

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

AUGUST 22, 2023

PRESENT:

Alexis Hill, Chair

Jeanne Herman, Vice Chair

Michael Clark, Commissioner

Mariluz Garcia, Commissioner

Clara Andriola, Commissioner

Janis Galassini, County Clerk

Eric Brown, County Manager

Mary Kandaras, Chief Deputy District Attorney

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

23-0544 AGENDA ITEM 3 Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Clark mentioned the prior Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting and did not think it was fair for staff to come to the Board with an item and indicate there was a rush to conduct a vote. He asserted there should be proper planning and prior notice to allow elbow room for the Board in case it needed additional information or had to postpone an item.

Commissioner Clark said he attended a meeting with Chair Hill in which she indicated she had only received positive feedback from residents regarding holding the public comment period solely at the end of BCC meetings. He thought that was interesting and claimed he had only received negative feedback about this. He declared he would be sending public records requests to Washoe 311 for all the emails Chair Hill received about public comment since its elimination from the beginning of the BCC meetings. He wanted staff to conduct a study to identify the difference in the length of the meetings since this change occurred. He also wanted to see an analysis of how many people made public comments now compared to the prior three years, over the same number of meetings. If the idea behind removing public comment from the beginning of the meetings was to save money and time, he wanted to find out if it really had that effect.

Commissioner Clark shared he met with Chair Hill and two of the attorneys in the District Attorney's (DA) Office the prior week and Chair Hill had said she would be willing to put the Chair position up for a vote on a BCC agenda. He asked her to follow through with this. He offered an apology to County residents for voting for her to serve as

Chair of the Commission. He thought they would be able to work together but declared they had been unable to do so. He claimed he had not been able to get any of his requests agendized. He stated he had a vote of no confidence for the Chair and reiterated his request to see a vote for the position on a future agenda.

Commissioner Andriola thanked staff for the great experience of serving meals to seniors the prior day in celebration of National Senior Citizens Day. She enjoyed hearing stories from the attendees and thanked everyone who participated. She was moved by the opportunity to serve the seniors and engage in conversations with them.

Commissioner Garcia observed there were two items on the Consent Agenda that day related to the Clerk's Office. She wanted to acknowledge the great work of County Clerk Jan Galassini and her staff. She informed that under Ms. Galassini's leadership, her team effectively told the history and story of the County Commission as well as other important meetings. She encouraged people to look at the comparison between the different jurisdictions, which was included in the meeting materials. She noted that the Clerk's Office was busy issuing marriage licenses and business licenses and had recently filled an important gap in the community in relation to passport services. She remarked that the Clerk's Office did all this work while maintaining excellent customer service to the public. She appreciated that Ms. Galassini and her team brought an element of positivity, respect, and professionalism to the dais even during the most contentious meetings. She thanked Ms. Galassini and acknowledged her hard work.

Chair Hill agreed with Commissioner Garcia and said the BCC was lucky to have the support of Ms. Galassini and her staff.

Commissioner Clark requested to agendize a vote of the Commissioners to have public comment returned to the beginning of BCC meetings and asserted that most people went home before the end of the meetings. He thought this would allow people to plan their day around it and would allow them to hear what people had to say. He understood some of the Commissioners would not be in favor of this and he wanted their position to be on the record. Vice Chair Herman concurred with Commissioner Clark's statements.

Chair Hill announced the County was in an emergency situation regarding foster care, stating approximately 75 homes were needed to fill the gap for children who were staying at the Kid's Kottage in congregate shelter, which was not a best practice. She shared that Commissioner Garcia had been a leader in this after fostering to adopt her children. Chair Hill indicated she had just signed up for foster care as well because she felt she had to be part of the solution if she was going to ask the community to help. She reported there were approximately 634 children in foster care, which was down from 900 about five years ago, but so many people had gotten out of foster care since the pandemic. She urged people to go to www.haveaheartwashoe.us if they had the capacity and were interested in foster care. She declared this was important and these were the community's children.

Chair Hill thanked the Emergency Management team for their work during an emergency fire evacuation the prior week in Incline Village (IV) and their preparation for Hurricane Hilary. She was grateful the hurricane had not impacted the County. She stated the Emergency Management team always looked out for the safety of the community and she appreciated their work with the County and its regional partners.

Chair Hill shared that the Washoe County Leadership Academy (WCLA) had its kickoff the prior week. She noted it was comprised of community members from all the different Commission districts who would participate in a nine-month course and complete a class project that would impact County citizens. She informed that the BCC met with the participants, and she looked forward to seeing what the WCLA class did.

23-0545 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Presentation and Appearance by Dr. Peter Reed, Director, University of Nevada, Reno School of Medicine, Sanford Center for Aging, Supporting Quality of Life for Nevada’s Elders.

Sanford Center for Aging Director Dr. Peter Reed conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Who Are We; The mission; Our Philosophy; Volunteer Programs (2 slides); Senior Outreach Services (SOS) Program; Medication Therapy Management; Community-based Health & Wellness Program; Community Wellness Programs; Sanford Geriatric Specialty Care Center (2 slides); OLLI (Osher Lifelong Learning Institute) at UNR; Nevada Geriatric Education Center (2 slides); Gerontology Academic Program; Translation Research & Evaluation Projects; You’re Invited; Sanford Center for Aging.

Dr. Reed shared he would provide an overview of the Sanford Center for Aging (Center) and highlight the various community supports and services it offered to enable elders to live well. He recalled the Commissioners had participated in activities the prior day for National Senior Citizens Day and he thought his presentation would be a nice follow-up.

Dr. Reed asserted the Center was best thought of as a community-based aging services organization. He said the Center was a community asset and resource to help support elders in Washoe County, and it provided tools to those who served elders in the community. He shared that the Center was founded in 1993 and had been hosting a variety of events and opportunities to celebrate its 30th anniversary and its impact on the community. He noted his final slide would be an invitation to join the Center for one of its upcoming events.

Dr. Reed declared that the mission statement was the lifeblood of the Center itself and what it did. He observed the mission was established for the Center when it was founded through a generous gift from Graham and Jean Sanford to the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). Their donation was for the creation of a community-based resource to help elders navigate the systems of support to get the resources they needed to live well as they aged.

One overriding philosophy at the Center, Dr. Reed shared, was that aging was a positive life experience. He acknowledged there was a lot of fear, stigma, and jokes about aging and the aging process, but the Center viewed aging as a natural, normal, and lifelong process. The Center viewed elderhood as a life stage, just like childhood and adulthood. It was a life stage in which there were continued opportunities for community engagement, meaning, purpose, learning, growth, and being active citizens. He commented that the Board members worked with many elders in the community who were very active and conveyed their thoughts and perspectives to the Commission. He declared elders had every right to do so, just as anyone else at any other age. He mentioned ageism, noting that like other forms of discrimination, it made assumptions about a person's abilities or limitations based on the group in which they were a member. The Center tried to resist ageism and enable elders to thrive.

Dr. Reed informed the Center had a range of different community outreach programs and stated volunteers were at the heart of how the Center did its work. One of the major programs through which the Center supported volunteers was known as the AmeriCorps Seniors/Retired & Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP). He said it was a federally funded program that he liked to describe as the Match.com of retired volunteers. The Center identified elders or retirees in the community who were interested in volunteering or giving back to the community, and then identified the best fit for their volunteer service and matched them with another organization. The Center had about 12 other organizations in the community in which it placed volunteers. When matching, the Center wanted to ensure the volunteer found meaning and purpose in the work they did and that the organization was also benefitting.

A volunteer program that the Center hosted directly, Dr. Reed shared, was the Volunteer Transportation Program. This was a State-funded program that started as an initiative where the Center recruited individuals who would use their own personal vehicles to pick people up and give them the rides they needed. He declared transportation was one of the biggest concerns for elders in the community, as well as nationwide. He reported the Center was fortunate to receive funds to purchase its own wheelchair-accessible van and hire a part-time driver so it could provide rides directly. He pointed out that other transportation programs primarily drove individuals to the doctor, but the Center had a broader definition of the need for rides that people might have. The Center tried to support people in social engagement opportunities and connecting with other kinds of resources.

Dr. Reed mentioned the Senior Outreach Services (SOS) Program, stating it was for low-income home-bound elders in Washoe County. SOS program volunteers provided one-on-one in-home companionship to people in need. It was essentially a friendly visitor program that increased their socialization to reduce isolation, loneliness, and boredom.

Regarding Medication Therapy Management, Dr. Reed said the Center had a certified geriatrics pharmacist who conducted a comprehensive review of all the medications and over-the-counter (OTC) drugs that someone might be taking; the goal was to reduce the number of prescriptions. He mentioned the term “polypharmacy,” which was

used to refer to individuals who were taking way too many medications prescribed by a variety of providers. He noted it was not always known what the interactions were between those medications, so it was important to look at a person's health conditions and ensure an optimal set of medications to promote their health and well-being.

Dr. Reed spoke about the community-based health and wellness programs, which were essentially several health-education series offered by the Center. They were all developed by other organizations around the Country and researched to demonstrate the impact they had. He noted they were evidence-based programs that the Center adopted and replicated, and then delivered within the community. He listed several of the programs and indicated most of them were six to eight weeks. People participated with their peers to obtain knowledge, skills, and tools, and build their own self-efficacy.

Dr. Reed reported the Center hosted its own comprehensive Geriatric Specialty Clinic. The clinic was launched in 2015 as part of University Health, but because of the recent merger between UNR's School of Medicine and Renown Health, it now operated as a Renown Health clinic. Within the clinic, there was a team of geriatrics experts including medical providers, social workers, and the geriatrics pharmacist, who worked together to conduct a comprehensive assessment of people's needs and provide them with clear recommendations for what they could do to better support their conditions. Those recommendations went back to their primary care provider (PCP). The clinic was essentially providing a specialty consult for primary care to deal with the complicated situations that people might experience such as dementia, frailty, polypharmacy, and multiple chronic conditions. The clinic used a 90-minute whole-person assessment to get to know the individual as well as possible and develop recommendations to support their health and well-being.

Dr. Reed mentioned the Center had a range of education programs. The Osher Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI) became part of the Center a little over two years ago. OLLI was a community-based adult education initiative that offered about five to nine classes per day. Those who signed up for an annual membership fee of \$85 received access to all those classes in person. He noted that since the pandemic, the classes were offered through a hybrid and were also being archived so people could access them at their own convenience.

The Nevada Geriatrics Education Center, Dr. Reed informed, was an initiative to provide training to current and future professionals in the healthcare space to help them better support older adults. There was a wide range of different programs offered through that center including training State staff on geriatrics, holding annual conferences, training lay caregivers, offering lectures, and a federally funded initiative known as Improving Care of Elders through Community and Academic Partnerships (ICECAP) Nevada. He noted that ICECAP was specifically designed to train PCPs to increase their baseline level of competence in supporting their older patients.

Dr. Reed shared that the Center also taught students at UNR through a minor or certificate program in Gerontology. Both offerings were designated as a “Program of Merit” by the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education (AGHE). It was one of only a handful of programs in the Country that had this designation, and the Center was thrilled to be able to teach UNR students about aging, aging services, and what they could do in their future careers to help support elders. He discussed the Center’s research program, stating it primarily conducted program evaluation research to demonstrate the impact of the Center’s own initiatives. However, the Center also served as a third-party evaluator getting contracts from other organizations to help evaluate the programs they offered. He said he liked to think about the overall mission of the Center being served by all the things he detailed. In a sense, the Center was engaged in evaluation research to demonstrate the evidence base and document the impact of programs in the community and clinical settings. Then all those resources were used as opportunities to help train the future aging services workforce.

Dr. Reed remarked the Center would have another of its 30th-anniversary events on September 21. It would host Dr. Jerry Gurwitz, a geriatrician and geriatrics researcher from the University of Massachusetts (UMass) Boston. Dr. Reed asserted that Dr. Gurwitz was a very accomplished researcher who would discuss aging and the aging experience and what it meant for culture and society.

Dr. Reed thanked the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for its generous support of the Center. Chair Hill acknowledged the impressive work the Center did both on the ground and academically.

Commissioner Clark recalled a previous presentation he had seen about the Center and was glad Dr. Reed was able to give a presentation to the BCC that day. Commissioner Clark remarked that seniors were one of the fastest-growing populations and noted there were over 100,000 seniors in the County. He observed the Center was helping people who needed help as well as those who were still very healthy and wanted to volunteer. He highlighted the social, health, education, transportation, and diet aspects and indicated the Center had the whole package. He thought the County could learn a lot from what took place at the Center. He looked forward to collaborating with the organization in the future. In response to a question from Commissioner Clark, Dr. Reed clarified it cost \$85 per year to join OLLI, but the rest of the programs at the Center were available for free because they received grants and gifts. Commissioner Clark declared that was an incredible value. He suggested the County sponsor some of the OLLI membership fees, maybe through an open enrollment program where the County covered half the cost during a 90-day period to help seniors get involved and to support the Center. He looked forward to attending the event on September 21 at 4:30 p.m.

Dr. Reed appreciated the kind words and the offer of support for the programs the Center offered. He declared the Center was committed to ensuring that all its programs and services were developed in collaboration with other organizations. He noted that his presentation highlighted what the Center offered, but the Center was part of the larger aging services network in the County and the State. There were many different

community-based aging organizations that did similar kinds of things and the Center worked in concert with them to make sure the resources were available. Despite all of that work, it was a rapidly aging community, so the Center struggled to meet all of the needs because they were quite significant. He reiterated that the Center worked in collaboration to achieve an impact.

Commissioner Clark stated he wanted to agendize an item to remodel the senior center. He wanted the senior center to have showers, laundry facilities, and other things to make it more vibrant. He suggested that the senior center have a branch office of the Sanford Center and said he would talk to Dr. Reed to see if they could collaborate on this.

Chair Hill thanked Dr. Reed for his presentation. Dr. Reed thanked the BCC for the opportunity and said he looked forward to working with the Board more closely.

23-0546 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Recognition of Washoe County employees receiving Safety Awards by the Safety Committee Chair, Ben West, Security Administrator.

Eric Crump, Community Services Department

Jacob Ayala, Community Services Department

Arunas Narusevicious, Community Services Department

Antonio Lopez, Assessor

Sarah Turner, Medical Examiner

Security Administrator Ben West informed the Safety Recognition Award recognized outstanding contributions of Washoe County employees for actions beyond the requirements of their normal role that were proactive and protected life and property. He shared that all the award recipients were nominated by other County employees and voted on by the Safety Committee.

Mr. West recognized Ms. Sarah Turner, an investigator with the Medical Examiner's (ME) Office. During the past winter, several investigators had to go to Incline Village (IV) in inclement weather. On one of those trips, Ms. Turner learned that many of her colleagues were not familiar with proper chain installation. She took it upon herself to conduct trainings at the ME's Office to ensure her colleagues were properly prepared to install chains on County vehicles so they could respond to IV.

