

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

MARCH 19, 2024

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
Nathan Edwards, Assistant District Attorney

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

24-0138 **AGENDA ITEM 3** Invocation.

No Invocation was provided.

24-0139 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Public Comment.

Ms. Jennifer Kent was not present when called to speak.

Ms. Pam Darr provided a document that was distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She expressed concern about the Truckee Meadows Public Lands Management Act (TMPLMA) being rushed, as many constituents had unanswered questions. Additionally, there were no measures to prevent land from being taken from Washoe County residents. She mentioned many positive organizations that followed the 30 by 30 initiative also contributed their efforts to the TMPLMA. Ms. Darr claimed the Rockefeller Foundation wanted to control the lands in order to list them on the stock market and sell them internationally. She referenced the document and stated the Rockefeller Foundation was using ecosystem accounting. She declared the citizens had a right to the public lands, the growth, and the minerals. Ms. Darr urged the Board to return the TMPLMA to the County and ensure the County could be involved in how the public lands were managed rather than Wall Street or other countries.

Ms. Bonnie Billings indicated she applied for the vacant Library Board of Trustees (LBT) position. She remarked that there were many qualified candidates who applied for the position. She commented in support of her candidacy. She spoke about her

qualifications, including her employment as a director of a kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12) school and her experience writing policies and conducting and writing evaluations. Ms. Billings mentioned her role as a director involved overseeing all the libraries in the district, managing their budget, and administering the one-to-one technology for all K-12 students. She mentioned she was responsible for choosing the curriculum. She noted the roles she managed required a strong facilitative leader to overcome the competing interests of others and emphasized her ability to help people understand each other. Ms. Billings stated she was an advocate for libraries and described libraries as the hub to exercise the freedoms outlined in the United States (US) Constitution by offering a wide range of knowledge, expertise, and training for all US citizens. She hoped libraries would continue to uphold the principles contained within the US Constitution.

Mr. Terry Brooks read an original poem about the process of adaptation in relation to homelessness.

Ms. Tracey Hilton-Thomas read from a document that was placed on file with the Clerk and directed her statement toward Chair Hill.

Ms. Elise Weatherly introduced herself as a County resident. She commented that the notion of agreeing to disagree could work for several jobs; however, it did not work well in the information technology (IT), accounting, payroll, or music fields. She described herself as the data, noting she was not the programmer. She questioned what she should say to individuals who lied. Ms. Weatherly stated the current life was temporary and concluded people would stand before God to provide an account of their lives. She shared an anecdote about hearing a voice saying she would be sustained after it was determined she had four months to live. She used an example of playing a note close to the correct pitch and talked about paying attention to what was going on. Ms. Weatherly stated she performed virtuous acts because she knew her actions would be considered, and she was afraid of God. She added she would abide by God's orders. She said she had not made much money during the past eight and a half years because she had to resign from her director of payroll position due to the chemotherapy she was undergoing. Referencing an advertisement she had heard, she noted she would call Regional Animal Services if a dog was being abused or abandoned because they performed their job well. Ms. Weatherly referenced a contest in the County and voiced her opinion that not all lawyers lied. She indicated she wrote a song about paying for a lawyer who lied about trusting the law firm and not having to follow Nevada law.

Mr. Mark Neumann noted the Board would be voting on Agenda Items 10 through 14, which he believed would pass. He hoped a clause could be added to the agreements referenced in the agenda items so only local contractors would be employed. He noted the County's taxpayers paid for the projects and believed the projects should be completed by individuals who owned and operated businesses in the County. He described his experience touring the Douglas County Community and Senior Center and recommended that the Board visit the facility. He mentioned visiting the facility would cause the Board to feel saddened by Washoe County's treatment of senior citizens.

Mr. Bruce Parks introduced himself as a Washoe County taxpayer. He referenced Agenda Item 9 and noticed a lack of diversity in the appointments to County boards and committees. He observed the boards and committees were predominantly left-leaning. He stated very few conservative candidates were appointed to the public bodies and pointed out 19 of the 133 County library system employees were conservative. Mr. Parks addressed the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). He asked where DEI was being practiced within the County's public bodies, noting neither of the values was observable. He requested that the Board take into account the diversity of voices, opinions, and outlooks when considering appointing a candidate to the LBT as well as all future appointments. He asserted doing so would benefit the County. He declared half of the information was being overlooked if only one position's viewpoints were being heard. Mr. Parks addressed Agenda Item 17, stating some of the proposed changes to the County Board of Commissioners (BCC) Rules of Procedure Handbook were timely and necessary. He criticized the proposed language for Article 5 of the handbook and questioned how a Commissioner could represent their district when there were hindrances to itemizing matters on a BCC agenda. He noted there were factors unique to specific districts. He commented that the Commissioners should all be able to add an item to an agenda by directing the inclusion of an agenda item during the meetings.

Mr. Gordon Gossage, the president and chief executive officer (CEO) of Regenesi Reno, indicated he applied for the vacant LBT position. He announced the downtown rotary group he was affiliated with had awarded \$5,000 to offer oral histories of Western heritage at the library and for students. He divulged he moved to the County from a much more liberal eastern area of the Country, and he cherished the Western heritage of Washoe County. He expressed appreciation for the diversity of his neighbors in the County and noted there was a need for such people as Mr. Parks. Mr. Gossage stated the series of oral histories would enlighten audience members on the meaning of Western heritage to them personally. He clarified the series would be much more positive than other books at the library that young children read. He said there were many aspects to Western heritage that such individuals as himself needed to know, including several principles that people might not agree with and needed to be understood. Mr. Gossage indicated that, even though he and other individuals might not be comfortable with firearms, he wished to learn about them. He mentioned he had friends who owned multiple guns. He commented that the series would enable people to learn more about the residents who grew up in the area, some of whom were third- or fourth-generation Nevadans. Additionally, people from other parts of the Country with a different set of values could have an opportunity for others to learn about them. Mr. Gossage promoted unity among the County's communities, which he identified as long-time residents and those who recently arrived from other states.

Ms. Janet Butcher provided a document that was distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She commented that it was nice to see Vice Chair Herman seated in the Chair position for the meeting. She was unsure why the previous week's BCC meeting was canceled despite the presence of a quorum. She referenced the document that was distributed to the Board, which contained a detailed analysis of the LBT applicants. Ms. Butcher did not believe the 21 applicants should be considered for the vacant LBT position and remarked that there would be a time for them to sit on the board. She believed

the applicants who resided in the County for 21 years or more should be prioritized for consideration because of their investment in the community. She informed there were five applicants for the LBT in September 2018, which she speculated was a reflection of the contention resulting from Library Director Jeff Scott's leadership. Ms. Butcher noted the analysis indicated the districts were not equally or equitably represented in addition to there being a heavy bias toward selecting people with liberal values. She observed Districts 4 and 5 were overlooked on a consistent basis. She pointed out when applicants were asked how many years they lived in the County, there were some applicants who had not answered the question properly. She commented that the Board had a tough job ahead of them, and she wished there was a special meeting scheduled for Agenda Item 9.

Ms. Sandee Tibbett commented in regards to Agenda Item 9. She emphasized the importance of selecting the appropriate person for the open LBT position. She implored the Board to take careful consideration when voting on the matter, as it likely did not wish to be in the position of having to appoint a new candidate for the role in three months as a result of choosing the wrong person. She praised all the current LBT members. Ms. Tibbett stated they demonstrated their ability to adapt to adversity, communicate effectively, and work as a team to successfully address library business. She remarked that addressing library matters had not been easy during the past few months. She said the new trustees should complement the existing LBT by maintaining neutrality and approaching decisions logically. Ms. Tibbett further described the traits of her preferred candidate, including valuing the community, actively listening to residents' concerns, being responsible, being devoid of woke ideologies, acting with integrity, and possessing family values. She also opposed a candidate who had a personal or political agenda regardless of political affiliation. Additionally, she was in favor of selecting a candidate who cultivated honesty. Ms. Tibbett noticed some of the applicants openly shared their intentions during BCC public comment sessions, in writing, or both. She said these were deliberate acts that contributed to the hostility within the community and declared they needed to stop so the community could heal and unite. She requested that the Board appoint an individual who was dedicated and could commit sufficient time to ensure the LBT's success.

