thought the circulated money helped the working poor and declared he was in favor of the bill.

Chair Hill asked for other comments from the Board and stated there was not a lot of passion regarding the bill. She asked Ms. Matijevich to go to the next bill, AB356.

Ms. Matijevich stated AB356 was brought forward by a bi-partisan group of legislators and pointed the Board to the Staff Report for the names of those in the group. The bill would enact provisions relating to mobile tracking devices. She stated the bill was introduced on March 22, 2023, and was scheduled for a hearing very quickly thereafter. She explained the bill expressly provided that a person committed the crime of unlawful installation of a mobile tracking device if the person installed, concealed or otherwise placed a mobile tracking device in or on the motor vehicle of another person without the knowledge and consent of an owner or lessor of the motor vehicle, unless the person was a law enforcement officer who installed, concealed or otherwise placed the mobile tracking device pursuant to a warrant or court order, was the manufacturer of the motor vehicle, or were certain creditors. The bill provided that a person who committed any such offense was guilty of a misdemeanor for the first offense, of a gross misdemeanor for the second offense, and for the third or any subsequent offense, a category C felony.

Commissioner Clark commented that many people in the County did not realize it, but many of the County vehicles already had trackers on them. When he was the Assessor, it had been brought to his attention that a County employee was taking three to four-hour lunches on a regular basis which was discovered due to a tracking device. He was unsure whether many County employees were aware of this, but he wanted it to be on the record that the County employed tracking devices.

Chair Hill remarked this was interesting and asked Ms. Matijevich if the bill addressed employers placing tracking devices on vehicles they owned. Ms. Matijevich responded the bill would address a tracking device that was installed on the motor vehicle of another person. If the motor vehicle belonged to the employer, and it was issued to the employee for use in the course of their duties, that would not be covered by the bill.

Commissioner Clark clarified he did not mean to insinuate there were any violations by the County. He asserted that trackers had been a hot-button issue and he wanted to ensure County employees knew they were likely being tracked. He knew a lot of rental car companies used trackers and he wanted it to be on the record that many employers also utilized trackers. He commented about facial recognition software, stating

that during COVID-19 (C19) casinos were monitoring people's temperatures as they entered those buildings. He asserted people should be aware that there were cameras, microphones, and tracking devices everywhere.

Commissioner Herman observed the bill was pretty specific; however, she was unsure if it was good to take away someone's method of making a living.

Commissioner Garcia stated she was supportive of AB356 and was happy to see that it received bi-partisan support. She did not listen to the hearing but spoke with Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch who told her that some of the comments received were in relation to victims of domestic violence. Some individuals had been adversely affected by tracking devices that had been placed on their vehicles without their knowledge, so she was very much in support of the Bill.

Chair Hill stated she was also in support of the bill. She thought it was important that people knew when the tracking was happening, especially by a private investigator. She stated privacy was being violated and she wanted to see the bill move forward.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Val White declared that the legislation was created for Mayor Hillary Schieve because a private investigator legally and lawfully placed a tracking device on her car. She asserted that Mayor Schieve pressured the police department to appease her requests. She opined private investigators did a great deal of good and asserted one individual's desire not to be tracked should not supersede the good work that private investigators all over the State did. She asked the Board not to support the bill.

Ms. Penny Brock thanked the Board for allowing her to speak on this issue. She stated there were some bills that she did not see on the list but wanted the Board to consider. She commented on AB242 regarding voting by electronic voting machines and said she wanted to preserve the right to vote via paper ballots. She requested the Board not support this bill. Additionally, she remarked on AB246 which would require election materials to be printed in nine languages. She recalled a time when people had to vote in English and wondered why people were trying to divide the Country. She asked the Board to take a stand against this bill. She said she was passionate about Senate Bill (SB) 54 which proposed a top-down election process. She said the bill proposed that the Secretary of State (SOS) alone would prepare a manual and determine what happened with elections, which she opined was wrong because it would not provide for any accountability. She wanted it to stay as a bottom-up process so the people at the local level could decide how they wanted to vote. She asked the Commissioners not to support this bill.