Mr. West recognized Mr. Antonio Lopez from the Assessor's Office. Shortly after the Sutro Street gate to the Administration Complex on Ninth Street was repaired, Mr. Lopez was heading to work on a weekend and noticed a suspicious vehicle parked on Sutro Street that followed him inside the gate. Mr. Lopez notified security which allowed them to follow up with their partners at the Reno-Sparks Livestock Events Center (RSLEC). The RSLEC was able to confirm it was one of their employees and all their employees were now trained and able to access the complex properly.

Mr. West recognized Mr. Jacob Ayala, Mr. Eric Crump, and Mr. Arunas Narusevicious from the Community Services Department (CSD). In January, there was a significant snowstorm on a day that a Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting was scheduled and oaths of office for newly elected officials would take place. Due to the expected attendance of the elected officials and the public, all three employees took the time to shovel and spread ice melt so employees and the public could enter the complex safely and on time for the swearing-in ceremony.

10:34 a.m. **The Board recessed.**

10:35 a.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

Commissioner Clark suggested Ms. Turner film a training on chain installation that could be made available for viewing by County employees and the public.

Chair Hill declared the County had the best employees and expressed her thanks to those receiving the Safety Award.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 6A1 THROUGH 6H1

23-0547 **6A1** Recommendation to approve Resolution R23-126 which amends the Washoe County Clerk Fee Schedule to include fees associated with the Clerk's provision of passport application services, with an effective date retroactive to July 1, 2023; and authorize the Chair to sign the Resolution. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

23-0548 **6A2** Recommendation to approve the creation of one new full-time Deputy Clerk – Board Records and Minutes position, pay grade 12, (County Clerk) as reviewed and evaluated by the Job Evaluation Committee (JEC); and authorize Human Resources to make the necessary changes. [Net fiscal impact is \$107,536.] Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

23-0549 **6B1** Recommendation to 1) approve roll change requests, pursuant to NRS 361.765 and/or NRS 361.768, for errors discovered on the 2019/2020, 2020/2021, 2021/2022, 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 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 \$216,925.40]. Assessor. (All Commission Districts.)

23-0550 **6C1** Recommendation to: 1) approve a Cancellation Agreement to terminate a Water Sale Agreement between Washoe County and American Ready Mix; and 2) approve a Water Rights Deed to re-convey 30.00 acre-feet of water rights from Washoe County to American Ready Mix. The water rights were previously dedicated to support an approved aggregate operation project. Pursuant to Washoe County Development Code, Chapter

110, Article 422 amendment, water rights are no longer required to be dedicated to the project, and the subject Cancellation Agreement and Water Rights Deed allow for the reconveyance of the water rights back to American Ready Mix. Community Services. (Commission District 4.)

23-0551 **6D1** Recommendation to approve the acceptance of grant funds awarded by Community Solutions International, an organization with the mission to end homelessness, in the form of a grant and in the amount of [\$50,000.00; no county match], from April 17th, 2023 through April 17th, 2024; Authorize Dana Searcy, Homeless and Housing Services Division Director to sign award documents, and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

23-0552 **6E1** Recommendation to accept the 2024 Agreement to use the Account for Affordable Housing Trust Fund Welfare Set-Aside Program by Washoe County between Washoe County and the Nevada Housing Division of the State of Nevada Department of Business and Industry in the amount of [\$217,114.00; no county match] retroactive to July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2026 to provide emergency housing assistance; authorize the Acting Director of the Human Services Agency to execute the grant agreement; and direct the Comptroller's office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

23-0553 **6F1** Recommendation to approve and acknowledge a Fiscal Year 2024 allocation from the Specialty Court Funding and Policy Committee of the Judicial Council of the State of Nevada to the Sparks Justice Court [\$31,550 for FY24, no match required], paid in quarterly installments retroactive to July 1, 2023, grant end date June 30, 2024; and direct the Comptroller to make the appropriate budget amendments. Sparks Justice Court. (All Commission Districts.)

23-0554 **6H1** Recommendation to Acknowledge Receipt of the Report of Sale- July 18, 2023, Delinquent Special Assessment Sale [Sale Proceeds \$0.00] as all parcels paid prior to the sale for the following districts: WCAD 32 - Spanish Springs Valley Ranch Rd, parcels: 076-310-65, 076-371-09, 076-391-23, 077-230-07, WCAD 37 - Spanish Springs Sewer Phase 1A, parcel: 089-243-07, 089-323-04 (No Fiscal Impact to the General Fund) Treasurer. (Commission Districts 4 and 5.)

Commissioner Garcia requested to pull Item 6E2 from the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Clark requested to pull Item 6G1 from the Consent Agenda.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Tom Green spoke about Item 6D1 regarding grant funds awarded by Community Solutions International and read the organization's mission statement. He opined the organization's goals were lofty and expressed concern about the use of the word "equitable" and the phrase "a lasting end to homelessness." He asserted the County had created a cottage industry that would not go away. If Community Solutions solved homelessness, he wondered if the County would shut down a project that had cost \$17 million per year to operate. He inquired what would happen to the employees, the office space, the tent, and the land if that were to happen. He believed the County had already spent way too much on homeless issues and declared the City of Reno took a laissez-faire approach to both law enforcement and community quality of life issues.

Ms. Janet Butcher informed she was a frequent public commenter at Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meetings and was not paid to do so. She declared she did not represent any organization. She shared she had a few opportunities to thank members of staff in the Clerk's Office and County Clerk Jan Galassini. She thought the staff did a spectacular job and she invited everyone to visit the Clerk's Office to see what Ms. Galassini had been able to do with the books.

Chair Hill highlighted Item 6D1, stating the receipt of that grant was a huge achievement for the homeless services team. She asserted the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) thought Community Solutions was an incredible organization and had awarded it a Genius Grant. She believed receiving the grant from Community Solutions showed that Washoe County was following best practices.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 6A1 through 6H1, with the exclusion of Items 6E2 and 6G1, be approved. Any and all Resolutions pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 6A1 through 6H1, with the exclusion of Items 6E2 and 6G1, are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

23-0555 **6E2** Recommendation to retroactively approve an Interlocal Contract between Washoe County and Washoe County School District for personnel to provide support and access to social work services and associated activities at the Family Resources Center at Proctor R. Hug High School for a total amount of [\$98,000.00] for the period of July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024. Approve Amendment #1 to the Interlocal Contract which authorizes the Washoe County School District to apply unspent funds totaling [\$11,000] toward the personnel expenditures of the Washoe County School District position that supports the Family Resources Center at Hug High School for a total amount not to exceed a total of [\$109,000]; and authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute Amendment #1. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Garcia shared that she had been employed with the Washoe County School District (WCSD) for 16 years and completed her employment on June 30,

2023. She wanted to provide this disclosure, though she had confirmed with Chief Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras that she did not need to abstain from voting on this item.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 6E2 be approved and authorized. The Interlocal Contract for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

23-0556 **6G1** Recommendation to approve the appointment of Washoe County Government Affairs Liaison, Cadence Matijevich, to fill an unexpired term on the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee following the resignation of Jamie Rodriguez from the Committee, with a term ending June 30, 2025; and recommendation to approve the reappointment of Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District Division Chief Chris Ketring to a four-year term on the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee expiring June 30, 2027. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Commissioner Clark pointed out the requirements for service on the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee and read from the Staff Report regarding the current vacancies. He wondered why the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) was not seeking candidates who might be retired from fire or law enforcement dispatch and he wanted this position to be opened to the public.

County Manager Eric Brown responded that this was an active commission that was engaged in monitoring and advising the County and the Enhanced 911 (E911) board on regulatory and legislative issues. He informed that the Government Affairs Liaison, who was actively involved in monitoring State and federal legislation, had always been assigned to the board, and he thought Ms. Cadence Matijevich would be an excellent participant. He spoke about regionalization efforts, stating there were a lot of potential regulatory and legislative issues that had to be understood. He indicated the BCC would hear more about those efforts in the following month.

Chair Hill agreed with Manager Brown and supported the appointments of Ms. Matijevich and Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) Deputy Chief of Operations Chris Ketring.

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 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Cadence Matijevich be appointed to fill an unexpired term ending June 30, 2025, and Chris Ketring be appointed to a four-year term expiring June 30, 2027.

23-0557

AGENDA ITEM 15 Discussion and possible adoption of a resolution from the Washoe County Commission in support of introduction and passage by the 116th Congress of a bill that recognizes county authority over historic roads and establishes an administrative adjudication process for determining Washoe County's title to certain rural county highways, commonly referred to as R.S. 2477 roads. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Lincoln County Commissioner Varlin Higbee shared he spent approximately 30 years on the Planning Commission dealing with roads and rights-of-way for rural counties. He observed rural roads and counties made up a large portion of the State of Nevada, noting Lincoln County had 4,000 miles of road. He declared that rural roads became critical to urban areas, particularly in a situation where there was a road leading to the developer's property and the developer did not have the right-of-way to that road. The developer then had to go to the federal government to obtain that right-of-way.

Commissioner Higbee related the bill to the Mining Act of 1866. That act allowed a person who had private property or a mining claim on public lands to build a road to get to it. However, this was limited when the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) was passed. Now, for a county to claim a right-of-way, it had to sue the federal government. He observed this bill would change that. If a person could prove that a road existed before 1976, they could present that information to their district manager or State office and be granted a title and the deed to that road.

Commissioner Higbee discussed how this issue came to the forefront for him. He indicated that Lincoln County finally had the opportunity to grow, and it needed to develop some roads to make this happen, but it could not do that because it did not own the roads. He mentioned there was money available for rural infrastructure and there were people who lived in Lincoln County without electricity. Lincoln County needed the right-of-way to the county's roads to be able to develop infrastructure. He declared the proposed resolution would allow Lincoln County to do that without having to go through the Nevada Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) process because it had already been disturbed. It belonged to the county, and instead of an easement, it would become a right-of-way that the county owned.

Vice Chair Herman thanked Commissioner Higbee for driving all the way to Washoe County to provide this information to the Board and acknowledged the work he had done on this issue. She expressed excitement that this item was on the agenda. She noted there was a gentleman who had helped Commissioner Higbee on the Washington, D.C., side of this issue and asked for him to be introduced. Commissioner Higbee responded that the lobbyist he worked with was Mr. Robert Weidner, who had been working on this for over 30 years. Commissioner Higbee pointed out that the last time this was done was in 2020; the language of the bill was reworked so it fell in line with FLPMA rather than conflicting with it. A person still had to prove a road existed prior to 1976 and show that it had beneficial use. Commissioner Higbee asserted that Mr. Weidner was instrumental in making this change.

Commissioner Higbee requested that Mr. Weidner be allowed to speak to which Chair Hill agreed. She observed that the bill was attached to this item and asked for background information.

Mr. Weidner remarked that Route 66 ran from Chicago, Illinois, to Los Angeles, California. He pointed out that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) did not recognize Route 66 on any of its master title plats; it did not exist in the BLM offices, but everyone knew that the road did exist. He declared the bill would clear up situations like this.

Mr. Weidner reported these were county roads that were granted in FLPMA in 1976, but the BLM failed to recognize that they were county roads. He acknowledged a county would not want ten roads to the same place out in the wilderness, it would prioritize one or two ways to get to a certain area. He asserted this was not a way to pave the west or do anything extreme; it was simply to honor and recognize the rights that were already granted when Congress passed FLPMA. This would take things out of the federal courts and allow a county an administrative process to gain control of the roads it rightfully owned.

Chair Hill asked if the bill was being carried by anyone or if there was any additional information. Mr. Weidner responded that the bill was introduced by former California Congressman Paul Cook before his retirement. Mr. Weidner stated it was ready to go, noting all the counties had been asked to adopt a resolution of support so it could be taken to US Senators Catherine Cortez Masto and Jacky Rosen so they could move forward. In response to a question from Chair Hill, Mr. Weidner responded he and Commissioner Higbee thought it would be a good idea to give the senators some support by doing this.

Chair Hill inquired which specific roads this would help with. She acknowledged this was mainly for Vice Chair Herman's district. Vice Chair Herman responded that she was concerned for her district, but she believed there were also some roads in Commissioner Clark's district that would have to be handled this way. They needed a way to do it. Chair Hill said she was looking for a bit more information, but she understood why this was so important for Lincoln County. Vice Chair Herman spoke about District 5, stating there were a lot of roads that went through ranches that were necessary for that ranch to survive. Ranch owners had to maintain their water holes and fences, and restrictions prevented them from using mobile vehicles to do these things. Chair Hill asked if people were not allowed to drive on the roads, to which Vice Chair Herman replied a lot of roadways would be shut down and some already had been. She wanted to ensure the County had the titles to the land it owned and was able to use it and improve it. Right now, there were the roads the County was unable to improve because it did not have the right-of-way. She opined this would solve a problem that would lead the County to many advantages in the future. She thought it was a very necessary bill.

Commissioner Clark said he would defer to Vice Chair Herman as this would primarily affect her district. He thought she needed the Board's support to ensure no one was impeded when traveling to and from anywhere in her district.

County Manager Eric Brown supported Vice Chair Herman's comments. He shared he recently had an opportunity to travel the roads in the northern stretch of District 5 and it was a whole different environment. He thought it would be prudent for the Board to support this initiative because the County had some work to do to figure out how to better maintain and ensure access to the roads in that area, especially the ranches. Chair Hill thought Lincoln County wanted to develop areas where it did not have federal approval to access those roads or develop the land. She did not think this sounded like the same situation as the one in District 5. She was unclear about what the impediment was for the people in that district and which specific roads were impacted. Manager Brown responded the County had not done an analysis on the specifics, but his understanding of the legislation was that it would allow the County to preserve the right to manage those roads in some cases where the ownership rights might be ambiguous. He was confident such situations were occurring in District 5 but was unable to provide specifics because it would be a massive undertaking. He believed that, conceptually, it made a lot of sense to support this.

Commissioner Andriola shared that she would support this item. She gave kudos to Mr. Weidner for working on this for over 30 years. She believed this would create a path for the County to have a process that could be designated in the event that something was questionable. She thought this was very important to many of the rural areas, even those that were not yet identified as having this issue. She declared it was an important decision to support this conceptually.

Commissioner Garcia said this was very interesting and thanked Commissioner Higbee and his guests for being in attendance. She asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras if Washoe County currently had any pending litigation regarding roads in rural areas. Chief DDA Kandaras responded she was not aware of any at that time. She pointed out that the resolution indicated it was in favor of establishing an administrative procedure over litigation. She observed that litigation was expensive so that was a plus. Mr. Weidner said one of the major goals was to remove these issues from the court and have a simple yes or no process. Commissioner Higbee spoke about the Jarbidge incident in Elko County. He was unsure if the lawsuit was completely settled, but the county had already incurred about \$600,000 in court costs.

Commissioner Garcia asked if there was any involvement from the congressional delegates on this topic. Government Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevich replied that during her time with Washoe County, conversations had not occurred because there was no current pending legislation. The broader issue of this subject had been discussed with the delegation previously, but the County had not engaged them prior to asking for approval from the Board to move forward in requesting that the delegation support legislation related to this.

Commissioner Garcia inquired how many counties had already signed off on this to which Commissioner Higbee responded it was six or seven. He said additional information would be provided during a Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) report. He expressed appreciation for the Board's support.