Mr. Sean Hill indicated he was the CEO of Sierra Nevada Journeys and had applied for the vacant position on the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission. He spoke about Sierra Nevada Journeys' background. He disclosed he had been affiliated with the organization since 2009 and focused his career on the organization's vision of transforming lives by promoting curiosity, confidence, and connections to nature, especially for underserved students. Mr. Hill divulged he was a father of two sons and mentioned visiting regional parks with them to hike and camp. He described his experience with managing a pilot program in District 3, during which hundreds of students from that district were transported to the Sun Valley Regional Park. He reported 85 percent of the students had not visited that park before, and 69 percent of the students had not been on a hike before. Eighty-five percent of the students indicated they wished to return to Sun Valley when asked. Mr. Hill stated he committed his career to establishing equitable access to the outdoors. He mentioned he was completing his participation in the Washoe County Leadership Academy and spoke positively about the education in public service that he received in the program. He described himself as a collaborative leader and indicated he

was respected by his peers and colleagues. Mr. Hill expressed his willingness to volunteer his time to the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission. He believed he would provide valuable experience and perspective to the commission.

Ms. Penny Brock expressed consternation regarding the cancellation of a BCC meeting for each of the past three months. She asserted the Commissioners were elected to attend the BCC meetings and conduct the business of the County and its residents. She contended the Chair should not be permitted to cancel the meetings when a quorum of three was present and encouraged the other Commissioners to confront Chair Hill on the matter. She declared the Commissioners were elected to represent the residents and not the Chair. Ms. Brock claimed Chair Hill had continuously denied itemizing paper ballots and hand counting on a BCC agenda, and Ms. Brock said it could be considered election interference. She informed a growing number of counties decided to vote by paper ballots and hand counting. She mentioned a case was recently heard by the Supreme Court concerning the Dominion voting machines. She stated there was new evidence emerging that would confirm the Dominion voting machines were corrupted, challenging the integrity of the elections because the voting machines were used since 2017. Ms. Brock brought attention to the second Elko County Board of Commissioners meeting regarding the use of paper ballots and hand counting. She thanked the staff for responding to her research request through Washoe 311. She explained the request was for the letter that County Manager Eric Brown sent to the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS) and the response, which Chair Hill had indicated as the reason for not being able to include the matter on an agenda. She said the District Attorney's (DA's) opinion and the staff report were favorable to using paper ballots and hand counting. She added the letter she requested was not sent by the head of elections, but by a staffer who did not have the qualifications to have written the letter. She noted the letter described inaccuracies in Vice Chair Herman's proposed resolution.

Ms. Valerie Fiannaca talked about the email correspondence between Mr. Scott and a local librarian that she said showed the contention between conservative individuals and the LBT. She offered to provide additional information on a thumb drive upon request. The email correspondence included negative comments regarding some library patrons, including Ms. Fiannaca. Ms. Fiannaca remarked about the inordinate amount of time spent on such matters as the email discussion and speculated it cost the taxpayers an exorbitant amount of money. She divulged she used a few words to search the contents of the email correspondence and wondered what would have happened if she had chosen to search for more words. She said she would continue sharing such information with the Board. Otherwise, she did not think the Board would see it. She noted conservative residents accounted for 68 percent of the County when including non-partisan, Libertarian, and Republican residents.

Mr. Nicholas St. Jon expressed frustration regarding previous unfulfilled requests and complaints by members of the public about communicating with the Commissioners on a regular basis. He demanded that the BCC Rules of Procedure Handbook be amended to require the Commissioners to attend town hall meetings at least once a month. He insisted that a resolution to ban all vaccine passports be added to a BCC

agenda. He also demanded the removal of the metal detector from outside the Chambers' entrance, as he said it was unconstitutional. He indicated there was sufficient documentation to prove there were no policies, procedures, statutes, or ordinances that could override the Fourth Amendment of the US Constitution. Mr. St. Jon requested that an item discussing the election citizen advisory board (CAB) be included on a BCC agenda. He stated the matter was imperative when it was brought up in July or September 2023, and he commented it was ridiculous that the County was rushing into a general election year without the matter being itemized and discussed. He divulged oaths and official bonds of officers when their term of office began had been reviewed. Mr. St. Jon referenced Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 282.010 and 282.200. He requested that Commissioner Andriola resign immediately because she did not have a bond.

Ms. Betty Thiessen remarked it was refreshing to see Vice Chair Herman conducting the meeting. She indicated she lived in the Rancho Haven area, wherein a burglary recently occurred, and three individuals were identified as the culprits. She noted no one was home at the time of the incident, and the individuals who carried out the crime could deduce the residence was empty due to the snow. She added one of the neighbors was diligent and called dispatch immediately, resulting in the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) apprehending the suspects. Ms. Thiessen said several neighbors contacted the DA's Office, which revealed the charges against the suspects were dropped, and she wanted to know why. She disclosed she and her husband were elderly and lived alone. She mentioned she was locking the gate every day and expressed fear, as two of the suspects were released while one was being held on additional charges.

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

10:41 a.m. **The Board recessed.**

***11:15 a.m.** **Chair Hill arrived at the meeting. The Board reconvened with all members present.**

24-0140 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager Eric Brown announced that Agenda Item 17 would be tabled until an April 2024 Board of County Commissioners (BCC) meeting.

Vice Chair Herman requested that an item be placed on a BCC agenda regarding the dirt roads in the northern area of the County that had not been maintained since around 2009. She wanted the agenda item to allocate Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program funds toward repairing and maintaining the neglected roads.

Vice Chair Herman asked to include an item on an agenda to require that developments be presented at citizen advisory boards (CABs). She commented that there had been several requests by board members and meeting attendees for an agenda item on the matter. She believed the Board needed to listen to the people, especially during an

election year. She remarked that the second requested agenda item should not take long to complete, and the current process was not working well.

Vice Chair Herman reminded the Board the Waste Management (WM) contract might need to be reviewed because she noticed there were still problems. She advised closely monitoring the storm in Lemmon Valley.

Vice Chair Herman expressed displeasure that Board members seemed to dedicate more time and effort to assisting the City of Reno rather than the Washoe County residents. She noted the Board was supposed to care for Districts 1 through 5. She reminded the Board about its role in representing the residents.

Vice Chair Herman shared she was studying the BCC Rules of Procedure Handbook and commented about being ready for some action during the BCC meeting in April 2024.

Commissioner Clark thought it was disingenuous for the acting Chair to be running for office. He believed the current meeting was a good example. He recalled four Commissioners were available for the BCC meeting scheduled for the previous week and indicated the meeting should have taken place. He talked about having to wait after the recess period for Chair Hill to arrive to continue conducting the meeting, noting there were approximately 50 attendees. He stated around 24 man-hours were wasted due to the situation, and he pointed out Vice Chair Herman could have continued chairing the meeting until Chair Hill arrived. Commissioner Clark questioned why the March 12, 2024, BCC meeting was canceled despite there being a quorum. He did not believe canceling meetings was fair to the citizens and noted longer meetings resulted from the need to accommodate for the cancellations. He was in favor of Chair Hill resigning and Commissioner Garcia assuming the Chair role. He believed the Board needed to have some continuity and thought someone running for office should not hold the Chair position, as it posed a political advantage.