Ms. Debra Sauk spoke in opposition to the legislation regarding tracking devices. She asserted anyone who owned a cell phone was carrying a tracking device, so the bill was kind of oxymoronic. She thought the bill was useless and not worth the paper it was printed on.

Commissioner Garcia moved, seconded by Chair Hill, to support AB356. The motion failed on a vote of 2-2, with Commissioner Herman and Commissioner Clark voting no.

Ms. Matijevich stated the next bill staff had identified for the Board to consider taking a position on was Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 5. This was brought forward by the Legislative Committee for the review and oversight of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and the Marlette Lake Water System. The bill expressed support for the Lake Tahoe Transportation Action Plan. The bill was not yet scheduled for a hearing. She mentioned the deadline for bill introductions was March 27; therefore, the Legislature had been very busy since there were over 130 new bills that were being worked through. She remarked ACR5 resolved that the members of the 82nd Session of the Nevada Legislature recognized and expressed support for the Lake Tahoe Transportation Action Plan and further expressed support for the funding of high-priority transportation projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. It also directed the Chief Clerk of the Assembly to prepare and transmit a copy of the resolution to a number of different governmental entities and to each member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Matijevich for the summary. She stated she was working very hard to find transportation solutions in the Tahoe Basin. She believed the resolution would provide support and funding for solutions to ensure there was transportation to go all around the lake, and on ferries across the lake, to reduce vehicle miles traveled within Lake Tahoe. That was why she asked for the bill to come to the Board and opined it would be great if the Board could support the resolution.

Commissioner Clark stated since it was Chair Hill's district, he would defer to her and support her position on the resolution. He would like to see good transportation around Lake Tahoe as it was a place he avoided in the summer due to the congestion. He thought anything that the Board could do to relieve congestion would be much appreciated. Chair Hill thanked Commissioner Clark for his support and stated it meant a lot to her.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that ACR5 be supported.

Ms. Matijevich stated SB263 was brought forth by a bi-partisan group of legislators who were representatives of the Washoe legislative delegation. She pointed the Board to the Staff Report for a list of the names of those in the group. She informed the bill would make an appropriation to the Children's Cabinet for the purchase and renovation of a parcel of land to carry out the Oddie project. The bill would appropriate from the State general fund to the Children's Cabinet the sum of \$8 million for the purchase of land and any buildings thereon and the sum of \$4 million for the renovations by the Children's Cabinet of the parcel of land and any buildings thereon. She explained while it would make an appropriation from the State general fund, the bill was not something that was included

in Governor Joe Lombardo's budget as it was introduced. It would need to go through the process to have an appropriation.

Commissioner Garcia stated the bill was the brainchild of Executive Director Nicole Lamboley of the Food Bank of Northern Nevada (FBNN). The plan was to use the shell of an old grocery store that had not been utilized and convert it into one-of-a-kind spaces that could help target the highest-need population in one of the highest-need zip codes. The FBNN would provide access to food as well as a culinary area for workforce development on-site. She toured the project site which would be designated for the Children's Cabinet as well as related wraparound services. There would also be dedicated space for the Boys and Girls Club to help address childcare needs. She opined it was one of the most exciting projects she had seen, and she could not convey how needed it was. The Board had been very supportive of ensuring that constituents were receiving access to childcare, food, and mental health services. She hoped her colleagues would join her in supporting the bill.

Commissioner Clark stated he wanted to defer to Commissioner Garcia as the project was in her district and he supported her initiative.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Clark, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that SB263 be supported.