Vice Chair Herman pointed out that Commissioner Higbee was the current president of NACO. She remarked that about five or six years ago she had been working on this same thing and had maps of all the roads drawn up. She believed Assistant County Manager (ACM) Dave Solaro had a copy of them. She declared Washoe County had made a good start on getting the roads identified.

Commissioner Higbee mentioned that just before he became a Commissioner in Lincoln County there was a huge push across the State to identify the roads. He reported the State lost roads because they were closed. Things were being created such as a wilderness area or a monument, and there were mining claims, water rights, and private property rights inside those areas. He asserted that was what really started the push for this. Over the past 10 or 12 years, every county, especially the rural ones, had made an effort to obtain an inventory of its roads. He was unsure how the larger counties worked, but for the smaller counties, the road departments were completely funded by the State gas tax. They did not get a dime of the general fund budget. To get that, the county had to inventory its roads and have the inventory approved by the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). Then the funding was distributed to the counties; they received an allocation based on their population and miles of road. He stated if Lincoln County did not have an inventory of its roads, it would really struggle. He said that was where Revised Statute (RS) 2477 came in regarding true ownership of the roads. He remarked that NDOT at least recognized the county was maintaining those roads, which was the key to making this work. He opined it made it easier to approach the district manager and request that a right-of-way be issued.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Chair Hill stated she was in support of the concept, but she did not know if she could approve this item without seeing the bill language. She indicated she would vote no on this item.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Chair Hill voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 15 be adopted. The Resolution for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

23-0558 **AGENDA ITEM 7** Presentation and overview of the Washoe County property program by Dave Solaro, Assistant County Manager. The Board of County Commissioners have requested information related to the Washoe County property portfolio, to include facility master planning, review of lease versus own considerations, and properties for potential disposal. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Assistant County Manager (ACM) Dave Solaro conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Legal authority (2 slides); Property types; All deeds are not created equally; Moana Open Space restriction; Tahoe Basin stormwater transfer property; Master planning; Lease vs. own considerations; Leased properties; Surplus properties; Questions.

Mr. Solaro recalled the Board requested information related to Washoe County properties. He thought it would be beneficial for the community to understand how the County used property and made property decisions. He provided an overview of the topics in his presentation, which included the Board's legal authority over County property, property types, master planning, leased properties, and surplus properties. He explained Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) Chapter 244 gave the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) the authority to manage the real and personal property belonging to the County. Chapter 244 also outlined the process for the County to purchase and dispose of property.

Mr. Solaro stated there were three ways the County utilized properties. The first use was general government such as administration buildings, courthouses, detention facilities, libraries, and maintenance facilities. Properties associated with the utility fund such as the North Spanish Springs Floodplain Detention Facility were another category. The largest portfolio of property belonging to the County was open space and parks which included regional, neighborhood, and specialty parks, golf courses, and open space. He said the County's portfolio consisted of properties that were donated, bequeathed, transferred, traded, or purchased. He noted there were some properties on the vacant property list that were purchased by the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA) at a time when State law prohibited the RSCVA from owning property. Since the BCC created the RSCVA, the BCC was listed as the owner of those properties. He displayed the "Moana Open Space restriction" slide and explained that the property was bequeathed to Washoe County with a deed restriction requiring it be used for parks and recreation purposes. He thought there were ways to remove the restrictions, but it had not been the policy of the BCC to direct staff to remove deed restrictions on properties donated for specific uses. He remarked that the Board created its unsolicited proposals policy for people who wanted to use public land for things they thought would benefit the community. An example of a successful application of an unsolicited proposal was the ice-skating rink at South Valleys Park.

Mr. Solaro informed the Master Plan was a dynamic, long-term planning document for facility, utility, and park needs. He reported the County was currently updating the document so staff could be more responsive to the needs of the community. When deciding whether to purchase or lease property, staff reviewed the Master Plan, the Strategic Plan, and the needs of the department requesting property to determine the best avenue. He recalled that between 2006 and 2008 the County planned to build a new facility for the Sparks Justice Court (SJC). Due to changes in the economy, the County was unable to build that facility and instead signed a long-term lease for an existing building that was large enough to be a courthouse. During that time, the BCC directed staff to move as many County offices into County-owned buildings as possible, which in turn reduced lease expenses by 61 percent. He displayed the "Leased properties" slide and noted the Housing

and Homeless Services building should have been included in the list but was not. He pointed out that the number of properties leased by the County was small. He mentioned the space leased for the Housing and Homeless Services Department was short-term as the department would be moved to the administration building by 2024. He declared staff did not take leasing versus owning properties lightly.

Mr. Solaro inferred the Board asked for this item to learn about any surplus property the County had. He displayed the “Surplus properties” slide and explained the first two properties listed were purchased in the mid-90s for the Jan Evans Juvenile Justice Center (JEJJC). The County subsequently received a different piece of property to house the JEJJC but kept the original properties in inventory. Since the community had now grown around those properties with a bus route and shopping in the area, he thought there was a possibility those properties could be turned into affordable or low-income housing. He reported there was a tax-delinquent property on Tenth Street which staff thought could be combined with the County’s Ninth Street complex. He remarked that during the Board’s January retreat, it directed staff to identify affordable housing measures and those were two ideas that came from that directive.

Commissioner Clark asked if there were properties the County could liquidate to bring income into the County in the form of tax dollars. He mentioned tax-delinquent properties and wondered if the Treasurer’s Office always sold those properties or if it kept any that were potentially useful. Mr. Solaro stated the Treasurer’s Office published a tax book once a year that was reviewed by government entities for useful parcels. He explained the tax book was where staff got the idea for the Tenth Street property. Commissioner Clark asked if department heads reviewed the tax book for facilities that could serve their department, to which Mr. Solaro responded yes.

Commissioner Clark asked if all the properties owned by the County had current appraisals. Mr. Solaro replied that the County did not have an appraisal on each of the properties. He stated the Assessor’s Office informed staff the total assessed land value owned by the County was \$45 million and the total assessed property value was close to \$170 million. He noted that would not be the value if the County were to put those properties on the market for sale. Commissioner Clark declared he asked for this item to learn which properties were useful to the County and which properties could be liquidated and put on the tax rolls.

Chair Hill appreciated that the list of leased properties was smaller than she anticipated. She thought it made sense for the County to own the buildings it used. She mentioned a recommendation from the Elections Group for the County to acquire some warehouses, which staff were looking into. She mentioned the leased space for the North Valleys Library and wondered if there was an opportunity to turn a County-owned or tax-delinquent property into a library in that area. Mr. Solaro responded that project was in the Library Master Plan. Chair Hill spoke about discussions regarding the construction of a new courthouse. She reported she recently toured the current courthouse and noticed a lot of problems with the building. She thought that project was a worthwhile investment in the community. She stated other agencies had developed workforce housing on their surplus

properties and she thought the County should look into doing the same. She asked if staff understood the Board's direction for this item, to which Mr. Solaro responded yes. He noted there was a lot of open space owned by the County which the Board would need to determine whether to sell or use for another program. Chair Hill recalled that the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) housing assessment indicated the best way to get workforce housing was for property to be donated to a developer. She looked forward to discussing if there was a way the Board could be part of the solution for housing issues in the community. She asked if the Community Services Department (CSD) was working with the County's housing services group to investigate delinquent properties and determine if they could be used for workforce housing. Mr. Solaro indicated he forwarded the tax-delinquent list to CSD and would follow up.

Vice Chair Herman thanked Mr. Solaro for his presentation. She thought the market was too high to purchase property and suggested the Board sell off properties that were no longer useful to the County.

Commissioner Clark echoed Vice Chair Herman's comments that it was not a good time to buy but it was a good time to sell. He anticipated that the court system would be part of the next Master Plan update. He provided photos of the current courthouse that were placed on file with the Clerk. He reported that the first-floor elevator was out of order and the bathrooms in the building were in disrepair. He thought the County needed to work to keep that building maintained and operational. He wondered if there was space in the courthouse where excess supplies could be stored instead of leaving them out in the open. He opined the courthouse was a mess and expressed concern regarding the maintenance of the building.

Commissioner Clark spoke about the lease for the Housing and Homeless Services Department. He thought the lease was \$16,000 per month and asked if that was an accurate figure. Mr. Solaro responded he would have to get back to Commissioner Clark with that information. Commissioner Clark asked to be provided with the square footage of that building as well. He wondered who was responsible for negotiating the price when the County purchased or leased properties. He reported that the property next to the Cares Campus, which was recently purchased by the County, was one of the most expensive pieces of real estate in the Truckee Meadows. He requested information regarding the County's procedure for buying, accepting, and selling property.

23-0559 **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to consider a request from SouthWestern Property Corporation (SWPC), as requested by Commissioner Clark, for Washoe County staff to negotiate an Easement Deed and Easement Agreement between Washoe County ("Grantor") and SWPC ("Grantee") for design, construction, installation, use and maintenance of a requested emergency access road, including relocation of an existing public utility easement and associated improvements over, across and through a portion of Washoe County property Assessor's parcel number (APN) 520-250-31, (5100 Spectrum Boulevard, Regional Public Safety Training Center) located at the terminus of Spectrum Boulevard

Reno, Nevada. Said easement request would provide for emergency ingress/egress to the adjacent City of Reno approved residential development; and if approved, authorize County staff to negotiate an Easement Deed and Easement Agreement and require staff to present the negotiated Easement Deed and Easement Agreement to the County Commission for approval at a later date. Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

Assistant County Manager (ACM) Dave Solaro informed that Mr. Mark Campbell was present to speak on behalf of the developer. Mr. Solaro declared this item was not a planning item and the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) was not being asked to approve a development. He pointed out that this item was a request by a third party for two easements across a property owned by Washoe County that housed the Regional Public Safety Training Center (RPSTC). He noted there was no legal obligation for the Board to entertain this request. He stated the Staff Report included a letter from the RPSTC Manager's Board expressing concern about this item.

Mr. Mark Campbell, President of Southwestern Property Corps (SWPC) and manager of Dandini Spectrum Apartments, displayed documents that were placed on file with the Clerk. He stated the company owned three parcels of land in Washoe County which had all been dedicated to housing. He alleged this development would not hurt or diminish the RPSTC in any way. He informed that the Dandini Spectrum Apartments project would require a 20-foot-wide easement through the RPSTC's property. That easement would be used to provide a secondary water supply line to the apartment complex and the RPSTC. He pointed out that line was in the Truckee Meadows Water Authority's (TMWA) long-range plan. He declared his project would cost \$130 million and would consist of 420 workforce housing units, two pools, two clubhouses, and publicly dedicated trails throughout the property. He remarked the SWPC was the successor in interest of the property it purchased for the apartment project, which included a 62-acre easement under the RPSTC building. He declared the SWPC would relinquish that easement if granted the easement requested in this item.

Mr. Campbell reported the apartments were designed with noise-reducing or abating windows to mitigate noise concerns from the RPSTC's firing range. He stated lease agreements for the apartment complex would inform inhabitants that there was a shooting range within 800 yards of the housing complex and any renters who complained about noise from the shooting range would be permitted to move to another apartment. He noted the SWPC currently paid about \$24,000 in taxes for this property which would increase to \$1.3 million upon completion of this project. He remarked one of the conditions of approval from the City of Reno was that the SWPC build a new sanitary sewer line down Parr Boulevard which would provide additional sewer capacity for the jail. The Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) also required that the SWPC pay to upgrade the Parr Boulevard and Highway 395 interchange which would cost one million dollars. He claimed this project would create 300 temporary and 40 permanent jobs over time. He declared the SWPC was prepared to work with seniors to dedicate 300 units for extended

leases with a price increase cap of 4.5 percent. He and his partners were also working to form a non-profit in Washoe County to support seniors through rent increases.

Mr. Campbell noted this project had recently become contentious. He stated the SWPC had been working for over a year to develop solutions to issues for this project. He reported that three months prior the company received a letter from the RPSTC's board indicating it was not supportive of granting an easement for this project. He attended a meeting with Sheriff Darin Balaam where they discussed grading and preparing an entrance route to the property that would not impact the RPSTC's planned K-9 facility. He thought the Board had three options for this item, a yes vote, a no vote, or a vote to continue working with the developer to come to an agreement. He listed the repercussions if the Board voted against this item. He believed the Board had a fiduciary responsibility to its constituents to be a good steward of taxpayer dollars. He urged the Board to vote yes or send this item back to staff.

Sheriff Balaam stated he was the chair of the RPSTC's board. He was not solely responsible for any decisions or directives that came from the RPSTC's board to the developer regarding this project. He noted the RPSTC's board was concerned with the SWPC's proposed road as it would impact the K-9 and mounted horse unit training center the RPSTC planned to build. He reported that he and County Manager Eric Brown met with Mr. Campbell's team to come up with a new plan for the road. The new road proposal would cut through wildland fire training grounds and the RPSTC's board would have to find a new place to conduct that training. He relayed that the biggest concern of the RPSTC's board was the firing range which caused the board to unanimously vote no on this easement. He said there were not many options if the current firing range were to be shut down. The RPSTC's board asked the SWPC to put funds aside for an indoor range. The SWPC agreed to allocate \$50,000 for an indoor range. Sheriff Balaam then invited an individual familiar with the construction of indoor ranges to walk the RPSTC's property and estimate what it would cost to convert three bays into a shooting range. He remarked an indoor range was estimated to cost \$15 million. He asserted the only other option was to have officers travel to the Washoe County Regional Shooting Facility located on Pyramid Lake Road. He declared the issues with that solution were that the range could not create a section strictly for law enforcement which would put their equipment within reach of the public, and officers would have to travel over an hour to shoot there. He clarified the RPSTC's board was not against seniors. He pointed out that the developer already had the opportunity to build 200 apartments through the City of Reno's approval which could be used to house seniors. He spoke about parking issues in the area and suggested the developer fund a gate for the RPSTC so access to the facility could be restricted after hours. He reiterated the chief concern of the RPSTC's board was the shooting range as Washoe County and the Cities of Reno and Sparks could not fund a \$15 million indoor range.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras noted Chair Hill called Sheriff Balaam during public comment, however, this was an action item, and the Board was entitled to obtain any necessary information it desired. She thought Sheriff

Balaam's remarks should not be classified as public comment but rather as information from a shareholder, to which Chair Hill agreed.

Mr. Campbell clarified that the 200 apartment units approved by the City of Reno required two water lines so no housing units could be built without the approval of this item. He declared this project's parking plan exceeded the Reno standard and would have the highest parking capacity the developer had ever built.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Barbara Stirling stated she was a volunteer on the Sparks Senior Citizens Advisory Committee (SCAC). She asserted she was not paid to be at the meeting. She recalled Mr. Campbell's comment regarding seniors and their need for housing and she thought the Dandini Spectrum project offered a solution. She appreciated the project's proposed open space plan and opined it was a great opportunity for residents and the public to access walking trails. She claimed the requested easement in this item would provide a secondary water source and fire access to the RPSTC. She alleged future projects could not be developed along Parr Boulevard without an extension of the sewer capacity which Mr. Campbell had indicated the SWPC was prepared to complete.