Commissioner Clark spoke about his meeting with the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS) representatives on Friday, March 16, 2024, during which they discussed voter rolls and voter integrity. He informed the representatives that, according to the Carson City Clerk-Recorder, 8,000 to 10,000 people were removed from the voter rolls in Carson City. The representatives brought to Commissioner Clark's attention that Elko County removed 33 percent of the inactive registered voters from its voter rolls. Commissioner Clark recalled having mentioned the issue numerous times and noted the County Assessor's Office and Treasurer's Office rolls were cleaned. He pointed out the Assessor would be held legally accountable if the Assessor's Office's rolls were not cleaned. He mentioned the State employed someone to perform a ratio study every three years to ensure the Assessor's Office was performing its duties properly. Commissioner Clark wondered why the voter rolls were not being cleaned and expressed concern regarding the inaccuracies on the voter rolls. He had shared ballots with the previous two County Registrar of Voters (ROV) and the SOS that were addressed to a former resident at his address who had moved eight years prior. He revealed the ROV was incorrect about the information for his address

half of the time and questioned how many other names were on the rolls that should not be. Commissioner Clark asked if an item could be placed on the agenda pertaining to how Nye County would be conducting the elections. He added the SOS, with Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards present, agreed to supply Commissioner Clark with the information related to Nye County's election process. He believed the County should emulate Nye County's example, as they had some checks and balances processes that the County did not.

Commissioner Clark requested itemizing quarterly or monthly evening meetings for deliberation on a BCC agenda and remarked that someone restricted the ability to add agenda items, as he had previously requested that the matter be placed on the agenda. He noted there were residents who worked during the day and did not have the opportunity to share input about the County. He informed there were many municipalities throughout the Country that organized evening meetings so every citizen could express their opinions.

Commissioner Clark wanted to place an item on a BCC agenda for possible approval of retroactive pay for the County employees from when the Manager's Office staff received their pay raises early.

Commissioner Clark said he had questions about the statements made on the morning news interviews with the Karma Box Project creator, Mr. Grant Denton, about the Cares Campus. He thought Mr. Denton would attend the meeting on March 12, 2024, or the current meeting, and Commissioner Clark wished to learn more information about the matter.

Commissioner Clark shared the *Reno Gazette-Journal* (RGJ) newspaper dated March 10, 2024, for the article titled 4th St. property value drops, which was placed on file with the Clerk. He noted the County owned the Cares Campus, and the City of Reno patrolled the area of Fourth Street. He did not believe the City of Reno was adequately patrolling the Cares Campus, as he commonly observed litter, public intoxication, bodily fluids, and trash. He advised the County needed to take better care of the surrounding community. Commissioner Clark commented that the County was not helping the business owners who abided by the rules. He mentioned people were considering leaving, and individuals' businesses were negatively impacted by the concentration of unhoused residents on Fourth Street.

Commissioner Clark talked about the heavy turnover rate for the County ROV and stated the reports of the ROV leaving due to violent threats were untrue. He urged the County to be truthful with the public and resolve the matter. He recommended establishing a bipartisan CAB that would cooperate with the ROV. Commissioner Clark noted the matter related to the ROV was an ongoing issue that would not improve if the County continued to minimize the situation. He referenced an article that was placed on file with the Clerk and invited a rebuttal to the article. He claimed the public records differed from the County's public statement, and he did not think that was right.

Commissioner Andriola shared she and Vice Chair Herman were Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) representatives, and they both attended the previous NACO meeting. She spoke with the NACO executive director during the NACO meeting about submitting the Support, Treatment, Accountability, and Recovery (STAR) program for consideration for the National Association of Counties (NACo) Achievement Award. She added she was working with the County Manager's Office Government Affairs Liaison Cadence Matijevec and Alternative Sentencing Chief Justin Roper to submit the application for the award. She indicated the deadline for the submission was March 30, 2024. Commissioner Andriola mentioned the idea stemmed from a discussion among other NACO members regarding programs that addressed success, and she and the NACO executive director believed the STAR program seemed to be an appropriate candidate.

Commissioner Andriola recognized Manager Brown had been receptive to her requests to consider local first, and she believed there was an opportunity to expand on that concept to include construction. She affirmed there were statewide statutory provisions with language regarding local purchases, and she wished to consider if there was an opportunity to explore that.

Commissioner Andriola thanked the staff and expressed gratitude toward Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen for her assistance in researching the statutes governing equine properties. Commissioner Andriola had been in contact with a representative of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, who was working in parallel with the County to explore changes as well as investigate the codes and possible actions that could be taken. She explained Assemblywoman Hansen directed the Legislative Counsel Bureau to assess what could be altered, and Commissioner Andriola was eager to review the report. Once the report was completed, outreach efforts would commence because the affected people and the residents needed the ability to voice their feedback. Additionally, Assemblywoman Hansen would be attending all of the meetings related to the matter. Commissioner Andriola noted the matter would eventually be itemized for BCC action.

Referencing Ms. Valerie Fiannaca's initial public comment, Commissioner Clark requested a copy of the contents of Ms. Fiannaca's thumb drive that she offered to share. He wanted more information regarding the incident that Ms. Betty Thiessen described during the initial public comment period.

Vice Chair Herman reported being notified about funds that were supposed to be allocated toward safety measures for children attending school being reappropriated for concrete walls for Interstate 80 (I-80). Chair Hill replied that the information was incorrect and clarified Vice Chair Herman was referring to an opinion piece. She explained the City of Reno intended for the grant funds to be used for the Safe Routes to Schools Program. The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) accepted the funds for the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Commissioner Garcia apologized for the amount of time she would need to address a matter. She explained the District Attorney's (DA's) Office forwarded her an email thread that involved Commissioner Clark's correspondence. She mentioned a copy

of the email conversation had been sitting on her desk for multiple months while she debated sharing the contents of it. She recounted Commissioner Clark communicated his disinterest in corresponding with Commissioner Garcia via email on February 9, 2024, and his preference was to communicate at the Dais, which she did not think was the best method of communication due to potential Open Meeting Law (OML) violations. Commissioner Garcia believed she needed to bring attention to the matter because of her family's safety and she wished to counter the spread of misinformation.

Commissioner Garcia stated there were politically charged falsehoods and misinformation regarding her residency during and after her campaign. She disclosed she purchased a house in District 3 the previous week and finished moving in that weekend. She expressed sadness about having to continuously weigh her vulnerability and safety, as the event should have been a source of pride and excitement for having worked hard to purchase a three-bedroom house in a child-friendly neighborhood. Commissioner Garcia conveyed her disgust regarding the level of surveillance conducted by several private investigators targeting her. She claimed these private investigators repeatedly approached her tenant, friends, and her special needs children in 2022. She described those tactics as disgusting and unacceptable. She pointed out she was a 43-year-old educator and government official who lived alone with her two children. Commissioner Garcia expressed disappointment at the perceived necessity of investing in property on a dead-end street in order to monitor who was entering and leaving the area in addition to investing in security cameras and coaching her children on how to cope with confrontational adults while in public. She indicated the personal attacks and allegations directed at her started two years ago, and she focused on her duties as a public official once she was elected; however, the conduct she described persisted.

Commissioner Garcia declared she would not be silent any longer. She provided copies of the County email correspondence she referenced, which was placed on file with the Clerk. She stated the email thread continued to perpetuate the misinformation related to her and was considered harassment, intimidation, and improper use of County emails. She described the information contained in the email thread. It began with an email originating from Ms. Denise Myer on December 27, 2024, who was a Republican candidate for District 3 that ran in opposition to Commissioner Garcia during the 2022 General Election. A letter dated October 15, 2023, which was placed on file with the Clerk, was sent to the DA's Office and contained the same referenced falsehoods and misinformation regarding Commissioner Garcia's residency. Commissioner Garcia referenced the letter, which alleged the proof of residency that she voluntarily submitted to KUNR Public Radio was false. Additionally, the letter accused Commissioner Garcia of accepting political donations under fraudulent circumstances and demanded that she be investigated. She pointed out Ms. Myer's signature on the final page of the letter was misspelled. The information was forwarded by Commissioner Clark to Chief Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Mary Kandaras, ADA Edwards, and DA Christopher Hicks on the same day.