Ms. Matijevich stated SB368 was brought forward by Senators Dallas Harris, Pat Spearman, Fabian Doñate, Dina Neal, Nicole Cannizzaro, Skip Daly, Marilyn Dondero Loop, Edgar Flores, Roberta Lange, Rochelle Nguyen, Julie Pazina, and Melanie Scheible. The bill's provisions were related to real property and dealt with discriminatory language that was contained in property records and was something that the Board had identified as a priority item. Initially, the bill was targeted to be submitted as one of Washoe County's bills but when it was learned that Senator Harris had the bill, it was determined there was no need to duplicate efforts. She informed that the bill would make some amendments to the current provisions that allowed property owners to file declarations to remove discriminatory restrictions or prohibitions on property records. It would set forth a new process whereby the property owner, or other interested persons, could petition the District Court to request that the court issue an order directing the County Recorder to redact from the original written instrument a restriction or prohibition that was void and unenforceable by operation of law. She clarified the redaction would be made to the copies made of the original instrument and said the bill sponsor had made it clear there was no desire to mark up the original document. However, on any copies of it that were distributed for purposes of a transfer of property, the unlawful, discriminatory language would be redacted. The bill would also make conforming changes to update the provisions that had been enacted previously. It would require the County Recorder to provide notice to anyone who had previously filed a declaration form that was in place at the time. Ms. Matijevich mentioned the bill would allow an interested person to petition the court for this. The bill defined an interested person as the owner or owners of the property, a representative of a

common interest community if the real property was located within a common interest community, or a non-profit organization or academic institution whose mission in whole or in part was to combat discrimination based on race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, familial status, sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity or expression. She believed the bill's provisions would allow a non-profit group or an educational institution like the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) to bring some of them forward in bulk to avoid placing the responsibility on the individual property owners. If a property owner did not wish to have their property record amended, they would be able to opt out of being included in any such filing. She mentioned the County Recorder wished to modify some of the language related to some procedural details and had been in contact with the bill's sponsor. Ms. Matijevich had offered support to help work through any amendments.

Chair Hill stated the Board had brought this bill to the Legislature with language that would essentially allow the County Commission to decide to redact the documents; however, she noted there had been obvious changes. She appreciated that UNR could be involved and knew of a professor who was very interested in collecting information about the properties, so people did not forget their history. She thought there was something cool about that added element.

Commissioner Clark did not believe there should be any discrimination in property ownership and believed it could hurt someone. He stated he supported this bill and he thought the Board should defer to the County Recorder and listen to her suggestions as she was the subject matter expert. He was curious to know what would happen in a situation where someone was refinancing their property or when there was an inheritance. He thought there were multiple ways a document might rise to the surface. He reiterated he would like to hear from the County Recorder, but said he supported the idea.

Commissioner Garcia acknowledged that County Recorder Kalie Work should have an opportunity to weigh in on the bill and thought it sounded like she had. Commissioner Garcia stated she was supportive of SB368.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Clark, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that SB368 be supported.

Ms. Matijevich stated SB371 was brought forth by the Senate Committee on Government Affairs and would revise provisions governing local government. She informed the bill would authorize a board of county commissioners and a governing body of an incorporated city, except as expressly prohibited by statute, to enact any ordinance or measure related to affordable housing including, without limitation, rent control.

Chair Hill stated when she and Commissioner Herman conversed about the bill, Commissioner Herman thought it would be a good discussion for the Board to have. She recalled informing Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nate Edwards that she had received questions from constituents about rent control. Although the issue was not

currently spelled out in State law, she thought the County Commission could consider it. She asked ADA Edwards if the bill would give authority to local governments because she thought it sounded like that was the Legislature's intention.

ADA Edwards stated he would provide some background information on the bill. He thought there had been quite a bit of discussion about whether the Legislature could create a mechanism in State law or whether it could be done by the local governments. There had been a difference of opinion between some government attorneys. One said, under a modified Dillon's Rule, it was already something the localities could do; however, others said they could not unless they had authorization from the Legislature. He thought the issue had evaporated into ambiguity and so had been brought back to the present legislative session. He thought the bill was designed to authorize local governments to enact it if they wanted, but asked Ms. Matijevich to correct him if he was wrong about that.

Commissioner Clark understood people were interested in rent control and he thought it could be the fix that was needed. As a lifelong real-estate broker, he stated he had seen many studies that claimed rent control did not work as landlords stopped reinvesting in their properties which created urban blight. He did not think rent control ever did what it was supposed to do, and it created unintended consequences. He said he could not support the bill.

Chair Hill stated she heard what Commissioner Clark was saying and thought because the bill would create enabling language, she did not necessarily feel like the Board needed to take a position on the bill. She suggested the Board could see how it shook out at the Legislature.