Ms. Marsy Kupfersmith expressed appreciation for Mr. Campbell's proposed senior rental assistance non-profit. She did not know if the Board understood how many seniors throughout Washoe County that program would impact. She alleged that elected officials claimed they wanted seniors to age in place, but that was not possible if seniors could not afford a place to age in. She thought seniors did their part in society and their needs were ignored as they aged. She asked the Board to move forward with this item.

Mr. Mac Rossi told a story about a family that built a horse training facility on the outskirts of South Reno. As the Reno population increased, the facility became surrounded by commercial and residential development which caused the family to move the training facility to a new location. He thought the RPSTC found itself in a similar situation with the shooting range. He pointed out the SWPC agreed to allocate some funds to a new shooting range if the RPSTC agreed to move it to a new location.

Mr. Tom Green opined that the land adjacent to the RPSTC should have been purchased by the County years ago. He noted that part of the development project had already been approved by the City of Reno. He did not remember reading anything regarding the sewer capacity in the Staff Report. He postulated other developments or expansions could not occur in the area without an expansion of the sewer line. He thought the design of the RPSTC's shooting range was not mindful of future growth. He reported a spotter used to be required to monitor the hillside behind the range with binoculars to ensure there were no people passing through the area. He pointed out that residents of Panther Valley had successfully petitioned the County to change the hours for the shooting range. He mentioned he previously served as a Chief Deputy for the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO). He spoke about negotiations between the WCSO and the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) regarding allowing UNR to assume the shooting range and turn it into a state-of-the-art facility for its rifle team. He thought there was no reason

the RPSTC could not cohabitate with the SWPC's proposed development. He claimed the County needed the money that would come from the property taxes for schools, public safety, and roads.

Ms. Donna Clontz spoke about an age-friendly group that was working to improve the lives of seniors through transportation improvement, access to information and resources, and affordable housing. She spoke in support of this item. She thought the County should work with the developer to come to an agreement on the project. She asserted the community had a need for workforce and senior housing. She asked the Board to approve this item.

Mr. Larry Chesney declared he served eight years on the Washoe County Planning Commission (PC) and six years on the Regional Planning Commission (RPC). During his time on both boards, he could not recall a developer who intended to dedicate a project to senior and workforce housing without being asked to do so. He pointed out that County regulations called for two means of access to the property for fire safety. He asked the Board to consider the benefits the project could provide to seniors and the workforce.

Mr. Ken Krater of Krater Consulting Group stated he and his partners were the original owners of this property. He thought the project was the highest and best use of the property. If the developer only built the 200 housing units approved by the City of Reno, he alleged the project would switch to attached or detached for-sale homes instead of an apartment complex. He suggested the County require the developer to disclose to tenants that there was a shooting range nearby. He spoke in support of Sheriff Balaam's work for mental health both within the WCSO and the community. He claimed this project could help the community with mental health by creating more housing. He asked the Board to support this item. He recalled Mr. Campbell's plan to relocate tenants who had issues with the noise from the shooting range. He spoke about parking requirements for this project and stated that 1.8 parking spaces per unit would result in the complex having surplus parking spaces. He pointed out that the City of Reno's code requirements were 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit. He opined that the approval of this item would be beneficial to the community.

Mr. Scott Myer informed he was a real estate broker. He recalled hearing complaints that developers refused to pay for infrastructure upgrades. He thought senior housing was an issue in the community. He pointed out that the SWPC was willing to pay for infrastructure upgrades in the area which he claimed would have a positive impact on future development there. He asked the Board to consider this item.

Ms. Denise Myer agreed with previous commenters. She expressed appreciation for the senior non-profit the SWPC planned to establish to ensure seniors could stay in their homes in the event of a rent increase. She declared that 70 percent of seniors were voters. She asked the Board to approve this item.

Mr. Roger Edwards thought the project was of regional significance and should be dealt with accordingly. He stated that 6.5 percent of the units for this project

were intended for seniors. He suggested the percentage of senior units should be closer to 20. He asked the Board to create conditions of approval for this item to require that 20 percent of units be designated to senior housing and to cap the rent prices for those units. He declared if the Board did not cap the rent prices for seniors, people on fixed incomes would be unable to live in the units at the current market rate. He asked the Board to approve this item.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Mr. Campbell for taking the time to discuss this item with the Board. She asked him about the approximate rent a senior would pay for a unit in the housing development. Mr. Campbell replied that rents were priced around \$2.10 per square foot in this market, so the price would depend on the size of the unit. He estimated costs could range from \$1,100 to \$2,500 depending on the size of the apartment. He explained the apartments were intended to be leased at market rate and there would be no rent-controlled units.

Commissioner Andriola asked Chief DDA Kandaras if there was any exposure to the County in the event of an incident related to the RPSTC's firing range and apartment tenants. Chief DDA Kandaras responded it would have to be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Commissioner Andriola asked if there was any additional potential legal exposure the Board should consider in terms of this project and the proximity of the RPSTC's firing range to which Chief DDA Kandaras responded no.

Commissioner Andriola remarked she met with Mr. Campbell and Sheriff Balaam to discuss this project. She spoke about Sheriff Balaam's suggestion of an indoor firing range and asked if there was an opportunity for the County to seek a bond to fund it. Mr. Solaro responded that was the type of scenario staff could research if directed by the Board to do so. He clarified the development itself had already been approved by the City of Reno. This item was to determine if the Board wanted to grant the developer an easement for secondary emergency access and a secondary water line through County property. This item was not for the Board to discuss or approve senior housing or other facets of the development project. Commissioner Andriola thought directing staff to work and negotiate with the developer was the best way to move forward with this item.

Chair Hill asserted that since the Board was offering a County asset, it would be in the County's best interest to ensure the promises made by Mr. Campbell were secured in writing. She asked Mr. Solaro if the Board could direct staff to investigate obtaining stricter requirements for this item, to which Mr. Solaro responded yes.

Vice Chair Herman predicted that the RPSTC would soon outgrow its current location due to increasing residential development in that area. She spoke about an idea to work with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to create a larger shooting range with a section for law enforcement and a separate one for the public. She thought Mr. Campbell's development would be successful and beneficial to seniors.

Commissioner Clark reiterated the development had been approved by the City of Reno. This item was to approve a secondary emergency fire road. He stated the

road would not be used for ingress and egress but for emergencies only. He thought Sheriff Balaam's concerns were legitimate. He claimed the good this project could bring outweighed any concerns. He mentioned the 62-acre easement the SWPC had over the existing RPSTC property which Mr. Campbell had agreed to abandon if he was granted the 2-acre easement from this item. He spoke about the developer's plan to expand the sewer capacity in the area and noted it could benefit the jail. He appreciated the non-profit the developer intended to establish to help seniors with rent. He opined the project made sense and this item should be approved. He asked the Board to consider the economic impact of this project. He stated he had not heard of a builder who voluntarily agreed to put rent controls on a development. He suggested the Board consider if the RPSTC was the highest and best use for the land it was located on. He wondered if the Board should move the RPSTC to another location and sell the property it was currently situated on to make room for more development. He urged the Board to approve this item.

Commissioner Garcia stated the project had been presented to her by many different people in different ways. She noted the amenities discussed started with childcare and workforce housing and had recently shifted to senior housing. She believed the highest and best use of this land was to preserve and protect it to meet the increasing public safety needs of the growing community. She asserted she would not vote for something that went against the voices of the WCSO, two police departments, and two fire departments. She opined public safety was the most critical part of a healthy community. She acknowledged the development offered great amenities and that senior housing was critical. She reiterated she could not vote against the interest of public safety.

Chair Hill noted there had been a lot of discussion regarding the RPSTC needing secondary emergency access. She pointed out this development would still need approval of an easement for a water line from the County, even if there were only 200 units approved. She asked Sheriff Balaam to provide his perspective on those issues. Sheriff Balaam reported the RPSTC's board supported the water line because it would be underground and was already in TMWA's long-range plan. He stated the dispatch department had the technology to move offsite with portable consoles during the construction of the water line. He reiterated the decision to reject this easement did not come from the WCSO alone, the decision was made by the RPSTC's board. He acknowledged senior housing was an issue in the community. He spoke about upgrades to the jail and asserted the County could add the sewer line without the help of the developer if needed.

Chair Hill declared she did not take this decision lightly. She thought the Board needed to secure Mr. Campbell's offer of supportive housing in writing. She believed Mr. Campbell would live up to his word, but reiterated she wanted everything secured in a written agreement. She agreed with Commissioner Garcia's sentiment that the Board needed to ensure the regional asset of the RPSTC was not disturbed. She suggested staff look for a way to implement a different pathway for the emergency road needed by

the development. She wanted staff to work with the developer to come to an agreement. She was not comfortable approving this item in its current form.

Commissioner Clark asked Chief DDA Kandaras what would happen if Mr. Campbell decided to utilize his existing 62-acre easement under the RPSTC. Chief DDA Kandaras believed that it was a utility or water line easement. She thought there had been good discussions surrounding this item. She reminded the Board this item was to approve an easement. She suggested the Board direct the Community Services Department (CSD) and the District Attorney's (DA) Office to work with the developer to determine the conditions of this easement and bring this item back to the Board for approval once an agreement had been made. As far as liability concerning the existing easement, she claimed that it provided limited uses which the County was not interfering with; therefore, there was no liability.

Commissioner Clark reiterated the proposed access road was not for public use, it was for emergencies only. He did not understand why people were using public safety issues as an argument against this item. He wanted to know more about the developer's 62-acre easement on County property. Mr. Solaro stated he researched the easement, and his findings were outlined in the Staff Report. He directed the Board to Exhibit D of the Staff Report and noted the easement was the green section on that map. He declared the easement was granted from Nevada Spectrum, LLC to Washoe County, and from Washoe County to Nevada Spectrum, LLC. He outlined it as a utility easement specifically for the maintenance of utility services such as water, electricity, natural gas, storm drain, sewer, cable, and telephone. It was a blanket easement over that portion of the property. After further research, he learned that when the County started building the RPSTC, it only purchased those 62 acres. He said the easement was put in place to ensure utilities could be provided to the parcel situated to the north of the County's property. Subsequently, the County purchased that entire parcel from Nevada Spectrum, LLC for the RPSTC; however, the easement was left behind.

Commissioner Clark alleged that if his fellow Commissioners were truly concerned about public safety, they would allow emergency vehicles access to the development. He reiterated that the only use for this road was for emergency vehicles. Mr. Solaro clarified this access easement would flow both in and out of the property. This easement was requested as a condition of approval from the City of Reno. He restated this easement would not be solely for emergency vehicles to access the apartment complex, it would also be used as an evacuation route in the event of an emergency. Commissioner Clark asserted that if there was an emergency, the Board should want the residents of this development to have an additional means of escape.

Chair Hill asked Mr. Campbell if he was willing to negotiate with the DA's Office to implement a contract or lien on the property to guarantee the multi-year leases for seniors. She mentioned Mr. Edwards's public comment regarding expanding the number of units reserved for seniors and she wondered if Mr. Campbell would be open to that. Mr. Campbell clarified there was no limit to the number of seniors allowed to live at the complex. He stated the program for seniors was to extend them multi-year leases at

market rates with a cap on increases. He recalled people had expressed concerns regarding the length of lease terms in the area. He restated these would not be rent-controlled units. He spoke about the non-profit he and his partners intended to set up for seniors. He noted the organization was initially going to be a foundation, but it was changed to a non-profit so anyone who wanted could put money into it. He pointed out some states did not allow people to sign more than a one-year lease and if that was the case in Nevada, the SWPC would allow seniors to renew their leases with a 30-day notice and it would be well-defined that their lease would not exceed the Consumer Price Index (CPI) or 4.5 percent, whichever was lower. He claimed longer leases were preferable to property owners because there were costs associated with tenants moving out.

Chair Hill expressed concern that if the project were to sell for whatever reason, the promises of the developer might not be carried forward. She pointed out this item was a developer asking for a County asset that could perhaps displace a regional training facility. Mr. Campbell asserted he was not asking for the RPSTC to be displaced. Chair Hill responded that the RPSTC's board reported this easement could be a major concern for the future of the RPSTC and its property. Mr. Campbell remarked his team investigated the cost of an indoor shooting range. The SWPC also researched the design of a water retention facility on its 62-acre easement. He declared he would be happy to work with the WCSO to determine if there needed to be a contract for the easement. Chair Hill believed there should be a contract for the senior amenities. Mr. Campbell pointed out that Sheriff Balaam mentioned it would cost \$15 million to build a three-lane indoor shooting range. He claimed the County's bonding capacity from his project's property taxes was \$20 million. He asserted if this project was not permitted, he would appeal to have the land's property taxes dropped because the land would be useless. He thought the County had enough bonding authority to move the RPSTC if it needed to. He opined the freeway was more of a noise issue than the RPSTC's shooting range. He stated developers liked to build complexes near freeways to make their units more visible to the public. Chair Hill reiterated more work needed to be done on this item and she was not prepared to approve it as it stood.

Commissioner Andriola made a motion to direct staff to work with the developer on a path forward. Chair Hill seconded the motion with an amendment to require the developer to agree, in writing, to the provisions Mr. Campbell had promised regarding senior and workforce housing. The motion failed. In response to a question from Chair Hill, Chief DDA Kandaras responded there would be no direction to staff; therefore, this item would not move forward. Chair Hill noted another Commissioner could make a new motion if desired or the failed motion could stand, and this item would not move forward.

Commissioner Clark made a motion to move forward with this project. He reminded that the development had already been approved by the City of Reno and Mr. Campbell had agreed to work with the County. He stated Mr. Campbell did not have to offer additional amenities but did so to make this deal more enticing to the County. He thought Mr. Campbell was a man of his word and this agreement could be made in good faith. Chief DDA Kandaras asked Commissioner Clark if he was referring to this easement when he said, "this project." Commissioner Clark stated he would like to see the County

grant this easement to the developer and move forward with this project. Vice Chair Herman seconded the motion. Chair Hill declared she was not comfortable moving forward with this item as it stood with no conditions. The motion failed.

Commissioner Garcia made a motion to deny this item. The motion failed for lack of a second. Chief DDA Kandaras stated that at this point there was no direction to staff about creating an easement or making an easement agreement. Based on the comments made, she thought staff would have adequate direction if the Board made a motion to negotiate this easement agreement and bring this item back to the Board. Chair Hill noted that was the motion Commissioner Andriola made which did not pass. Chief DDA Kandaras stated that in that case, there was no further action that needed to be taken and this item could be concluded.

Commissioner Clark declared he wanted this item to be approved but was open to directing staff to negotiate a solution with the developer to allow the progression of the project.

On motion by Commissioner Clark, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Commissioner Garcia voting no, staff was directed to work with the developer on a path forward.

1:30 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

2:30 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

BLOCK VOTE – 13, 14, 17, AND 18

23-0560 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to approve Sole Source waiver to extend the established Agreement between Washoe County and New Hope Placement, PLLC aka Well Care Services, for supportive housing and coordinated services to individuals with Severe Mental Illness, Substance Abuse Disorders, and/or Co-Occurring Disorders that impede their ability to live with complete independence, for the term of September 1, 2023 through December 31, 2024, in an amount not to exceed [\$1,404,000.00]; and if approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the Agreement. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

Public comment for each item in the Block Vote was heard together.