According to Commissioner Garcia, Commissioner Clark expressed an interest in discussing the letter during the next scheduled meeting. Commissioner Garcia was included in the email thread to ask for permission to provide Commissioner Clark with

a generalized response indicating the matter had been reviewed and determined to be meritless. She divulged Commissioner Clark's directive to the DA's Office for an investigation on her was signed with a different individual's name instead of Commissioner Clark's, and she expressed concern and disappointment regarding the revelation. Commissioner Garcia acknowledged the Board could not deliberate due to OML; however, she believed Commissioner Clark owed the Board and the public an explanation about the inaccurate signatures in the email thread. She questioned the purpose of the incorrect signature in the directive and the likelihood that Ms. Myer would misspell her own last name when signing the letter. She also pointed out Ms. Myer was currently a candidate for the District 3 commissioner position. Commissioner Garcia was primarily concerned about this instance not being the first in which she saw the same signature from the directive written at the bottom of Commissioner Clark's government email providing direction to County staff. Addressing Chair Hill, she questioned the identity of the individual whose name was signed on the email and asked if she was the same individual who published a press release about Swan Lake on December 12, 2022, on Commissioner Clark's behalf. She added she verified the identity was not that of a staff member for the County Manager's Office. Commissioner Garcia speculated there was an arrangement between the individual whose signature was used and Commissioner Clark. She said it was unprofessional and disheartening for someone to conduct County business under false pretenses. She believed directing the DA's Office under the endorsement of someone else could be perceived as an abuse of power.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned that a notice popped up every time the Commissioners logged into their County email accounts indicating that their computers were the property of the County and for authorized use only. Commissioner Garcia wanted to know if Commissioner Clark was permitting access to his County email account or work computer. She disapproved of using taxpayer dollars to counter misinformation; however, as a protective mother of two young children, she conveyed exasperation regarding the harassment, the use of intimidation, and the conspiracy theories that impacted her personal life and the County's official business. She invited Commissioner Clark to respond to her account of the events.

Commissioner Clark indicated he forwarded questions that he received to the DA's Office for its counsel. He clarified he asked questions whenever someone brought a matter to his attention, and he remarked that asking questions seemed to irritate people around the County. He stated there were several matters that required inquiry and added questions that were raised should receive an answer. He expressed commiseration for Commissioner Garcia feeling threatened by answering questions that were presented and said it should not have been that way. Commissioner Clark clarified he advanced questions that had not received a response from the DA's Office, including those related to Commissioner Garcia's residency, in order to obtain a reply. Once an answer was obtained, the Commissioners would progress to other matters they could handle. He declared he would continue to ask questions.

Commissioner Garcia pointed out Commissioner Clark did not respond to her questions. Commissioner Clark thought he answered them, reiterated he believed it was

horrible that Commissioner Garcia felt threatened, and said he did not threaten her. He apologized for possibly troubling Commissioner Garcia by asking questions. Commissioner Garcia noted it was within the Commissioners' purview to forward responses or ask for clarification from the DA's Office. She observed all the Commissioners had a tendency to do so. She reiterated her questions regarding whether Commissioner Clark was providing access to his government email account, his computer, or both in order to launch attacks against his colleagues. Addressing Commissioner Garcia's question, Commissioner Clark indicated he had not.

DONATIONS

24-0141 **6A1** Recommendation to accept a one-time equipment donation of one [1] Edward Bohlin customized leather with silver western saddle with an appraised value of \$6,900.00 donated by the Cashell Family to the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. To be placed in the executive office of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office and will be used for community outreach programs and special events of the Mounted Horse Unit. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 6A1 be accepted.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 7A1 THROUGH 7E1

24-0142 **7A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' special meeting of February 16, 2024, and the regular meeting of February 20, 2024. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

24-0143 **7A2** Acknowledge the communications and reports received by the Clerk on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners, including the following categories: Monthly Statements/Reports and Annual Statements/Reports. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

24-0144 **7B1** Recommendation to approve a Grant, Bargain and Sale Deed between Washoe County (Grantor) and the City of Reno (Grantee) conveying a 1,542+/- square foot parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number 009-421-10) from Washoe County to the City of Reno [at zero cost] to be used for a public purpose pursuant to Nevada Revised Statute 277.053, allowing for the continued operation, maintenance and/or replacement of an existing lift station currently owned by the City of Reno, located near the intersection of Oak Court and Sagittarius Drive. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

- 24-0145** **7C1** Recommendation to approve the award of the Washoe County’s Independent Audit Services to Eide Bailly LLP, in accordance with NRS 354.624, that states each local government is required to provide for an annual audit and in accordance with the State of Nevada Department of Taxation the Board of County Commissioners, for a contract period of one (1) year effective March 2024 for fiscal year ending 2024; fees are based on the amount of time required at various levels of responsibility, plus actual out-of-pocket expenses, including administrative charges. Estimated fees for the financial statement audit will be \$263,285 and \$19,950 for each major program in relation to the compliance audit over major federal award programs which includes a newly instituted technology fee and if approved, staff will submit the notification of award to the Nevada Department of Taxation. Comptroller. (All Commission Districts.)
- 24-0146** **7D1** Recommendation to approve an increase to the Public Service Intern classification (class code 60000040) from a current pay range of \$11.25 - \$14.62 per hour to \$15.00-\$20.00 per hour and delimit the Public Service Intern (M) classification (class code 60019101), pay range of \$15.00 - \$18.00 per hour, effective March 25, 2024, and to authorize Human Resources to apply future pay range increases to keep pace with the current pay structure and to respond to the current labor market; and authorize Human Resources to make the necessary changes. [No fiscal impact]. Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.)
- 24-0147** **7E1** Recommendation to: (1) accept various items donated totaling an estimated market value of [\$41,599.34]; and (2) accept donations from various donors to Washoe County Human Services Agency Homelessness Fund to support the participants at the Nevada Cares Campus, Our Place and to people experiencing homelessness in unsheltered settings in the amount of [\$7,800.00] retroactive for the period July 1, 2023 through January 5, 2024; and direct the Comptroller’s Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

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

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7E1 be approved. Any and all Resolutions or Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 7A1 through 7E1 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

BLOCK VOTE – 10 THROUGH 16

24-0148 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Washoe County Regional Archery Facility Phase 1 Improvements Project, PWP-WA-2024-127, located at 1255 Matterhorn Boulevard, Lemmon Valley, Nevada. Staff recommends Farr Construction Corporation doing business as Resource Development Company, [in the amount of \$414,780.00 and approve a \$73,395.00 contingency fund for a total project amount of \$488,175.00]. The project includes construction of a parking lot, storage road, and improvements to the access road. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

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 10 be awarded and approved.

24-0149 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Washoe County District Attorney’s 6th and 7th Floor Office Expansion Project - PWP-WA-2024-087, located at 1 South Sierra Street, Reno, Nevada [staff recommends Houston Smith Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$509,000.00]; and (2) approve a separate project contingency fund [in the amount of \$40,250.00] for the total construction cost not to exceed \$549,250.00. Renovations will convert open areas on the 6th and 7th floor of the Washoe County District Attorney’s Complex to allow for additional attorney offices. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

Vice Chair Herman inquired about the number of attorneys the County employed. She noted a lot of money was being allocated toward extra space, and she wanted to obtain some more information.

Commissioner Clark wondered if there were plans to enlarge the work area for the Public Defender and the Alternate Public Defender. Noting the improved work area that the District Attorney’s (DA’s) Office received, he expressed interest in whether there was a balance between the DA’s Office, the Office of the Public Defender, and the Alternate Public Defender’s Office.

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 11 be awarded and approved.

24-0150 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to: (1) award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Washoe County District Attorney 8th Floor Office Expansion Project, PWP-WA-2024-088, located at 1 South Sierra Street, Reno, Nevada [staff

recommends Houston Smith Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$1,010,000.00]; and (2) approve a separate project contingency fund [in the amount of \$90,300.00] for the total construction project not to exceed \$1,100,300.00. Renovations will convert a shell space on the 8th floor of the Washoe County District Attorney's Complex to allow for additional attorneys and support staff. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

Vice Chair Herman inquired about the number of attorneys the County employed. She noted a lot of money was being allocated toward extra space, and she wanted to obtain some more information.

Commissioner Clark wondered if there were plans to enlarge the work area for the Public Defender and the Alternate Public Defender. Noting the improved work area that the District Attorney's (DA's) Office received, he expressed interest in whether there was a balance between the DA's Office, the Office of the Public Defender, and the Alternate Public Defender's Office.