Commissioner Clark responded the only reason he would encourage the Board to take a position other than neutral would be to send a message that the Board did not necessarily support it.

Chair Hill stated she was not prepared to take a motion on the item. She felt that she wanted to wait and see how the discussions shook out.

Commissioner Garcia informed while she was running for election the previous year, rent control came up a lot on the campaign trail. She thought the bill was addressing the ambiguity that ADA Edwards had mentioned. She declared the Board had been in limbo for a long time and she was supportive of Chair Hill's idea to let the bill lie. She thought it would bode well if there was a clearer role or definition of what the Board could do. She did not want to weigh in on whether she was pro or against the actual issue, but she thought it was something that needed to be defined.

Chair Hill shared her concerns about saying no because the bill was enabling. The Board had many partner jurisdictions that might be interested in the legislation because it might work for them. She said if it did enable the Board then there could be further discussions down the road.

Commissioner Clark asked ADA Edwards' opinion on whether it would violate Open Meeting Law (OML) if he provided some information to ADA Edwards with a request to distribute it to the rest of the Board. ADA Edwards wanted to clarify if Commissioner Clark was meaning offline, or after the meeting, to which Commissioner Clark responded yes. Commissioner Clark said he was referring to the studies he had mentioned. The purpose, he said, was to ensure the other Commissioners had the information. ADA Edwards responded he wished to ponder the question, to which Commissioner Clark stated he did not need an immediate answer.

Ms. Matijevich asked that as the Board continued the discussion and determined its desire from a policy perspective, she wanted to point out that while the bill called out rent control as one measure, the bill encompassed any measure or ordinance related to affordable housing. She cautioned if the Board determined it wanted to take a position at the current meeting or in the future, that it should be clear whether its support or opposition pertained to certain components of the legislation or to the broader legislation regarding affordable housing. ADA Edwards stated this was a good point. He said if the Board wanted to, it could carve out pieces of the bill it supported or opposed rather than stating a blanket position.

Chair Hill appreciated the suggestions and indicated she wanted to wait and watch the bill as it moved through some of the hearings to get a better perspective before making a motion. She said she was feeling neutral on the item, but other Commissioners could make a motion if they desired. She was interested in watching how the bill progressed and said she would be happy to see the information Commissioner Clark mentioned regarding rent control and other affordable housing measures.

Commissioner Clark thanked Ms. Matijevich for the clarification. He stated it changed his view on the bill, but he still wanted to make sure that the other Commissioners understood more about rent control. He said he wanted everyone to be apprised of the pros and cons.

ADA Edwards informed he had pondered Commissioner Clark's question and one way to accommodate the request was to see if Ms. Matijevich would bring the bill back again to the next meeting. Commissioner Clark could distribute his information through Ms. Matijevich and the Office of the County Manager (OCM) so that it could be made a part of the agenda packet. Chair Hill agreed this was a great idea.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Tracey Thomas wanted to provide input from her personal experience at the Legislature. She said if the members of the Board did not agree with a bill 100 percent, then they would be opposed to it. They could not say they liked one part but not another. If the Commissioners did not like any part of the bill, then they would be marked as opposed and would not have a choice. Although, they could oppose the bill with recommended amendments. If there were amendments the Commissioners wanted to make, they could put those forward.

Chair Hill thanked Ms. Thomas for her comment and stated Ms. Matijevich had been teaching her about this because there were bills that she liked certain elements of, but not all. She knew that different committees had very strict rules on those things.

Mr. Marshall Todd suggested rather than rent control, maybe the Board should suggest an anti-gouging bill because, he asserted, permanent rent control did not work. He believed there were times when people needed to be held back and he thought an anti-gouging provision would be useful.

Mr. Cliff Nellis stated rent control was another leftist technique to solve the problem. He said he sympathized with people who had excessively high rents and opined that rent and the housing market had turned into the new stock market. He said hedge funds, BlackRock, Vanguard, and other companies were buying properties that they were not going to live in so they could flip them and make a lot of money off them. He asserted that rent and housing was more affordable three or four years prior, but then suddenly increased. He provided an example of a Texas subdivision that was purchased for double the price and stated BlackRock and Vanguard owned a huge amount of residential property. He surmised the solution was to disallow non-homeowners from buying residential properties. He spoke about the astronomical cost of rent and suggested the Legislature should do something about this.