Vice Chair Herman indicated the Block Vote would consist of Agenda Items 13, 14, 17, and 18. She requested an explanation for Item 17 due to the amount of the grant funding.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Janet Butcher thought individuals who came out of foster care were frequently forgotten. She alleged there were a lot of people who got into foster care for the money, and the kids did not have the love and connection

that a lot of other children received. Regarding Item 17, she pointed out the amount of funds being used for 50 units of supportive housing and believed the amount per unit was significant. She mentioned the amount of money being spent on units for seniors and opined it was considerably less. She thought this was off balance.

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

- 23-0561** **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to authorize the implementation of the LifeSet Program by Human Services Agency's Independent Living Program. The LifeSet Program is an evidence-based model program designed to provide intensive clinical and individualized services to youth aging out of foster care, or recently aged-out of foster care, with the goal of achieving a successful transition to adulthood by:
- (1) Acceptance of a grant award for the implementation of LifeSet Program developed by the Youth Villages, Inc., a private foundation, in the amount of [\$1,288,783.00; \$2,836,528.00 county match] for a four (4) year award period retroactive from June 1, 2023, and through November 30, 2027;
 - (2) Approval of the creation and funding of the following positions, one (1) FTE Human Services Supervisor (salary grade 17) and two (2) FTE Human Services Case Worker III (salary grade 15), salary grade implemented through the Korn Ferry class and compensation study, as reviewed and evaluated by the Job Evaluation Committee (JEC) effective August 22, 2023; with the recognition that if grant funding is reduced or eliminated, the position hours will be reduced and/or the position will be abolished accordingly unless additional funding is secured; and
 - (3) Authorization of the Acting Director of Human Services Agency to execute the award and related documents; direction of the Human Resources Department to make the necessary staffing adjustments as evaluated by the Job Evaluation Committee and direction to the Comptroller's office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

Public comment for each item in the Block Vote was held concurrently; see Agenda Item 13 for the public comment related to this item.

Commissioner Clark mentioned the LifeSet Program and expressed concern about hiring a supervisor and two caseworkers. He wondered how those individuals would remain on the payroll once the grant was gone. Regarding Housing and Homeless Services, he understood they had been consolidated and now reported to the Interim Director of the Human Services Agency (HSA). He reiterated his question about how the positions would be funded once the grant was gone and requested an explanation. Chair Hill noted this was outlined in the Staff Report. Commissioner Clark stated he wanted this to be addressed on the record.

HSA Division Director Pamela Mann explained that the LifeSet Program would allow the County to start its extended foster care services a little sooner. She observed this was originally an unfunded mandate from the State. A decision was made during a later legislative session to apply some funding to the County, but that funding had been delayed until 2026. LifeSet offered the County an opportunity to accept some grant funds so it could begin the foundational groundwork. She asserted that when extended foster care went live, this would prevent a disruption in service for the youth in the County's care who were transitioning into adulthood through the foster care system rather than through the adoption process. In response to a question from Commissioner Clark, Ms. Mann said this gave the County a head start and allowed it to use grant funds while it learned the process. She declared this set kids up for success after they transitioned into the extended foster care period, which was now 18 to 21 years old, and would provide them with resources.

Commissioner Clark remarked that when he asked these questions it was because he wanted the information to be available on the record. Ms. Mann asked Commissioner Clark if he had a question about the merger as well. He responded by asking if HSA was merging with Housing and Homeless Services. Ms. Mann believed conversations were being held regarding moving Housing and Homeless Services under the umbrella of HSA. Chair Hill thanked Ms. Mann for her response but noted this was not pertinent to the Block Vote items. She indicated it could be a discussion for the Board in the future. Commissioner Clark observed it was one thing to have a grant, and another thing to have that turn into a budget item after the grant disappeared. Ms. Mann shared that this grant was designed to pay for a larger portion in the early years and transition the County back to the general fund. The County would then expect to see revenue opportunities through the State's funding plan. She asserted that the County did not anticipate being unable to handle this transition. She indicated the services had to be provided to the youth regardless, and it would give the County the chance to establish that service ahead of the requirement.

Commissioner Clark said he was in support of providing the services and resources to the youth, but he had other concerns. He mentioned retroactive pay for existing County employees and said he was told there was no budget for that; however, he thought it looked like something else might have an impact on the budget, so he wanted to be able to wrap his mind around all of it.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be accepted, approved, and authorized.

23-0562 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Recommendation to approve the acceptance of Home Means Nevada Initiative Funds awarded by the State of Nevada Department of Business & Industry Housing Division in the form of a grant in the amount of [\$21,900,000.00; no county match], to pay the costs of constructing and equipping a 50-unit affordable supportive housing project on a portion of the Nevada Cares Campus, with funds required to be

obligated by December 31, 2024, and expended by December 31, 2026; if approved, authorize the County Manager to sign award documents, and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Public comment for each item in the Block Vote was held concurrently; see Agenda Item 13 for the public comment related to this item.

Commissioner Clark recalled talking about this with former County Commissioner Vaughn Hartung during the Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) January workshop. He believed that during that discussion, Commissioner Hartung indicated the cost for one of these 350-square-foot units was more than the value of his home. According to Commissioner Clark's calculations, he thought the units cost approximately \$1,400 to \$1,500 per square foot. He declared he could not think of many properties in the whole County that cost that much. He claimed this was wasteful and he thought the public needed to be aware of it. He alleged he had spoken with many individuals who had constructed properties like homeless shelters and veterans' homes and were able to do so for \$400 per square foot or less. He said he just viewed a property in Carson City that had only cost about \$200 per square foot. He asked why the County was spending this kind of money and observed it was already a done deal. He asserted no prudent person would think this was a good idea. He indicated County management told him this had to be done or the funds would be lost. He was unsure if this was a good enough excuse as real money was involved. He thought the County needed to look at this and be fiscally sound.

Chair Hill reminded that Vice Chair Herman had asked for background information on this item. Division Director of Housing and Homeless Services Dana Searcy informed this was funding Phase IV of the Cares Campus. It encompassed about two acres of the property and was for 50 units of supportive housing which she asserted was extremely expensive to build. She observed the units would house individuals with cognitive and physical disabilities who could not live on their own without services. This would also fund the remainder of the building, which would include training areas, mental health counselor rooms, laundry, a common space for gathering, and quite a bit of outdoor space. Concerning Commissioner Clark's question about the expense, Ms. Searcy informed she did not have the exact cost per unit. She stated staff could obtain that, but it was not a complete comparison to divide the total by 50 units as it did include a lot of extra space; the building itself was over 20,000 square feet. She reported this was scheduled to go to bid later in September and would come back before the BCC in December so some conversations could occur before then.

Commissioner Clark understood the units would house individuals with disabilities, but he asked if there were any provisions for seniors or women and children and families. Ms. Searcy responded yes. She noted there would not be any children at this facility as it would be within the gates of the Cares Campus which did not serve children. Housing would occur through the Continuum of Care (CoC) community queue. This meant that every service provider at Our Place and the Cares Campus would assess individuals

based on need. There was a standard assessment that would be used, with the highest-need individuals being placed at the top of the list. She reminded that over 40 percent of everyone at the Cares Campus was 55 years old or over. Those individuals, as well as women, would be able to be housed at this facility.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 17 be approved, authorized, and directed.

23-0563 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Recommendation to approve the Master Services Agreement (“MSA”) between Washoe County and TruEd Consulting, Inc. for the purchase of consulting services to assist in the design, implementation, and training of Anaplan budgeting software for Washoe County in an amount not to exceed [\$360,000] over the 5-year contract term. If approved, authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the agreement. Finance and Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Public comment for each item in the Block Vote was held concurrently; see Agenda Item 13 for the public comment related to this item.

Commissioner Clark wondered if there was a request for proposal (RFP) for this item. He inquired if it would have been simpler to find someone who understood these particular programs and have them train County staff as opposed to hiring TruEd Consulting, Inc. He asked if there was anyone else available who could assist with the training for Washoe County. He informed he visited Anaplan’s website and did not see any counties listed with success stories. He wanted to know why the County was hiring this particular firm.

Technology Services (TS) Project Coordinator Dan Simpson shared that about a year ago staff began investigating software applications to help the Budget team. The County evaluated several applications on its own and then put out a request for information (RFI). A series of questions was asked publicly, and eight responses were received for both the implementers and the software. Staff conducted evaluations and did three thorough demonstrations with different vendors. Ultimately, TruEd was selected as the implementer of the Anaplan software.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 18 be approved and authorized.

23-0564 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to adopt Resolution R23-125 amending short-term rental (STR) application fees within the Washoe County Development Code Master Fee Schedule, with an effective date of October 1, 2023, as authorized by Washoe County Code Section 110.906.05, and approve an annual adjustment to those fees based on the

Western Consumer Price Index beginning on July 1, 2024. This amendment updates fees related to the administration and enforcement of STR standards and permits in unincorporated Washoe County. Proposed updates include: increases of approximately \$270-\$350 for Tier 1 STR permit applications and renewals; new fees for applicant-requested changes to existing STR permits; and a new fee for applicant appeals of Tier 1 STR permits. Virtual Public Comment Eligible. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Division Director of Planning and Building Kelly Mullin conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background; Identified Issues; Proposed Solutions; What do STR Tier 1 Permit Fees Cover; Proposed Fee Changes (Attachment A-1); Public Input; Enforcement; Proposed Motion.

Ms. Mullin advised there were two agenda items pertaining to short-term rentals (STRs), one related to fee changes and one to Code amendments. She explained the program establishment period began in 2019 and standards were created in 2021. She said this was a collaborative period that included workshops and community engagement. The Codes addressed concerns brought forward by the community, including parking, trash, and noise. She noted the Board originally directed STR permit fees to cover the cost of program administration and enforcement. Because it was a new program, initial fee settings were based on unknown factors, such as the amount of permit applications and required program administration resources. She noted that fee reassessment was expected after the program was established and said the past two years had allowed for this. This period included the implementation of technical systems and process streamlining. She stated program fees clearly did not cover the cost of program administration.

Ms. Mullin announced that understaffing was one of multiple identified program issues. Due to understaffing, planners had been covering program administration duties. She reported the fiscal year (FY) 2024 annual estimated shortfall was subsidized by the general fund and said there were proposed solutions to help permit fees cover program costs. One proposed solution was to hire staff specifically for program administration. She pointed out this would reduce the annual estimated shortfall to approximately \$174,000 and explained that proposed STR permit fee increases would cover that gap.

Ms. Mullin stated the team did a significant amount of work regarding safety. She noted a code enforcement officer had been hired when the program began who was dedicated solely to STR enforcement. A system called Host Compliance monitored properties that advertised as STRs to identify their permitting statuses. She mentioned a 24-hour third-party complaint hotline was also used and said permit fees supported the entire permitting process, including the use of Accela permitting software. She explained process improvement meetings were held every two weeks with the Technology Services (TS) team. She spoke about a proposal that allocated some Tahoe Basin STR fees to Clean Tahoe beginning in 2023.

Ms. Mullin advised the specific proposed fee changes could be found in Attachment A. She posited that including an annual automatic Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment could reduce more dramatic fee adjustments in the future. A public input process was undertaken in preparation for the proposed changes. Property managers, property owners, local responsible parties for STRs, and community members who had signed up for STR updates were contacted by email.

Ms. Mullin explained that proposed enforcement enhancements included a regular data exchange with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO), to which the WCSO had agreed. The data would explain how frequently the WCSO responded to STR issues. The WCSO had also agreed to provide an increased presence in identified STR problem areas, when possible. She explained that street-side spot checks meant a code enforcement officer would be present in certain STR problem areas, such as summertime in Incline Village (IV).

Commissioner Clark asked to view the PowerPoint presentation slides again. He inquired if anyone on the previous Board or Ms. Mullin's staff was a property owner who understood licensing and property management. Ms. Mullin responded that she did not think any of her staff were licensed property managers. She explained preparation included communication with stakeholders who were property managers. This resulted in a 10 percent discount for local responsible parties of STRs who were also licensed property managers.

Commissioner Clark clarified that his question was if any staff possessed a working knowledge of requirements when the rules and regulations were compiled. Ms. Mullin stated she was not aware of any staff member possessing a Nevada property management permit.

Commissioner Clark said the plan resembled a hypothetical business plan meant to financially fail. He mentioned the administration costs, collected fees, and the approximate \$125,000 annual loss. He noted there were fewer than 700 permit holders and about 500,000 Washoe County residents and posited Washoe County residents were subsidizing the businesses of fewer than 700 people. He proposed a reexamination of the program's processes. He recommended a new business plan that incorporated the extra 10 percent most local property managers charged. He opined the program was set up to lose money and mentioned the undesired effects of combined negative County fiscal impacts and irritation caused to County residents. In his attempt to reach the issue's core, he reported finding three central issues: traffic, parking, and transportation; noise and rowdiness; and trash. He stated 94 percent of STRs were in District 1 and annual program fiscal shortages had cost everyone else in the County \$261,000 per year.

Ms. Mullin asserted this agenda item was meant to address concerns identified by Commissioner Clark. She noted there were a few approaches to enable a resolution. The first approach was to create two paraprofessional full-time employee (FTE) positions since these positions would cost less than planning staff to perform administrative actions. The second approach was to increase permit fees. She advised a combination of

these approaches should result in the attainment of the goal of permit fees covering administration costs.

Commissioner Clark posited that taxes paid by working-class citizens had helped affluent citizens rent out properties. He opined the issue should be resolved on the open market and said the County should remove itself from the property management business. He suggested staff be reapproached to modify the plan and speculated that any saved money could help resolve other community problems, instead of subsidizing IV's property owners.

Commissioner Clark asserted that, as the former Assessor, he knew there were over 8,000 properties in IV and Crystal Bay (CB). He declared that 149 survey respondents were not enough to represent the entire area. He referenced communication from constituents who said they had not been informed about surveys. He stated he was not comfortable with the amount of data collected and suggested that community members who were impacted by issues like noise, trash, and transportation be contacted instead of just property managers and permit holders.

Ms. Mullin said the survey focused specifically on permit fee changes, not on broader STR standards. She noted the number of survey recipients associated with an STR was approximately 1,000 so the response rate was about 15 percent. She agreed the response rate would have been smaller if the larger community was considered.

Commissioner Clark posited the Treasurer's Office could have contacted all affected citizens since it retained everyone's address. He postulated that displeased citizens would have recommended permit fee increases. He suggested anyone impacted by STRs should have been contacted, not just property managers or permit holders. He said since the issue was community-wide, all stakeholders should have been asked for feedback. He stressed the importance of resolving the three major issues of trash, transportation, and noise.

Vice Chair Herman suggested that as a member of the previous Board, she could potentially answer Commissioner Clark's questions. She mentioned her property management experience spanned many years and included hundreds of properties. She noted her vote to reject the program on the previous Board.