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 12 be awarded and approved.

24-0151 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation to award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the 2024/2025 Encroachment/Excavation Repair Project for various areas within the Truckee Meadows for the period of April 1, 2024 through December 31, 2025, to perform street cut pavement repairs as needed for specific Washoe County owned roadways in the Truckee Meadows pursuant to Washoe County's Street Cut Ordinance at Washoe County Code 85.058, et. seq., [staff recommends Sierra Nevada Construction, Inc., in the amount of \$384,007.00]. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

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 awarded and approved.

24-0152 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to award a bid and approve the Agreement to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder for the Senior Services Phase 1 Remodel Project - PWP WA 2024-144, located at 1155 East 9th Street, Reno, Nevada [staff recommends Houston Smith Construction, Incorporated, for the base bid plus bid alternates #1a, #2b, and #3, for the total construction cost not to exceed \$840,434.00]. The Senior Services Phase 1 Remodel Project consists of building and site improvements supporting food service operation and production to allow for an increased level of home delivered meals and replacement of the existing kitchen flooring. Community Services. (Commissioner District 3)

Vice Chair Herman hoped some of Commissioner Clark's recommendations, such as providing showers, would be implemented in the future, since the County was beginning to support the senior residents.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock supported remodeling the Senior Services' building. She questioned how much money would be expended on the facility and stated it was common knowledge that it was heavily occupied by Cares Campus residents. She commented that senior citizens would not want to visit the facility because of the concentration of the Cares Campus' residents and unhoused individuals there. Ms. Brock asserted the renovation would not help and asked how many phases there would be for the building. She suggested using the funds for a facility located in South Reno, West Reno, or Northwest Reno instead. She recalled expressing concern numerous times regarding the City of Reno providing for the senior population numerous times. She complimented the Cities of Sparks and Las Vegas, noting they used their libraries for senior individuals. Ms. Brock recalled her suggestion to utilize the County's libraries was repeatedly disregarded.

Ms. Janet Butcher inquired about why Agenda Items 8 and 9 were skipped, to which Chair Hill replied the Board would return to those agenda items. Ms. Butcher stated she understood that the Board would return to them and reiterated her question. She stated she did not hear the agenda items that were listed for the Block Vote. She requested that individuals speak to the agenda item they were addressing when delivering public comment during a Block Vote. She indicated she would listen to the meeting later so she could gather the information, as she kept track of voting records.

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 awarded and approved.

24-0153 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Recommendation to accept a FY24 Adoption Savings subgrant award from the State of Nevada, Division of Child and Family Services in the amount of [\$1,040,849.00; no county match] retroactive for the period of July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024 to provide supportive services to facilitate and maintain the successful adoption of children from the Washoe County Child Welfare System; authorize the Agency Director of Human Services Agency to execute the award and related documents; and direct the Comptroller's office to make the necessary budget amendments. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

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 15 be accepted, authorized, and directed.

24-0154

AGENDA ITEM 16 Recommendation to approve allocation of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds through the Coronavirus State and Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) in the total amount of [\$77,500] for the following two projects:

- a. Human Services Agency GenArete Pilot Program (\$49,500), which will utilize a dynamic tool to create high quality, individualized learning plans for children with developmental disabilities; and
- b. Permanent Supportive Housing - Supportive Services Needs Assessment (\$28,000), which will provide funds to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment for supportive services in Northern Nevada.

Recommendation to approve an increased allocation to the previously approved project:

- c. Increase funding for the District Attorney's Office - Court Case Backlog Personnel Workstations by \$225,697 for a total of \$616,429 to cover fire and seismic requirements as well as increased construction costs.

The total amount of allocations is \$303,197. If approved, direct the Comptroller's Office to make necessary net zero cross-fund and/or cross-functional budget appropriation transfers. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

On the call for public comment, Ms. LaVonne Brooks, High Sierra Industries (HSI) and WARC President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO), remarked about the amount of time that passed since she appeared before the Board. She added it was an honor to be present. She indicated HSI and WARC served individuals with disabilities throughout Nevada for many years, with a combined service of over 100 years. She mentioned she was in the same job for 24 years. Ms. Brooks noted there were several issues that could not be resolved. She agreed there were many problems involving the senior residents, noting the difficulty for senior citizens over 64 years of age who were neurodiverse and only knew of a day service program. She explained HSI and WARC initially aspired to develop a better process for teaching children who were neurodiverse. She spoke about the organization's progress and informed over 400 people participated using the organization's methodology. She reported HSI and WARC were currently using that methodology with children and making progress in families with children who were neurodiverse. Ms. Brooks expressed joy about participating with the County in a pilot program to work with foster children and applying knowledge related to the foster care system. She explained if skills, strengths, and opportunities could be identified early in childhood development, a difference could be made to avoid long-term care and future learning issues. She described the service provided by HSI and WARC as a complete family wraparound system, and she mentioned training for families was offered.

Vice Chair Herman wanted to ensure that the County was exercising particular care with where the children were being housed, as many children ended up being trafficked, and she expressed concern about the Board being responsible for that occurring.

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 16 be approved and directed.

* * * * *

Vice Chair Herman inquired about the existence of a code of conduct.

* * * * *

24-0155 **AGENDA ITEM 8** Recommendation to approve the appointment of one candidate to fill a term beginning on the date of appointment and ending on December 31, 2025, for the Washoe County Open Space and Regional Parks Commission. Applicants for the vacancy include: Jessica Brown, Matthew DeMartini, Barbara S. Fenne, Sean Hill, Kami S. Hitti, Matthew B. Kaempfe, Robert A. Laurie, James McNamara, Luke M. Rippee, Tami R. Rougeau, Charles Wellington II. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill inquired about Commissioner Garcia’s possible recommendation, noting the amount of time she committed to the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission. Commissioner Garcia thanked all the applicants. She was in favor of appointing Mr. Sean Hill to the vacant Open Space and Regional Parks Commission position because she believed his input was needed on the commission. She stated Mr. Hill was a well-respected nonprofit leader in outdoor education with nearly 10 years of executive leadership experience. She noted he supported education in general and outdoor access. She added Mr. Hill conducted a successful pilot program in District 3, which was greatly appreciated. Commissioner Garcia perceived Mr. Hill's aspiration to participate in the Washoe County Leadership Academy as an additional demonstration of his commitment to the role.

Chair Hill commented that Commissioner Garcia’s feedback was beneficial and thanked her for sharing.

Community Outreach Coordinator Alexandra Wilson instructed the Commissioners to select their top two candidates, and she indicated County Clerk Jan Galassini would provide the ballots for the first round of voting. She mentioned there were four subsequent voting rounds if necessary.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Robert Laurie expressed appreciation for the Board’s time. He referenced an email he submitted on March 2, 2024, which outlined his qualifications for the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission. He summarized the contents of the email, indicating he attempted to live and operate by a principle based on no surprises. He explained he tried to remain sincere and transparent in his language and actions. Mr. Laurie mentioned he was publicly vetted at the local, State, federal, and military levels for a significant period of time. He referred to a comment that

was made about him, which described him as boring but effective. He remarked that there were no hidden details about him. He stated he was familiar with board operations and emphasized his long-term experience with providing legal counsel to or conducting business with boards, commissions, or similar entities. Mr. Laurie said one element he learned over a period of time was to rely on the concept of respect to the public in addition to the staff. He added he possessed subject matter expertise, extensive land use experience from opposing perspectives as well as land finance experience. He mentioned he taught land finance at the law school level. He also spoke about the importance of having a vision when planning open space areas and recreational activities. Mr. Laurie commented positively about the pool of candidates for the position.

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the Commissioners' votes aloud. Chair Hill announced Mr. Hill secured the majority of the votes, as he received three votes.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Sean Hill be appointed to the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission for a term beginning on the date of appointment, and ending December 31, 2025.

Chair Hill thanked the candidates for applying for the position and encouraged them to stay engaged, noting there were many opportunities to be involved with Washoe County. She expressed the Board's delight in the applicants' interest.