**23-0193**      **AGENDA ITEM 22** Public Hearing: Second reading and adoption of an Ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 adopting a development agreement as required by the Warm Springs Specific Plan (WSSP) at WSSP.8.1, to utilize the regulatory zone designation specified on the Warm Springs Specific Plan - Land Use Plan for:

Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM22-0012 (Feickert) - Which is a tentative parcel map dividing a 40.43-acre parcel (APN 077-560-05) into four parcels of 10.02 acres, 10.04 acres, 10.07 acres, and 10.30 acres.

In order to develop any property in the WSSP more densely than General Rural (1 dwelling unit/40 acres), the specific plan requires that a development agreement be approved. Among other things, the development agreement adopts development standards for the property in conformance with the Warm Springs Specific Plan Development Standards Handbook Framework, a component of the Washoe County Master Plan, such as standards relating to uses, accessory structures, building requirements, setbacks, heating and fireplaces, architecture, landscaping, fencing, lighting, utilities, and other matters concerning the development of the land. Further, the development agreement provides for the participation of future property owners in any assessment district or general improvement district providing services, facilities and/or maintenance for the specific plan area.

The applicants and property owners are Gene and Tara Feickert. The subject site is approximately 40.43 acres in size and is located at 5870 Whiskey

Springs Road. The Assessor's Parcel Number is 077-560-05. The Master Plan Category is Rural Residential (RR), and the Regulatory Zone is Medium Density Rural (MDR); and

If approved, authorize the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners to sign the Development Agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

Chair Hill asked if the Board wished to have a staff presentation about the Ordinance and informed it was the second reading. Commissioner Herman responded no.

Chair Hill opened the public hearing by calling on anyone wishing to speak for or against adoption of said Ordinance. There being no response, the hearing was closed.

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1700, Bill No. 1890.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1700, Bill No. 1890, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

**23-0194**      **AGENDA ITEM 21** Public hearing, second reading, and adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 2 by adopting Supplement 17 to the Washoe County Code and all clerical and technical corrections made therein. If passed, Supplement 17 will codify ordinances 1687 (Parks & Recreation), 1690 (Administration & Personnel; County Finances; Purchasing), and 1692 (Dangerous & Vicious Dogs). This supplement does not include amendments to the Washoe County Development Code (Chapter 110), which is published separately from the general Washoe County Code. District Attorney. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing by calling on anyone wishing to speak for or against adoption of said Ordinance. There being no response, the hearing was closed.

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Ordinance No. 1701, Bill No. 1891.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Clark, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote with Commissioner Herman voting no, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1701, Bill No. 1891, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

**23-0195**      **AGENDA ITEM 23** Public Comment.

Ms. Cindy Martinez stated she wanted to talk about three things. She reiterated the Kool-Aid only worked if everyone drank it, and she did not drink Kool-Aid. She declared the truth was an absolute defense. She thanked Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nate Edwards for explaining County Manager Eric Brown's authority to approve the contract with the Elections Group. Regarding Commissioner Garcia's comments about the animal shelter, Ms. Martinez stated if someone had to choose between food for their children or food for their animals, the choice was clear. She thought it was in January when the Board approved the additional \$1 million from the United States (U.S.) Treasury Department for the rental and utility assistance fund which she thought was also an indicator that the economy was in trouble. She thanked Chair Hill for having foresight about the economy. People were facing some economic and financial headwinds that would be catastrophic and she hoped the County was making adjustments. She said she was a conservative by principle, but she did not lack compassion. She hoped the Board would consider the impact of its financial decisions. She thought the County and city governments could work together and be mindful and positioned to respond rather than react.