Chair Hill mentioned she knew of open markets where STRs were not permitted. She stated she received a massive number of complaints prior to permit implementation and many issues had since been mitigated. She commended the program's team and said there was still work to be done. She expressed support for the new FTEs' priority on enforcement and noted additional fee examination was necessary to ensure program sustainability. She said eliminating STRs was a very expensive prospect and mentioned South Lake Tahoe's familiarity with enforcement challenges for moratoriums of STRs not in commercial districts. She said the County balanced the issue to the best of its ability and expressed appreciation to the program's team.

Chair Hill mentioned a public comment from Mr. Eric Tracy she hoped Ms. Mullin could address. The comment questioned why STR penalty fees had not increased. Chair Hill explained her understanding that the Board was restricted in the amount of fees it could implement for civil disciplinary issues. Ms. Mullin advised the question would be addressed in Item 10 and said staff was examining if fees could increase. She said conversations regarding civil infraction fees had occurred at the program's outset with the District Attorney's (DA) Office. She noted an investigation would occur if Item 10 was approved.

Commissioner Andriola asked how many staff members were designated to enforcement, including the proposed fee increase and two additional FTE positions. Ms. Mullin advised there was one existing full-time code enforcement officer. She explained the two new positions were intended for the planning technician level. She noted there would be a total of three positions that focused on program administration and enforcement. A portion of the planning technicians' duties would be to provide support to the enforcement officer.

Commissioner Andriola inquired about enforcement scheduling. Ms. Mullin stated County staff operated during normal business hours, Monday through Friday. She said Host Compliance operated the 24-hour, third-party service and had its own team of complaint responders. Between the two services, there were 24-hour service capabilities. Commissioner Andriola clarified that a homeowner had 30 minutes to respond to a complaint. Ms. Mullin specified the responsibility fell on the local responsible party. Every STR had to identify a local responsible party who could be physically available within a short period of time, if necessary. She explained that sometimes the local responsible party was the homeowner, but not always. Commissioner Andriola asked what happened after Host Compliance contacted a local responsible party. Ms. Mullin explained the local responsible party had 30 minutes to text back. The code enforcement officer followed up with the local responsible party on the next business day to gather more information about how the situation was handled.

Commissioner Andriola shared some feedback she received and posited there had been issues with an abundance of leniency. She noted that a penalty was imposed after two infractions, and permit revocation occurred after three infractions. Ms. Mullin advised it was a combination of financial penalties and a "three strikes, you're out" approach, which meant three confirmed violations within one year resulted in the revocation of the STR permit. After that, there was a one-year "cooling off" period. She clarified that a confirmed violation meant a permit holder had exhausted all their due process rights. There was a process for when permit holders disagreed with an infraction's validity. Commissioner Andriola asked if the fee structure considered those factors and noted how much staff time was required to address infractions. She asked if the fee structure was built with the intention of reaching net zero. Ms. Mullin agreed the fees were created with the intent of the program being cost-neutral.

Commissioner Clark thanked Vice Chair Herman for clarifying that she had previously voted against the program. He announced he was a 40-year licensed property manager in Nevada and said he had rented many properties near the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). He mentioned that UNR students were not owner-occupants and commented that, due to a party atmosphere, there were many similar challenges to the STR issues. He noted the County's normal business hours did not align with the timing of parties. He speculated as to what would happen if a property manager was on vacation when a complaint was submitted. He said there was a lot that could go wrong and advised a business plan should not be based on fees or fines. He suggested property managers charge a large refundable deposit to prevent rowdy behavior because deposits would be more effective deterrents than contestable fees. He posited that most STRs were luxurious properties and some of the deposit could go to the County if the County helped with enforcement.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Linda Smith announced she was commenting on behalf of concerned neighbors of Tyrolian Village (TV). She advised there were over 80 property owners in TV and asked that her voice represent her neighbors as well. She supported the agenda item and posited fees should be increased even more than what was proposed. This would help cover the costs of fees for the more than 642 permitted STRs in IV. She opined there should be two full-time individuals stationed in IV, specifically on weekends and evenings, when most issues occurred. She said her homeowners association (HOA) had 30 permitted STRs and at least 3 unpermitted STRs. She mentioned her neighborhood continued to experience issues that included discharged firearms, outside urination, littering, attracting bears with improperly disposed trash, starting fires (five of which were documented), traffic, dog bites, illegal drug use, and playing loud music late at night. She said the program had only one full-time code enforcement officer and observed the program was asking for one and a half to two more positions. She suggested the addition of two more full-time code enforcement positions stationed in IV. She asserted that WCSO responses to complaints during evening and weekend hours were a poor use of law enforcement resources and jeopardized their ability to respond to other community issues. She asked the Board to accept Item 9 and add two more full-time staff in IV.

Mr. Jeff Mohlenkamp informed he lived in Washoe Valley, where he possessed an STR permit. He shared he was the State of Nevada's Budget Director for three years and had managed finances in multiple California cities. He thought over a million dollars was being brought into Washoe County's general fund but said he could not make an exact determination without seeing the numbers. He posited that STR overregulation was an issue. He said he spent over \$840 on property requirements such as interconnected fire alarms and outside lighting. He declared there were too many requirements for his 1,000-square-foot house. He advised that funding be spent on enforcement and recommended a tier system that separated owners with multiple properties. He opined the program issue was on the back end and overregulation was occurring on the front end. He urged honesty and transparency surrounding STRs and suggested the County was trying to regulate STRs out of commission. He said many people probably had STRs without going through the proper process, which he had considered but

decided against. He encouraged the implementation of tiers because he was being grouped in with much more affluent people.

Ms. Lesley Mohlenkamp said she was a proud resident of Washoe Valley and wanted to present a new perspective. She noted she was speaking on behalf of regular people who were just looking to supplement their incomes with STRs. She stated she was not a real estate mogul, corporation, or property manager. She and her husband had been excited to use their home as an Airbnb. They were told by their friend in Silver Springs that it was a simple process. Ms. Mohlenkamp mentioned she did not have the same simple experience as her friend. She said Washoe County's STR permitting processes and inspections took hours. She was required to measure rooms, draw blueprints, and create schematics, which were all examined by staff. She said the program was "one size fits all." She noted the Staff Report mentioned a need to increase resources, fees, and personnel. She observed it did not mention process simplification and opined that would increase income and encourage more people to participate in the STR process. She also stated the Staff Report mentioned revenue projections that ran short and suggested regular people were either priced out of the market or were not going through the permitting process. She had found similar local government entities and researched their permitting requirements.

Mr. Mark Neumann commented that something was wrong if the County lost \$265,000. He mentioned raising fees by \$80 per unit would still lead to losing money. He suggested any WCSO presence caused by an STR infraction be paid for by renters.

Ms. Deborah Sauk urged the passage of Item 9 but mentioned she agreed with the implementation of a tier system. She said TV had been recently brought up because of its STR problems. She surmised it had VRBO, not Airbnb, so it might need a different fee structure than an owner who occasionally rented out a single room. She noted a \$259,000 shortage in the proposal and said the fee increases only allowed a \$92,000 increase. She questioned why it did not balance. She summarized that she supported the item overall but encouraged more research to be conducted.

Commissioner Clark stated his agreement with Mr. and Mrs. Mohlenkamp. He posited he could save Washoe County \$259,000 by removing it from the STR business. He wanted the private sector to make determinations regarding STRs. He said the fee collection was not working and mentioned there were at least 80 unhappy people in TV. He asserted the program provided no benefits. He questioned why Washoe County was involved in STRs and complimented Vice Chair Herman's previous decision to vote against the program. He wanted the County to exit the STR business. He advised examining the long-term costs associated with hiring two FTEs. He did not agree with the logic of hiring more people to save money. He suggested removing permits, implementing WCSO help for complaints, and charging extra for repeated WCSO intervention. He related this suggestion to certain jurisdictions that required fines when false burglar alarms went off.

Commissioner Andriola affirmed she believed in market-driven free enterprise and said she was not a member of the previous Board. She felt the program was a bit regulatory and was interested in the Mohlenkamps' point that their single property

had the same fees as other properties. She observed that over 90 percent of STRs were in IV and CB, but the issue impacted all districts. She expressed interest in utilizing a tier system and noted implementation would require additional work. She added that knowledge could be derived from previous agenda items and suggested looking at HOAs that disallowed STRs. She noted the County had previously examined HOAs that allotted parking spots based on a tier system. She recommended that if the County continued to regulate STRs, a provision be added to allow for HOA oversight and guidelines. She expressed hesitation at disallowing STRs to be market-driven and stated streamlining regulations was challenging. She said the current issue was not about allowing or disallowing STRs and highlighted the significance of enforcement. She said she wanted HOA inclusion in the process and recommended the citizen advisory boards (CABs) provide regular enforcement and process feedback. She mentioned the ordinance affected all residents in the County and suggested the possibility of a tier system.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras noted Items 9 and 10 had similarities but Item 9 pertained to adopting a new fee schedule. She advised points of consideration could be discussed during Item 10, as well as the possibility of amending the Washoe County Code (WCC).

Commissioner Clark referenced Chief DDA Kandaras's comments regarding Item 10. He reiterated that the program provided no benefits and echoed Commissioner Andriola's statement that everyone in the County was impacted, including handling a \$259,000 bill. He asked how that money could be better spent. He stated the two Commissioners who were also property managers did not think supporting Item 9 was a good idea. He claimed the issue should be addressed on the free market.

Commissioner Garcia asked Ms. Mullin if the information from 2019 demonstrated a desire from the former Board for more regulations. She asked Ms. Mullin to speak to the relevant historical context. Ms. Mullin reported the Board had responded to strong community sentiment in 2019 regarding STRs and quality of life. She said community opinion was generally split between those wanting to operate STRs and those who lived next to STRs. She explained an extensive public outreach period had occurred because of so much community feedback, especially from residents living next to STRs. She stated the program was an effort to balance simplicity, enforceability, and solutions. She reiterated the ordinance was a result of community feedback and engagement. She reported the hotline had received 415 complaint calls in FY22 and 197 calls in the most recent year. She opined the decrease resulted from standards and regulations that were implemented to address community concerns.

Commissioner Garcia appreciated Ms. Mullin's embedded statements about bolstering enforcement.

Chair Hill mentioned STRs were a central focus of her previous campaign and reported the community was urging County interference at the time. The County was requested to help since citizens had no resolution channels and neighbor-on-neighbor disagreements were prevalent. She said the data proved there had been improvements. She

spoke to the Mohlenkamps' concerns and noted she had received feedback about uninhabitable rental properties, which had resulted in a push for building inspections. She posited the Board could reexamine regulations but warned program elimination would be a community loss, as the program had mended relationships and resolved concerns. She stated the program was not perfect, as there was always room for improvement, but she cautioned against throwing it out.

Commissioner Clark inquired about the correlation between fees and decreased hotline calls. Ms. Mullin clarified the decreased hotline calls demonstrated the program had helped property owners.

Commissioner Clark commented that the issue was not in the Board's purview. He said the County did not have adequate staff and commended Commissioner Garcia for asking about the issue's history. He asserted the program had not worked and it had cost the County money. He said he could see why people avoided the regulations and did not abide by formal STR processes.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Chair Hill, which motion duly carried on a 3-2 vote with Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Clark voting no, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be adopted and approved. The Resolution for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

23-0565 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to provide direction to staff on initiation of amendments to Washoe County Code Chapters 110 (Development Code) and 125 (Administrative Enforcement Code) pursuant to WCC Sections 2.030 and 110.818.05, to create the necessary code language to limit the number of short-term rentals (STRs) operating in unincorporated Washoe County. The amendments may include, but are not limited to, the establishment of a cap on the overall number of STR permits issued, the basis for such a cap, the area of applicability, and method(s) of implementation. The amendments may also include other changes to streamline and clarify current STR permitting and enforcement processes; and direct the County Clerk to submit the request to the District Attorney's Office for preparation of the proposed ordinance(s) in accordance with WCC 2.040. Virtual Public Comment Eligible. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Division Director of Planning and Building Kelly Mullin conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background; Potential Basis for a Cap; STR Caps Around Lake Tahoe; Other Proposed Changes; Next Steps if Initiated; Recommendation.

Ms. Mullin said the District Attorney's (DA) Office specified short-term rental (STR) limits must be established in response to identified needs or issues. Some potential bases for a cap were identified in the Staff Report.

Ms. Mullin mentioned concerns in the Lake Tahoe area, specifically in Incline Village (IV) and Crystal Bay (CB), about the lack of affordable housing and workforce housing. She stated Washoe County had to conform to standards set by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), which was a regional planning board that delegated certain land use authority to the County. STR standards impacted housing allocations (also known as rental allocations) that TRPA granted to the County. Every home built in the Tahoe area was required to have a residential allocation. These were awarded to each jurisdiction based on several factors, one of which was the jurisdiction's adopted STR standards.

Ms. Mullin informed that Douglas County, El Dorado County, and Placer County had each implemented STR limits within the past few years. She specified those limits had been adopted since Washoe County started examining STR standards. She noted there was a variety of STR standards in each of Lake Tahoe's major jurisdictions. Although South Lake Tahoe did not utilize STR caps, it had restrictions prohibiting STRs in residential areas.

Ms. Mullin shared that a list of potential Code amendments was found in the Staff Report. She explained staff was seeking authorization for changes related to permitting and enforcement processes, and potential fee increases for STR violations.

Ms. Mullin advised that if Code amendments were initiated, staff would work with the DA's Office to craft potential language. They would specifically look at the appropriateness of STR limits, implementation methods, linking the approach to known issues, and legal defensibility. After that, at least one planning workshop would occur. More could occur at the Board's discretion.

Vice Chair Herman did not think STR caps were a good idea. She asserted that people rented out properties to make money, not because they enjoyed dealing with potentially destructive renters. She posited people used STRs to make enough money to retire in their STR properties. She claimed an STR cap would take away people's freedoms.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Grant Meyer noted he was a 32-year IV resident and the IV Board of Realtors president. He stated he lived next to an STR that caused very few issues with parking, traffic, trash, or noise compared to the long-term rental on the other side of his house. He asserted the IV Board of Realtors was adamantly opposed to the STR cap and declared STR caps commodified public assets and disrupted healthy markets with government intervention. He reiterated STR caps commodified a public asset, which he believed incentivized property owners to acquire a permit and never use it. He thought STR caps would decrease the transient occupancy revenue for the County, negatively impact small businesses that relied on IV tourism, and negatively affect the housing market. He mentioned various studies found that 95 percent of STR owners used the property themselves, so it was a fallacy that STR permits took away from workforce or long-term housing. He stated the Tahoe Prosperity Center (TPC) acknowledged a majority of STRs in the area were owned by people who occupied the properties themselves. He posited if the Board implemented STR caps, it would eliminate

revenue and small businesses in the community. He reported there were 517 complaints out of an estimated 47,000 STR stays, so 0.01 percent of stays resulted in issues. He acknowledged some renters caused issues, but he did not want the Board to negatively affect the community because of them. He noted the IV Board of Realtors Public Policy committee asked the Board not to add an STR cap. He opined STR caps were an infringement on private property rights and would disproportionately impact a narrow geographic area of the County, as 94 percent of STR permits were in IV and CB.