Commissioner Andriola echoed Chair Hill's sentiment and recognized Ms. Wilson for her diligent efforts to formalize and disseminate information throughout the community in a meaningful way. She appreciated being a part of the process.

Chair Hill thanked Commissioner Andriola and Ms. Wilson for their mutual efforts.

24-0156 **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to appoint one candidate from a pool of applicants including: Shauna Adams, Danielle Anders, Ilya Arbatman, Ron Aryel, Katherine Ayzengart, Kim Barghouti, Manny Becerra, Nicole Bell, Scott Benton, Paula L. Berkley, Ryan Bernardo, Bonnie Billings, Franco Biondi, Jessica Brown, Andrea Caldwell, Megan Cannella, Raymond Case, Frederick Clayton, Kate Crist, Reva Crump, Grace Davis, Heather Drew, Roger Edwards, Robert Ellis, Brian Erbis, Scott Ferguson, Scott Finley, Maria Flores, Noah Glick, Gordan Gossage, Mel Grotberg, Erica Hall, Jessica Hofmann, Wayne Holland, Naseem Jamnia, Rosemary Johnson, Megan Kay, Valeria T. Koss, Patricia Kress, Samuel Lackey, Bradley Leavitt, Darla Lee, Timothy Lewis, Ed Lind, William Luikart, Jill Lynch, William Mason, Robbie Maus, Lesley Means, Krista Meier, Katelyn Miller, Olivia Nevarez-Salazar, Virginia A. Nolte, Patricia Olmstead, Melissa Olsen, Linda Park, Bruce Parks, Angeline Peterson, Peter Picetti, Ma'kayla Porter, Kelly Proud, William Puchert, Sharon Reardon, Luke Rippee, Judith Rodby, Marie Rodriguez, Tami Ruf, Christina Rutledge,

Hagen Sandoval, Linda Schmitt, Roger Scime, William Sims, Monica Stabbert, Ryan Stark, Susan Stieg, Andre Stigall, Marvin Tanner, Geraldine F. Taylor, Tracey Thomas, Owen Truesdell, Charles Wellington II, Brooke Westlake, Kathleen Whitfield, Thomas Willadsen, Sylvia Willard, Nadienne Williams, Lloyd Wilson, Benjamin Zober, and Sara Zober to fill one midterm vacancy on the Washoe County Library Board of Trustees pursuant to NRS 379.020(3) beginning on April 1, 2024, and ending on June 30, 2025. Library. (All Commission Districts.)

Community Outreach Coordinator Alexandra Wilson thanked Commissioner Andriola for her positive comments during Agenda Item 8. She indicated the Board's support allowed the appointment process to progress. She clarified there were 87 applicants in total. She mentioned there were initially 89 applicants; however, two candidates had asked that their applications be removed from consideration. She instructed the Commissioners to choose their top three candidates from the 87 applicants during the first round of voting. After the first round, the Commissioners would be instructed to select two candidates before determining the applicant who would fill the Library Board of Trustees (LBT) vacancy.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Tami Ruf indicated she was a resident of the City of Reno for 52 years. She described herself as an enthusiastic and confident candidate for the vacant LBT position. She quoted librarian and former First Lady of the United States (US) Laura Bush, who stated the most valuable possession in her wallet was her library card. She divulged her mother took her to the Downtown Reno Library to check out books when her family moved to the City of Reno in May 1972. She recalled memories from her experiences at the library as a child. Ms. Ruf shared the flagship and the northwest branches of the County's library system were favorites of hers. She mentioned she was a devoted user of the libraries' Libby application (app) and routinely had six to twelve books on hold. She disclosed she and her husband had two grown daughters who were raised to be ardent readers and library patrons and also had memories of the library locations identified by Ms. Ruf. Ms. Ruf commented that libraries were vibrant places where the stories of the past, present, and future were discovered. Additionally, people were welcomed through the doors of libraries and encouraged to find what they were looking for. She described libraries as places to learn, create, and expand one's mind. She wished to be involved in supporting the continued growth of the Washoe County Library System. Ms. Ruf noted she earned her library media specialist credential in 2010 and served as the librarian at the North Valleys High School for six years, which she attributed to her extensive experience and knowledge needed to support the growth of the County's library system. She added her experience ranged from program development and implementation to collection development and effective budgetary management. She believed her 26 years of teaching experience with the Washoe County School District (WCSD) honed her listening and strategic communication skills. Ms. Ruf mentioned she was an active member of several district and school-wide committees, which involved effective communication with a variety of individuals with strong opinions. She divulged her teaching colleagues and former students considered her an effective listener and communicator. She also

maintained a sense of fairness for all parties. She thanked the Board for its consideration. If selected for the LBT position, she assured she would serve with dignity and decorum.

Ms. Kathleen Whitfield mentioned she and her husband moved to the County in October 2022 from Texas and conveyed their enjoyment of the area. She indicated they obtained their Washoe County library cards after purchasing a house. She believed libraries were an essential resource for the community regardless of age and political, moral, spiritual, or personal qualities. Ms. Whitfield noted her prior experience in North Texas as a library board member, President of the Friends of the Library Board, and a three-time elected official for the local public school board, for which she served as president. She added she had much more board experience. She stated that, as a recently retired attorney, she offered a focus on collaboration. She promised to strive toward facilitating cooperation while performing LBT duties and make the best use of limited available resources if she was selected for the LBT position. That way, the library could continue to be an open and welcoming meeting place and resource for everyone in the community. Ms. Whitfield shared her experience with administering a book review as president of her local library the day after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack. She described the experience as encouraging, as different community members participated in a safe and welcoming location, and she believed libraries should all operate as such. She thought the LBT should focus on ensuring the library remained open and connected people by adhering to the mission statement. Ms. Whitfield thanked the Board for its consideration.

Mr. Roger Edwards introduced himself as an applicant for the open LBT position. He indicated he was a lifelong conservative individual, a Christian, a father of three, a grandfather of five, and a great-grandfather of two. He talked about his experience serving on several boards and commissions in the County, including the Planning Commission (PC) for eight years. Mr. Edwards stated he was a 37-year US military veteran and was employed in management for the entirety of his life. He mentioned his long-term involvement with board meetings. He referenced Ms. Bonnie Billings's public comment during Agenda Item 4 and said he was impressed with her involvement. He noticed the people who were involved with the library contributed to the current confusing circumstances related to it. Mr. Edwards conveyed a need for people who could work together, and he believed they needed a conservative stance regarding opening the library system to the community. He commented that there were many positive programs that should receive attention and expressed delight in viewing 20 students involved in a presentation taking place at the library. He remarked that the application process did not offer enough room for him to provide all his experience involving boards and commissions. Mr. Edwards noted he spoke before the Board on many occasions and recalled bringing his daughters to the library for the first time in 1974. He described himself as a lifelong supporter of the library system and the County. He asked for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Nathan Robison introduced himself as an engineer, a business owner, and a 34-year resident of District 5. He divulged his family used the South Valleys Library weekly, and it had been an important feature of his family's life. He mentioned he was a father of three adult children, who were also educated through the WCSD. He revealed one

of his children was gay, and another was asexual and nonbinary. He noted his children encountered challenges in school, particularly during elementary and middle school, but were currently excelling. Mr. Robison expressed compassion toward the many lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer or questioning, asexual, and more (LGBTQIA+) children who faced more difficulties than his children and were neurodivergent, difficult to manage, or unconventional. He noted they could struggle with more challenging circumstances in school. He thought those children had the school, their friends, and such institutions as the library to help them understand themselves and the world. He added they might not have other resources. Mr. Robison talked about a movement to pretend or wish children with such characteristics did not exist or force them to not exist. He encouraged resisting that movement. He called library censorship in a free society abhorrent. He commented that while it was difficult enough to be unconventional, the difficulty associated with being invisible was greater. He highlighted the cruel treatment of gay children was once considered socially acceptable and declared that was a period in history that should be regarded with a sense of shame rather than nostalgia. Mr. Robison asked that the Board appoint a librarian instead of a zealot to the LBT. He supported Ms. Ruf for the open position but respected the Board's decision. He thanked the Board for its time.