Mr. Cliff Nellis wanted to address the drag queen story hour (DQSH) issue again. He recalled that on February 28, 2023, Chair Hill stated the Board could not defund DQSH since the County did not fund it. He believed there were things the County could do. He relayed he had previously asked Manager Brown if Library Director Jeff Scott could be removed from his position by the Commission and Manager Brown had replied no. Mr. Nellis opined Mr. Scott did not represent the community, he represented the activist LGBTQ movement and he did not listen to the people. Mr. Nellis asserted he was not saying people could not be gay, he just did not want DQSH. He declared people would continue to talk to the Board about the issue until it cancelled DQSH. He opined the people wanted the Commissioners who supported DQSH to change their position and consider the community. He suggested the Board tell Mr. Scott that he needed to cancel the event and if he did not do so, then the Board would cut library funding by 10 percent. He did not think the Board would actually have to follow through, it just had to make the threat that if Mr. Scott did not do as he was told, he would be fired. Mr. Nellis urged the Board to do something to appease the community about the issue.

Mr. Nicholas St. Jon relayed that Manager Brown stated the County did not begin talking about the election process review until December 2022. Mr. St. Jon said he had a meeting with Manager Brown in July 2022 and at that meeting, Manager Brown indicated there were some systemic problems with the election system. Mr. St. Jon declared the issue was not new and he believed the County could have started work earlier and given the Board more time to establish a review board. Since the item had not passed, he wondered what would happen with the Elections Group. He asserted there still needed to be a review, not necessarily from an outside group, and asked how the Board could move the item forward and receive input that could change elections for the better. He believed one option was to bring a previous resolution back to the Board. He was interested in hearing how the Board would move forward. He spoke about spoiled ballots, noting he had met with Registrar of Voters (ROV) Jamie Rodriguez and asked about submitting a public

record request to view the spoiled ballots. He relayed that according to Ms. Rodriguez, counsel indicated such a request would violate the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). He asked for support from the Board as he just wanted to view the 500 spoiled ballots. He demanded the Board remove the metal detector from outside the Chambers. He referenced the Fourth Amendment and the Nevada Constitution and asserted people had a right to be secure in their persons. He reiterated his demand to have the metal detector removed.

Mr. Emiliano Pasillas declared he was a local pastor representing Anglo and Hispanic churches and several church groups in the area such as the Northern Nevada Spirit-Filled Pastors Association and Vision New Life (Visio Nuevo Vida). He thought there would be a vote about disapproving DQSH at the libraries. He urged the members of the Board to consider where they stood. He added that the Board mentioned rent control and he relayed that Storey County approved Tesla and other companies to begin business in the area which had drastically increased rent in Washoe County. He informed that families were sharing rent, sometimes two families per apartment, to be able to live in Washoe County. He asked the Board to consider this issue as well.

**23-0196      AGENDA ITEM 24 Announcements/Reports.**

Commissioner Clark commented that Roger Edwards was a senior citizen and a retired veteran who felt he was being overcharged by the County. Commissioner Clark wanted the issue to be added to an agenda and invite Mr. Edwards and a representative of the service Mr. Edwards was talking about to speak to the Board. If Mr. Edwards was being overcharged or if a service was not being provided and he was being assessed charges, Commissioner Clark wanted this to be rectified. Commissioner Clark wanted to have a public meeting about this and find out what the issue was.

Commissioner Herman wanted to find out how much the County would save in its budget by removing the metal detector. She seconded the Golden Valley issue that Commissioner Clark discussed. She asked that the Board bring back the 20-point resolution she had on an agenda the previous year as soon as possible.

Commissioner Clark addressed Cindy Martinez's concerns about the economy. He declared he was a fiscal conservative who always believed that a rainy day should be saved for. He shared he had spoken with the director of Catholic Charities who told him that two or three people each day were being moved out of their homes because they could not afford rent. He thought the Board needed to help those who needed help and opined one way to help them was to ensure the Board was frugal. He did not like to see any kind of waste. He suggested the Board find a way to balance things a bit better to ensure that food insecurity was not an issue for people in the community.

\* \* \* \* \*

**3:48 p.m.** There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

---

**ALEXIS HILL**, Chair  
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

---

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

*Minutes Prepared by:  
Taylor Chambers, Cathy Smith, and Lauren Morris, Deputy County Clerks*