Mr. Chris Raynor announced he was the managing broker for EXP Realty and the chair of Government Affairs for Sierra Nevada Realtors, formerly known as the Reno/Sparks Association of Realtors. He stated Sierra Nevada Realtors supported private property rights. He declared many local businesses looked to STRs for tourism and support and remarked that residents depended on STRs for jobs. He shared that one-third of 1 percent of all Washoe County homes were STRs. He did not think STRs took away from workforce housing and mentioned STRs allowed Lake Tahoe visitors to enjoy retreats and vacations. He shared that 685 of 218,000 Washoe County homes were STRs and the current estimate was that each STR provided approximately \$20,000 per year of revenue to Washoe County and almost \$14 million to the County's budget. He claimed current ordinances worked as intended and STR caps would create confusing regulations for STR owners. He wanted the community to be a great place to live, work, and stay and offered to engage with any Commissioners.

Ms. Bonnie Glennon announced she was an IV STR owner, licensed Nevada realtor, and licensed California real estate broker. She owned an STR with her daughter since 2022 and mentioned she had a great experience. Their STR was for personal use and rented through Airbnb. She pondered if there was an education issue between neighbors and renters. She used a \$500 party fee as a deterrent and said her STR had no parties as a result. She utilized exterior cameras to monitor visitors. When renting an STR in IV through Sun Bear Realty and Management recently, she was required to do a background check. She referenced one of Commissioner Clark's statements and claimed the private sector proposed restrictions to help the community. She thought the Board's guidelines improved the safety and quality of her STR. She suggested the Board refer to homeowners associations (HOAs) for STR limits.

Ms. Lesley Mohlenkamp reported she researched STRs in Aspen, Colorado; Big Bear Lake, California; Hawaii County, Hawaii; Park City, Utah; Bozeman, Montana; and San Diego, California, and found each entity had lower STR fees than Washoe County. She posited they kept costs low by limiting STR licenses. She suggested Washoe County examine how other entities addressed STR concerns regarding permitting and cost efficiency. She claimed her fee would be \$285 in San Diego because of a tier system. She reiterated the County should explore multiple options and look to reduce fees.

Mr. Jeff Mohlenkamp shared there were fewer regulations such as interconnected smoke alarms, exit lights, and floor plan submissions if he rented his house long-term. He questioned the difference between a 30-day and a 3-day rental and posited the Board should be consistent with regulations if its goal was public safety. He suggested

a tier for rentals of less than 150 days per year, so people like him who lived in their homes but rented it out a few weeks per year were not grouped in with those who rented properties as a business. He recommended the Board reduce front-end regulation and apply it to the back end.

Ms. Katherine Snedigar asserted that certain rights came with purchasing properties and the Board did not have the right to regulate properties, including noise complaint issues. She accused the Board of wanting to remove citizen rights. She claimed Washoe County had not reached a population of 500,000, as she believed it was approximately 487,000. She said there were 60,000 children in the Washoe County School District (WCSD) that year but there were over 63,000 when she moved to Washoe County 34 years ago. She claimed new schools were being built even though the County's population had not grown. She accused the Board of being motivated to collect money from STR owners. She questioned why STRs were being examined and suggested the Board was throwing money at the homeless population out of guilt. She warned that people would not want to visit Lake Tahoe and stated she could not afford to support the STR program.

Ms. Linda Smith announced she was commenting on behalf of the concerned neighbors of Tyrolian Village (TV). She requested her voice represent her 80 neighbors in support of STR limits. She sought urgent staff action to help her overwhelmed community. She noted that 10 percent of Washoe County's STRs were in IV and CB. She said her community no longer had workforce housing and mentioned the presence of congestion and traffic there. She declared her neighbors thought calling STR hotlines was pointless. She stated 2 percent of Douglas County's dwelling units were STRs because of its cap of 600 and less than 1 percent of El Dorado County's dwelling units were STRs because of its cap of 900. She compared this to IV where 8.3 percent of dwelling units were STRs. She believed the Board should honor the 2021 efforts to create the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan that established an IV commercial zone and tourist zone. She advised the Board to follow South Lake Tahoe's lead and limit STR permits to commercial and tourist zones. She claimed this would create much-needed workforce housing while respecting land use and density designations set by TRPA. She suggested the Board set an STR cap of 400 permits, or about 5 percent of dwelling units, within commercial and tourist zones. She asserted the citizens of TV and Tahoe Village had worked hard to present a thoughtful approach to solving STR issues.

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

Commissioner Andriola asked Chief Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras if the Board was limited to discussing STR caps. Chief DDA Kandaras referenced the Staff Report and advised the Board could discuss STR caps and other items. This included but was not limited to, streamlining and clarifying STR permitting and enforcement processes. She cautioned that STR elimination discussions should be agendized separately because they would prompt a new set of interested citizens and were beyond the scope of this item. She noted that Washoe County Code (WCC) Chapter 2 dealt

with amendments and creation of Codes and stated the Board could direct the DA to make amendments. The DA would then consult with the Board and stakeholders and ensure amendments met legal requirements.

Commissioner Andriola thanked Chief DDA Kandaras for the clarification and announced she did not support STR caps. She hoped certain topics could be considered, including HOA involvement. She felt a working group would be useful and mentioned citizen advisory boards (CABs). She specified she meant all CABs, not just the IV CAB since the entire County was impacted. She reiterated she did not support STR caps but did support additional research.

Commissioner Clark said a working group should include people who did not live in IV. He suggested inviting Mr. and Mrs. Mohlenkamp since they had real-life STR experience.

Commissioner Garcia communicated apprehension about the potential impact of STR caps on Washoe County's tourism market. She was concerned STR caps would eliminate revenue for small businesses and infringe on private property rights. She referenced a letter from a previous Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting and asked Ms. Mullin if the letter involved direct communication with the HOA. Ms. Mullin confirmed the verification letter specifically addressed how many parking spaces were assigned to an STR within a condominium complex under HOA governance. Commissioner Garcia verified it was specific to the parking criteria.

Commissioner Garcia reiterated she did not support STR caps. She confirmed her support for Item 9 and highlighted the importance of program revision. She said it was important to hear from staff, constituents, and stakeholders.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-1 vote with Chair Hill voting no, it was ordered that amendments not be initiated to establish a cap on the overall number of STR permits issued.

Commissioner Andriola motioned to include HOAs in the STR verification process and implement working groups, such as CABs, to provide feedback from all County districts. Chair Hill seconded the motion. She liked the idea of community engagement and mentioned a community working group that addressed STR ordinances in Douglas County. She had received feedback that their process was long, confusing, and contentious. She asked Commissioner Andriola how she envisioned the working group unfolding and inquired about a potential timeline. Commissioner Andriola said she would leave items related to enforcement, tiers, and community feedback up to staff discretion. She clarified she did not think the working group should be limited to CABs and would defer to staff for more effective ways to obtain feedback from all districts.

Chair Hill noted the Board examined STRs annually. She suggested a goal to evaluate recommendations by December 2023 or January 2024.

Chief DDA Kandaras explained that when drafting ordinances, legality was determined by the DA's Office. She reported the DA could speak with any potential stakeholders as they saw fit, but she did not believe the Board should require a working group for the purpose of helping draft ordinance conditions. She mentioned Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nate Edwards was an STR expert. She pointed out that when STR standards were established in 2019, ADA Paul Lipparelli declined to use HOA standards to establish the County's STR permitting standards because he did not think it was legally appropriate for the County to apply private standards to the issuance of public permits. She clarified she was not suggesting the Board avoid the subject; her intention was to inform the Board of past considerations. Her point of order was to specify that the Board was not required to issue amendments. The Board could either decline the item or move to initiate amendments to address specific items such as tiers.

Commissioner Andriola mentioned an in-depth discussion with ADA Edwards and clarified she was not requesting implementation, only consideration. She believed streamlining would be helpful and thought community feedback could help the DA's Office with ordinance crafting.

Chief DDA Kandaras verified with Commissioner Andriola that the standing motion was to initiate amendments that could include, but were not limited to, streamlining the enforcement process, evaluating tiers, and incorporating community feedback in the ordinance draft. Chief DDA Kandaras advised the motion was appropriate. Chair Hill agreed with the motion as its seconder.

Commissioner Clark thought obtaining feedback from more sources than CABs was important and added the County should act in accordance with the majority's will. He wanted to hear from as many people as possible and opined that the issue should be revisited within 60 days.

Commissioner Andriola agreed that as much community feedback should be obtained as possible. She specified the intended timeline to revisit the item was by or before December 2023.

Chair Hill noted she had addressed the STR issue since taking office. She wanted to be realistic and respect the timelines needed by the Community Services Department (CSD). She asked Ms. Mullin for her input. Ms. Mullin said it was feasible to present to the Board a drafted ordinance by the end of 2023, but she was not sure it could go through the Planning Commission (PC) by that time. She advised that she could accommodate a BCC update prior to finalizing draft language; she asked that the Board notify her in that case. Chair Hill and Commissioner Andriola confirmed the feasibility of the proposed timeline. Commissioner Garcia verified the motion was not intended to discuss STR caps.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Chair Hill, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered to initiate amendments that could include, but were not limited to, streamlining the enforcement process, evaluating tiers, and incorporating community feedback in the ordinance draft

23-0566 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation and possible action to: (1) Approve the purchase and sale between Washoe County and BHC Health Services of Nevada, Inc. a Nevada Corporation for the property commonly known as the West Hills Hospital located at 1240 East 9th Street, Reno, Nevada (APN 008-171-38) (an approximate 3.43 acres portion of the overall 4.69 acre site) as authorized in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 244.275 for \$4,800,000.00; and (2) authorize the County Manager to execute any and all required documents necessary for the property purchase. Community Services. (Commission District 3.)

Assistant County Manager (ACM) Dave Solaro reminded that in December 2022, the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) allocated \$4.8 million of the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) for the potential purchase of the property known as West Hills Hospital which closed on December 20, 2021. He asserted that the closure had greatly impacted mental health capabilities within the community for adolescents. He believed this is what led to the discussions with the property owners about the possibility of Washoe County having first right of refusal before the facility was sold. He spoke about the negotiation process with the group that owned the facility, noting it took a while to get to a point where it made sense for Washoe County to own a piece of property where it did not provide the services to the community but had the ability to contract with others to provide them.

Mr. Solaro reported he had conducted research and learned from his counterparts in other departments about the effects of the Medicare process and how it impacted the ability of service providers to cover their costs associated with this. He observed that Washoe County had the opportunity, through the use of the SLFRF, to purchase a facility and assist a provider in providing these needed uses.

Regarding the negotiation process, Mr. Solaro informed that the County followed the process as required by State law. An appraisal was obtained, and Mr. Solaro sat down with the Chair and Vice Chair at that time and had a conversation to determine if it sounded adequate. He declared it had sounded right to County staff, particularly when the cost per square foot was taken into account, thus the offer of \$4.8 million was made and accepted by the owner. He clarified that the sales price equated to approximately \$101.70 per square foot. Staff did an analysis of the building and determined there were some renovations that would have to occur to bring the facility up to a usable standard; that cost was about \$192 per square foot. The total overall cost of the facility was approximately \$293.77 per square foot.

Mr. Solaro observed that new construction of facilities of this type would cost around \$750 to \$950 per square foot. He listed items that were hitting the local market and vying for costs for new construction, such as prevailing wages, public works, the ability to get contractors, and increased costs of materials. He clarified that the \$750 to \$950 was for construction costs, it did not include the property costs, water rights, connection fees, or other associated fees. He declared that an existing building at just under \$300 per square foot was a great deal for Washoe County.

Mr. Solaro reiterated there was some work that needed to be done and noted it was a large property at about 3.43 acres. The owner was leasing a portion of the property to the Coral Academy of Science so the County would do a subdivision and carve a section out. He informed there were other uses besides youth mental health, staff was working with the health district as it had a need for new space. The health district received a \$10 million grant from the State for a tuberculosis (TB) clinic and a satellite health office. He said that was a use that could be done on this property either within the building or in a separate building on the property. That would allow the BCC to then determine the fate of the 10 Kirman Avenue facility where the TB clinic currently resided. He reminded that the West Hills property was kitty-corner across from the Washoe County Administration Complex so the location was great for the County and the health district.

Mr. Solaro pointed out there were some deed restrictions the owner wanted to ensure were tied to this property, which were included as part of Exhibit C, the purchase and sale agreement. Washoe County had been able to negotiate that the County and the health district could contract for the work. There was a list of things the County could do that were outside of those deed restrictions because the company that owned the property understood the County's plight and what it was trying to do for the community. However, if Washoe County decided to sell the facility in the future, those deed restrictions would come into play and would limit the property by disallowing its use for health care services. Based on the zoning, it would be used for offices, classroom space, or other uses within the public facilities zoning in the City of Reno. He wanted to ensure that was on the public record so the Commissioners understood that if Washoe County sold this parcel in the future, there were restrictions that would kick in.

Chair Hill observed that Mr. Solaro had worked hard on this. She remembered the initial conversations about this and thought it was a very exciting day.

Commissioner Clark expressed concern about the deed restrictions. He recalled Mr. Solaro's statement that this was a great deal, but he wondered if anyone from the company that owned the property had explained to County staff why they were so adamant about the deed restrictions. Mr. Solaro responded that the company wanted to restrict the use of the property because it had other properties in the area that provided some of these services. The company did not want Washoe County to be able to sell the property to a competitor. That was the business model the company had used for the properties it bought and sold across the Country; it limited competition for the services the company provided to the communities it moved into or served. Commissioner Clark asked if there was any way to negotiate a better price. He opined this was like selling a car that the buyer

could only use one day per week. He thought it devalued the property and declared it was like putting a lien on it. It would prevent the County from selling the property on the open market in the future. He reiterated his question and indicated that if the Board moved forward with this, he would like to see it tied to the property on Kirman Avenue. He asserted that was a surplus property that it did not make sense for the County to own. He thought it made more sense for Renown Health to own it since it was right on the corner of Renown's campus. He wanted that property to be appraised and sold, and then use part of the profits of the sale to pay for the West Hills property. He proposed liquidating some non-performing County assets to buy something the County needed. He thought that made financial sense.

Commissioner Garcia shared she had been excited to see this item finally come before the Board as she had participated in conversations about this with County Manager Eric Brown and the District Board of Health (DBOH). She declared that as a school counselor by trade, she would never forget the day she read that West Hills was closing its doors; it had been very startling for practitioners who worked with youth in the community. She remarked that Nevada was ranked 51 in the nation for adult behavioral health and there was a tremendous crisis regarding youth mental health. She informed there was a lack of beds and a lack of options for children and adults. People were transported to jails or had to wait in emergency rooms. She asserted it did not just impact jails and hospitals, it also impacted schools and the foster care system. She mentioned the decline of Medicaid providers over the years and expressed concern about how difficult it was for a person to find resources for their family and children. She felt it was urgent that this item move forward.

Commissioner Garcia informed that State legislators recently looked at improving workforce shortages to address the mental health crisis. She thought policymakers needed to be on the lookout for creative and innovative approaches to do things locally and improve the mental health infrastructure as a whole. She expressed excitement for this and the possibilities it contained.