Ms. Valerie Fiannaca advocated for Ms. Billings's appointment to the vacant LBT position. She noted Ms. Billings resided in District 4, currently served on the Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board (CAB), and was respectful of the other citizens. She pointed out Ms. Billings' experience with sitting on a library board for a large county. She disclosed she met Ms. Billings the morning of the meeting. Ms. Fiannaca believed the chosen candidate should not be any of the individuals who were outspoken at the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), WCSD Board of Trustees, or LBT meetings. She was opposed to appointing a candidate who could cause more controversy for the LBT.

Ms. Linda Schmitt indicated she lived in the County for 30 years and recalled she was appearing before the Board for the third time to convey her interest in serving on the LBT. She desired to serve on the LBT because of the lack of representation of District 4 and thought it would be positive for someone from the City of Sparks/Wingfield Springs area to serve on the LBT. Ms. Schmitt noted she satisfied all the requirements for consideration. She mentioned she was not controversial and spoke about her commitment to the well-being of the County's residents. She stated she was a government official who retired from the City of Sparks and currently volunteered to assist unhoused women with restoring their lives. Ms. Schmitt believed the library was a place of growth and learning for everyone.

Ms. Brooke Westlake began her public comment with a joke about libraries. She disclosed she resided in the County since 1989 and expressed excitement about being considered for the LBT appointment. She outlined her 25 years of working experience, 15 of which pertained to leadership, communication, sales, marketing, and team building. She said team building and communication were needed in the community's libraries. Ms. Westlake mentioned her three appointments, all by different Nevada governors, which included being a lay member of the Northern Nevada Bar Board, a commissioner for the Board of Examiners for Long Term Care Administrators (BELTCA), and a member of the State Bar of Nevada for fee disputes. She was formerly a Nevada Commission for Women

member. She indicated she was a mother who struggled with reading throughout her life and was enrolled in special education classes for reading during elementary, middle, and high school. Ms. Westlake observed her oldest son experienced extreme difficulties with reading while in school and was diagnosed with dyslexia at eight years of age. She was diagnosed with it at 36 years of age. She expressed pride in not allowing dyslexia or her struggles to prevent her from pursuing a higher education, during which she earned three degrees. She earned her master's degree from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) in criminal justice at the age of 37 and after giving birth to her second child. Ms. Westlake said she was passionate about the possibility of being appointed to the LBT because she could testify to her struggles with reading and prevailing over one of the most challenging obstacles in her life. She understood how to work well with others and enjoyed building teams. She described herself as an effective communicator and conveyed her desire to be involved in the County library team. She indicated she would be honored to serve as a LBT trustee for her community. Ms. Westlake shared an anecdote from having won a bookmark contest during her sixth-grade year at Robert Corbett Elementary. She noticed many positive tasks to add to the community related to libraries. She thanked the Board.

Mr. Charles Wellington mentioned this was his first time speaking before the Board. He expressed his desire to be involved in the library system by being appointed to the LBT. He mentioned he traveled throughout his life around the Country, and he lived in the State since 2005. He recalled he had many fond memories of visiting the library while he was growing up. Mr. Wellington divulged his parents were divorced, and he often visited the library when his parents were at work. He recognized the importance of the library to the community and the current situations related to the library. He wanted to contribute positively. He shared he worked with several diverse groups throughout his life and, as a father expecting a new child, looked forward to opportunities to read books to his children. Mr. Wellington stated a library was important for providing people access to technology. He believed there was something profound about holding a book. He revealed he was a published author in the epic fantasy genre and remarked that writing over 150,000 words for a single book was not an easy task. He acknowledged there were 87 applicants to consider who had fond memories and questioned why anyone would want to be on the LBT otherwise. He looked forward to possibly being selected and thanked the Board.

Ms. Joni Hammond talked about the presence of a bias against conservative individuals throughout the library system perpetuated by Library Director Jeff Scott and the librarians. She referenced Ms. Fiannaca's public comment during Agenda Item 4 regarding negative email correspondence. She shared a firsthand account from when she worked at a library during the Presidential Preference Primary (PPP) Election. Librarians had responded negatively to an individual holding a sign that said caucus in the parking lot of the library and attempted to have him removed from the premises, even though the individual did not violate any election protocols. Ms. Hammond identified this event as an obvious display of bias. She implored the Board to appoint a conservative candidate to the LBT and attempt to add equal representation to it. She thanked the Board.

Ms. Alanna Fitzgerald introduced herself as a long-term resident of the County, a retired social worker, and a loyal library patron. She emphasized the significance

of the Board's decision on the item and asked that the Board consider the importance of the libraries to everyone in the community. She asserted libraries should continue to be safe and comforting areas that embraced everyone. She spoke in opposition to trying to cause any groups to feel unwelcome or excluded based on books or other library materials. Ms. Fitzgerald acknowledged selecting a new LBT trustee was a daunting task. She believed adding an individual who was known to oppose inclusiveness was counterproductive to effectively governing the County's library system. She hoped the Board had useful information for its selections. She thanked the Board.

Ms. Candace Powell provided a document that was distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk. She introduced herself as a parent and a proud library card holder. She spoke in support of the County's libraries and the LGBTQIA+ community as an ally. She requested that the Board consider the behavior and the character of many of the applicants for the vacant LBT position. She alleged many of the individuals seeking the position were perpetrators of intimidation and trauma of small children at library events. Referencing the document summarizing the Drag Queen Story Hour (DQSH) event that took place at the Downtown Reno Library on June 15, 2023, she stated the agency of her children was disregarded, and negative rhetoric was used around her two- and six-year-old children as they entered the library. Ms. Powell detailed how her children felt unnerved by protestors violating their privacy by filming and photographing them without consent. She revealed some of the protestors who were photographed at the event were in attendance. She indicated she was still angry about the matter, but expressed gratitude for the library system's preparation with volunteers who shielded participants with umbrellas. Ms. Powell recounted the environment she and her children entered was welcoming and observed her oldest child was visibly relieved. She pondered what else the protestors were capable of without regard to others' agency and safety, considering they were brazen enough to photograph the children without parental consent. She wondered what entitled those protestors to decide to act in such a manner on their own. Ms. Powell expressed sorrow for her children currently associating the Downtown Reno Library with fear and harassment. She shared her daughter asked if one of the individuals who photographed her was a kidnapper, and Ms. Powell identified the individual as one of the applicants for the LBT position. She asserted anyone intimidating children and violating their privacy should not be rewarded with a position of power. She stated the first criterion for considering an LBT trustee was the demonstration of use and appreciation of the County's libraries. She remarked that documented harassment of children should not be the standard for such an important role in the community. Ms. Powell was in favor of selecting an LBT trustee who would champion inclusivity and uphold diverse programming in the libraries so they could be nurturing spaces that welcome everyone.

Ms. Janet Butcher commented that there were several worthy applicants for the LBT position. She stated there was a group of people who promoted equity but were not equitable in appointing individuals to public bodies, especially the LBT. She spoke in support of selecting a candidate who could be financially responsible and ask the right questions concerning LBT decisions. Ms. Butcher noted the library was full of books and remarked that anyone could recall their reading and library experiences, which she clarified she was not disparaging. She mentioned she spent a lot of time reading. She advised the

library was not a place for social engineering. She indicated some individuals' comments were a continuation of misinformation and falsehoods. Ms. Butcher asserted nobody was attempting to prevent anybody from entering the library. She explained sexually graphic reading materials did not need to be at eye level of children and said people could access those materials for their children if they wished. She disputed the discussions pertaining to book banning were false and assured no one was trying to ban books. She recalled *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* and *Gone with the Wind* were banned by the American Library Association (ALA). Ms. Butcher added she and other members of the public were asking for responsibility and informed Mr. Scott could not indicate how much money was being spent. She divulged her cost analysis experience, noting it was easy. She suggested organizing DQSH at Our Center and speculated the reason it was not currently held there was due to insurance.