Chair Hill agreed with Commissioner Garcia. She shared she had spoken with Human Services Agency (HSA) staff and learned there were two attempted suicides by youth in the community over the weekend, and one was actualized. She declared that was the urgency and the need on the ground; the County did not have mental health care for juveniles. The County was doing something about that, and Chair Hill applauded the team for its work on the negotiations. She thanked Manager Brown for moving so quickly when he found out that West Hills was going to close. She declared it was a big deal and a big day for the community and it showed what the local government could do. She said this had been considered the responsibility of the State for so long, but the State was unable to do it. The County was trying to find partners and Chair Hill believed that would come back to the Board in the future. She expressed excitement about this item.

Commissioner Clark stated he did not want to slow down the process, he was just asking some questions. He wanted to know what the turnaround time would be with the renovation if the County were to purchase the property that day. Mr. Solaro

informed that the due diligence period to finalize the purchase and sale would be about four to six months. During that time, the County would do construction documents and all the other things necessary to be able to move forward with the renovation. He believed the facility could be operational by July or August 2024. He explained this was not something that could be done overnight and that a request for proposal (RFP) would have to be done to find a partner to help the County through this process. He mentioned that the kickoff for either a portion of this property or a new facility for the health district would also occur. That would put the County in the position to talk about the sale of the 10 Kirman property in about a year. He said he did not want to move too quickly. He acknowledged there was a critical need, but the County wanted to do things correctly. In response to a question from Commissioner Clark, Mr. Solaro indicated the goal was to ensure that the facility was open for business roughly one year from now. Commissioner Clark asked if that was a realistic expectation. Mr. Solaro believed it was.

Commissioner Garcia thanked the staff in the Office of the County Manager (OCM) for their patience and continual negotiations through this process.

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

23-0567 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to acknowledge and approve a resolution allowing an invocation at the opening of public meetings of the Board of County Commissioners and the guidelines and procedures pertaining thereto. Human Resources and Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Human Resources (HR) Organizational Effectiveness Manager Elizabeth Jourdin conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She reviewed slides with the following titles: The process; Guiding principles & participant guidance; Procedure; Thank you.

Ms. Jourdin observed this request was brought forward by Commissioner Andriola and staff put a team together to determine how to bring this item to the Board for consideration. The team looked at established case law to ensure they did not violate the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment, which did allow for legislative prayer, but there were some constraints. She reported the team evaluated a 2014 Supreme Court case as well as two more recent district-level cases, in the Fourth District and the Ninth District. The team also investigated what other local municipalities had done in this regard, noting Washoe County was not the first to bring this forward. They reviewed several different resolutions that public bodies had developed for approval and the team looked at guidelines, processes, and procedures. Once the package was created, the team sent it over to the District Attorney's (DA) Office for review and recommendation.

Ms. Jourdin shared that staff was proposing that an invocation occur at one designated Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meeting per month. They wanted to

honor the rich cultural and spiritual fabric of the Washoe County community by adding this to the agenda. She remarked that the invocations should be positive and uplifting in nature; they would not be an opportunity for disparagement of other people, organizations, or beliefs, or to present one particular belief system as superior to another. She stated invocations should not exceed two minutes in length and noted staff had discussions about whether to cut off the invocations in the same manner as public comment. Staff decided no, as they did not think that was in the spirit of invocation. Ms. Jourdin thought the recommended time limit of two minutes provided a little bit of leeway and she was hopeful the invocations would not be long.

Ms. Jourdin informed the team built a request form that was available on the Washoe County website and noted it mirrored the request for proclamations. Invocation requests would be scheduled on a first-come, first-served basis, with preference given to those who had not provided an invocation previously. Staff wanted to present this as an inclusive, equitable opportunity for members of the community. Confirmation of the invocation request would come through the agenda coordinator in the Office of the County Manager (OCM).

Chair Hill said she was impressed and thanked Ms. Jourdin for pulling this presentation together so quickly.

Commissioner Andriola expressed appreciation to all the County staff who worked on this item. She thought it meant a lot to be able to represent all faiths of the community. She believed it was a great opportunity to partner with the interfaith community and look at that as an additional resource. She was excited to see this develop so quickly. She thanked Ms. Jourdin, and Ms. Jourdin remarked that it was a team effort.

If no one requested an invocation, Chair Hill wondered if it would just not be added to the agenda. Ms. Jourdin reminded that the plan was to have one invocation per month, potentially during the middle BCC meeting or a meeting when there was already a proclamation agendized. Under the guidelines, if someone was scheduled and there was a cancellation, the agenda item could default to something such as a moment of silence that would be directed by the Chair of the Commission.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Janet Butcher said she thought this was a wonderful idea. She indicated she loved to hear from any and all denominations. She believed the County did need prayer, but she hoped other items would be agendized as quickly as this one was. She wondered why requests from Vice Chair Herman and Commissioner Clark had not been agendized when they had been asking for several months.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be acknowledged and approved. The Resolution for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

23-0568

AGENDA ITEM 16 Recommendation to approve a resolution transferring Washoe County's 2023 pro-rata share of the State of Nevada's Private Activity Bonding Authority (\$6,889,172.03) to the Director of the State of Nevada Department of Building and Industry to support the development of affordable housing projects, specifically the construction of a multifamily housing project of approximately 240 affordable housing units, with rent amount restricted to 60% of Area Median Income or below located off of Chocolate Drive in Sun Valley, Nevada, and to authorize the chair to sign the resolution. (APN: 502-250-09 and 502-250-10, Applicant: Pedcor Investments, LLC. Project property owner) Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill asked if the Board wanted a presentation on this item and it was determined that no presentation was needed.

On the call for public comment, Mark Neumann noted this item did not pertain to any of the boards he served on, he was just speaking as a concerned resident of Sun Valley. When the Chocolate Drive project was first proposed, the residents of Sun Valley indicated they would rather have had houses; however, that was voted down in favor of apartments. He asserted the low-income apartments were subsidized apartments and that 60 percent of the voucher was paid for by Washoe County taxpayers. The developer in Indiana would still get the full price per square foot, it was just subsidized by Washoe County citizens to help low-income individuals. Mr. Neumann claimed the developer was asking for a bond of over \$6 million from the County's taxpayers to pay for the apartments. He wondered if the developer would be paying interest on the bond and if it would be the current interest rate. He inquired if this would be a loan or if the developer was just being given the money. He did not think this was a good use of funds.

Commissioner Clark expressed appreciation for Mr. Neumann's comments and said he valued Mr. Neumann's opinion. He referred to an earlier agenda item in which the developer would pay for everything, create jobs, and put in power and sewer lines. He wondered how to compare these two projects and asked how someone could vote yes on one and no on the other. He requested information about how the financing for this item worked and how it would impact the local economy.

Homeless Services Coordinator Catrina Peters informed that private activity bonds were a tool to aid in financing affordable housing projects. In Nevada, the private activity bond program was administered through the State of Nevada Housing Division (NHD). She observed this was not a bond issued by Washoe County, it did not have a fiscal impact on the County, and it did not impact the County's bond rating. This item was a resolution to endorse the project and allocate the County's pro-rata share of private activity bonds to the State for this project.

Commissioner Clark hoped Mr. Neumann understood the explanation from Ms. Peters. He wanted the taxpayers to be aware of what was taking place at these meetings.

Chair Hill asked Ms. Peters to describe the “lasagna effect” for workforce housing. She wanted Ms. Peters to clarify why this was needed instead of a fair market value (FMV) apartment complex. Ms. Peters asserted that financing an affordable housing development was very complicated and required a developer to look at multiple sources to fund and finance that development. The private activity bonds were one layer in the lasagna of the capital stack of affordable housing. Getting approved for a private activity bond by the State also automatically qualified the developer for a 4 percent tax credit, which allowed them to tap into the low-income housing tax credit program to add another layer to that lasagna.

Commissioner Garcia said she appreciated Mr. Neumann’s advocacy for Sun Valley. She shared she was new to this and the first time she saw the complicated layering of financing was at a groundbreaking in May in Sun Valley for a 95-unit project. She thought it was eye-opening and stated she still did not really understand how it all worked. She mentioned that 100 percent of the units in this project would be affordable housing and depending on the final buildout costs, a one-bedroom unit would rent for approximately \$900 per month, \$1,000 for a two-bedroom, and \$1,100 for a three-bedroom. She declared that was eye-opening given the current circumstances. She understood treading carefully and said there was a lot of misinformation and distrust. She appreciated Mr. Neumann’s advocacy for his community, but she wanted to advocate for this as she thought it was an incredible project for constituents in Sun Valley.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be approved and authorized. The Resolution for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

23-0569 **AGENDA ITEM 19** Public Comment.

Mr. Terry Brooks observed that the last time he attended a Board of County Commissioners’ (BCC) meeting he spoke about homelessness leading to poor physical health. Now he wanted to speak about how it led to poor mental health. He said that homelessness, health, and illness could lead to insecurity, instability, and mental illness. He shared that Mental Health America (MHA) released its annual report which indicated that Nevada ranked 51. He said the Washoe Regional Behavioral Health Policy Board sponsored a bill for crisis stabilization centers. He informed that emotional and personality disorders, alcoholism, and drug abuse were more common and frequent among homeless men. Homeless women often had stressful lives and psychiatric problems and endured physical and sexual assaults. Homeless children experienced mental health problems and behavioral and developmental delays and were more at risk for nonacceptance, teasing, and bullying. They were also more likely to engage in dangerous behaviors that could result in death and were more at risk for depression and suicide. He opined that if even one ounce of prevention was created it could save more than a ton of cure.

Mr. Gary Schmidt displayed documents that were distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. He said he lived in Washoe County for 50 years and had been living in Storey County for about three years, though he still owned property in Washoe County. He stated he had a degree in economics and had done about a year of graduate work in real estate. He indicated he owned commercial, agricultural, and residential rental properties in four states. He wanted to warn the Commissioners of an item that might eventually come before them, which was an application by the Gerlach General Improvement District (GGID) for a zoning change amendment. He declared it was quite simple but there was a lot of detail, so he wanted to provide the Board with some materials in advance. He provided background information, stating that just six years ago the GGID had requested a regulatory zoning amendment to change the subject property from general rural (GR) to medium-density suburban (MDS). The GGID sold off three lots but had not done anything since. He reported the GGID was now seeking to change the current zoning of 57 parcels to 162, and Gerlach only had 110 parcels. He asserted this would more than double the capacity of the town of Gerlach and would not maintain the rural character of the town. He referred to a staff report that indicated the community supported these changes, which he declared was not true.

Mr. Mark Neumann spoke about Agenda Item 8, noting the developer was willing to do all kinds of things for the community, which he claimed was not the case for the developer of the Chocolate Drive project. He said when residents asked the developer to do things for Gepford Parkway or 4th Avenue, the developer responded that all the citizens would enter and exit from 2nd Avenue. Mr. Neumann declared the developer refused to do anything for the drainage and street improvement, except for the streets that would require emergency access. He expressed frustration that one developer was approved and did not have to do anything for the community, while the other wanted to help the community but was rejected. He mentioned that 7th Avenue from Sun Valley Boulevard westward into Lemmon Valley would need improvements. He hoped the street would be widened, stating that since houses and a high school were built in the area there was a lot more walking and bicycling and some of the paths were very narrow. He thought this was dangerous due to the increased traffic coming from the North Valleys.

Ms. Katherine Snedigar stated that despite continuously introducing herself as a non-person, the BCC kept treating her like a person. She asserted she was not a person that could be regulated. She suggested members of the Board quit if they felt like they were being bullied. She said they should do the job they were elected to do if they wanted to be respected. She declared they did not represent the people. She wondered what benefit she received when her tax dollars were given to the homeless. She used expletives to express her frustration to which Chair Hill requested her microphone be muted and the timer be stopped.

Chief Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras informed that the Board was allowed to place restrictions to conduct an orderly meeting and the use of profanity disrupted operations. In response to comments from Ms. Snedigar, Chair Hill asked her not to argue with Chief DDA Kandaras. Chief DDA Kandaras observed that an individual's First Amendment right was not absolute in a public meeting and there was a

lot of case law on that issue. She listed the ways a person's comments violated the orderly process of a meeting. Chair Hill asked Ms. Snedigar if she wanted to continue her public comment.

Ms. Snedigar continued and expressed her frustration with the Board. She claimed the Commissioners did not respect or represent the people. She thought they lied to the people and she alleged they were in the process of racketeering with the Elections Group. She asked that her speech not be interrupted again.

Ms. Janet Butcher wanted to clarify that when she spoke about the \$21 million and it equating to \$48,000 per unit, she had read all the materials for Item 17 but there was no mention of peripherals. It only mentioned the 50 units, which was how she came up with that number. She referred to Mr. Schmidt and noted he was an example of someone who had to sit through the meeting all day to be able to speak about an issue he felt was important. She requested public comment be returned to the beginning of the BCC meetings or that the Commissioners vote on this so the public could see who was in favor of it and who was not.

County Clerk Jan Galassini advised the Board she received an emailed public comment that was placed on file.

23-0570 **AGENDA ITEM 20** Announcements/Reports.

Commissioner Clark invited the public to attend his Lunch with a Commissioner event that would take place the following day from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in Spanish Springs. He also invited the public to attend his Biking with a Commissioner event that would take place at 9:00 a.m. on Sunday. The ride would begin at Cottonwood Park and end at Hub Coffee Roasters downtown. He thought a lot of people were reluctant to ride along the Truckee River by themselves and noted this would be a group effort.

Commissioner Clark requested a future agenda item regarding selling the Kirman property to Renown Health. He wanted to see the first public comment period returned to the beginning of Board of County Commissioners' (BCC) meetings or for the Commissioners to take a vote on whether or not they wanted this to occur. He asked for the Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce (Chamber) to provide a presentation to the BCC so people could gain an understanding of what the Chamber did. He requested that an item be placed on an agenda regarding retroactive pay for County employees. He wanted the Board to take a vote so he could see where each of the Commissioners stood on this issue. He asserted the members of the Board seemed to be in favor of this back in February but had since backed off the issue. He declared the Board needed to respect the workforce and the employee raises should be treated like those in the Office of the County Manager (OCM). He said he was informed by the County Manager that the County did not have the funds to do this. He believed the OCM and Human Resources (HR) should have thought about that before their own raises went into effect.

Commissioner Clark remarked that he had attended a meeting along with Chief Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras, Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nate Edwards, and Chair Hill. During that meeting, Chair Hill said she would agendize an item regarding a vote on whether or not to retain her as BCC Chair. He wanted to see that on an agenda as soon as possible.

Vice Chair Herman asked for the first public comment period to be returned to the beginning of BCC meetings.

Manager Brown thanked the Commission for approving the West Hills property and declared this changed the trajectory of mental health delivery in the County. Chair Hill thanked Manager Brown for his passion and acknowledged the significance of this approval.

Commissioner Clark thanked the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office (WCSO) deputies in attendance for their service.

Chair Hill thanked everyone for a great meeting.

* * * * *

5:45 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

ALEXIS HILL, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

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

Minutes Prepared by:
Taylor Chambers, Deputy County Clerk
Kendra DeSoto-Silva, Deputy County Clerk
Lauren Morris, Deputy County Clerk