Mr. Frederick Clayton stated he was born in the City of Reno but spent much of his time in many other places, forming a flexible and diverse outlook. He considered himself adaptable to situations. He recalled his father moving him out of the State in 1940. He shared his first experience visiting the old Downtown Reno Library when he began the first grade in 1945. Mr. Clayton indicated he was a patron of many types of libraries and divulged he worked in a library on an aircraft carrier during his military service, which was his only experience working for a library. He described the US Information Service Library located in Kabul, Afghanistan as one of the most interesting libraries he visited based on its contents. He said he was typically financially conservative, and his aunt, whose son had reading difficulties, instilled in him a different perspective by placing priority over her son practicing reading. Mr. Clayton thanked the Board for listening.

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the Commissioners' votes aloud. Chair Hill summarized the top candidates were Ms. Marie Rodriguez, Mr. Manny Becerra, and Ms. Tami Ruf. Per Ms. Wilson's direction, Chair Hill instructed the Commissioners to each choose one of the remaining candidates. Ms. Galassini read the results naming Ms. Ruf as the selected candidate.

On motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Vice Chair Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Tami Ruf be appointed to the Washoe County Library Board of Trustees for a term beginning April 1, 2024, and ending June 30, 2025.

Chair Hill encouraged the other applicants to remain involved in the County and conveyed the Board's admiration for their desire to participate.

12:43 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

1:30 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

24-0157 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Discussion and possible approval of the revised Washoe County Board of Commissioners Rules of Procedure Handbook (most recently reviewed on January 16, 2024). The purpose of the rules is to establish rules of procedure for the conduct of meetings and members of the Board of County Commissioners, where such rules are consistent with the laws of the State of Nevada. Possible amendments may include, but are not limited to, the following subjects within the rules of procedure: consent agenda parameters, order of business, virtual appearances by remote technology system, reconsideration, terms of officers, communication records, clarifying applicability of Robert's Rules of Order, and placement of items on Board agendas. Commissioners may propose additional amendments for adoption as well. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

This agenda item was tabled.

24-0158 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Recommendation to approve the updated Washoe County Code of Conduct which lists expectations employees and Washoe County representatives in their interactions with the public and each other. The updated version reflects the current Washoe County Statement of Values. These values include integrity, effective communication, and quality public service. The Code of Conduct maintains the expectations of honesty, respect, duty to public service, tolerance, fairness, courtesy and professionalism. The updated version adds the expectation of promoting a positive work environment by prohibiting bullying, outlines the investigation process for complaints made under the Code of Conduct, and establishes a biennial training requirement for employees on bullying. The training requirement will be accomplished through an online training that will be available on the approval of the updated code. Human Resources. (All Commission Districts.)

Human Resources (HR) Director Patricia Hurley informed the Washoe County Code of Conduct policy had been in effect since the 2000s and acknowledged it needed to be updated. She noted the County had new values and training requirements to incorporate into the policy. The staff also wanted bullying to be accurately reflected. Ms. Hurley added the policy would be expanded to apply to all employees, officials, and any individuals who worked for the Board of County Commissioners (BCC).

Chair Hill was in favor of holding elected officials and appointed officials to the same standards.

Vice Chair Herman asked Ms. Hurley to outline the proposed changes to the Code of Conduct policy. Ms. Hurley brought attention to the altered formatting in the updated policy and read from the Purpose and Code of Conduct sections. She mentioned the policy defined the standards and expectations for employees as well as the appropriate conduct while on duty. She indicated the second part of the proposed changes would

include an update to the new value statements that defined integrity, effective communication, and quality public service. Ms. Hurley said some of the policy's contents were moved to different areas within it. She stated the policy further defined the terms honesty, respect, and duty to serve the public using more modern terminology, and those definitions were formatted so they could be read with greater ease. She pointed out the addition of descriptions for tolerance, fairness, courtesy, and professionalism. Ms. Hurley noted a section dedicated to bullying and examples of such behavior were incorporated. A portion was included related to mandatory training scheduled for every two years. The updated policy outlined the process of investigating a complaint.

Commissioner Andriola appreciated that the differences and changes were shown. She supported how the Code of Conduct policy demonstrated a standard for all individuals associated with the County. She emphasized the importance of the description of quality public service, adding it encapsulated the responsibility for everyone in the County to uphold. She clarified the other definitions held the same significance but noted employees and officials had a duty to serve every resident. Commissioner Andriola considered how matters could be improved. She believed the staff's reevaluation of the policy and the resulting evolution demonstrated the necessary progress that everyone should embrace. She thanked Ms. Hurley for her efforts.

Commissioner Clark inquired about whether there were workshops with existing ordinary County employees and if they had an opportunity to provide input for the Code of Conduct policy. He further asked if there were any notes or minutes of meetings that were held to obtain feedback from the average County employees. He believed it was always important for individuals who would be governed by the policy to have a tremendous amount of input. Responding to Commissioner Clark, Ms. Hurley indicated the staff did not organize the types of workshops mentioned by Commissioner Clark. She clarified the policy was reviewed by the leadership of the Washoe County Employees Association (WCEA), the largest bargaining unit available, and there were no concerns that were voiced. Commissioner Clark thanked Ms. Hurley for her explanation and commented that it was always important to obtain feedback from the leadership of the associations. He reiterated his concern for the employees who would be forced to work under the conditions outlined in the policy. He remarked that he had no involvement in composing the BCC's Rules of Procedure Handbook. He thought it was important to organize workshops or generate anonymous questionnaires to gather feedback from the employees.

Commissioner Garcia thanked Ms. Hurley and asked a clarifying question regarding whether the updated Code of Conduct policy would include all Commissioners and appointees. Ms. Hurley responded in the affirmative and read from the proposed policy.

Commissioner Clark indicated he would likely be unable to support the proposed changes without the employees' involvement. In response to Chair Hill's inquiry about his input, Commissioner Clark reiterated he wished the individuals who would be governed by the proposed Code of Conduct policy to have the opportunity to attend a workshop and review the policy. He requested that the matter be postponed until input was compiled from the employees and the Commissioners so the HR Department alone did not

determine what the new policy might be.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned the matter was itemized on the February 14, 2023 agenda, as a consent item, and it was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion before Commissioner Andriola was appointed to the BCC. She stated the agenda item consisted of reviewing the baseline standard of conduct for all employees. Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Herman moved to table the agenda item, with a 3-2 vote. Commissioner Garcia noted the matter was tabled for over a year, and she supported the updates. She appreciated the staff's time and effort. She wished to move forward with approving Agenda Item 18.

Vice Chair Herman remarked that she was of the same opinion as she was a year prior and would vote in agreement with Commissioner Clark on the matter.

Commissioner Clark appreciated that Commissioner Garcia pointed out discussion on the matter began during the previous February. He observed there was ample opportunity to organize workshops since then. He said there was enough time to solicit feedback from the ordinary employees if HR intended to revisit the matter, and he declared he would always advocate for the average County employees. Commissioner Clark recognized the County would be unproductive without the employees, so they deserved to have some input on the matter. He speculated they might offer insight and used an example demonstrating that he would speak to an employee on the factory floor rather than management if he wanted to understand how a factory operated. He reiterated he wanted HR to prepare a questionnaire or workshops to obtain input from the ordinary County employees regarding the proposed changes to the Code of Conduct policy.

Commissioner Andriola asked if the WCEA representatives solicited feedback from any of the County employees and inquired about the process the representatives used to address or gather information. Ms. Hurley replied she did not have an answer. She explained the process was to send the drafted policies to the WCEA, and she was uncertain whether it sent the policies to its members. She obtained feedback indicating the WCEA did not discover any issues with the proposed Code of Conduct policy. Ms. Hurley reminded the Commissioners that the Code of Conduct was an existing policy. She added the updated policy clarified some questions that might have been posed by employees when the policy would be implemented.

Commissioner Andriola asked if there was an opportunity to solicit feedback, noting the majority of the Code of Conduct policy was in place. If the updated policy was approved, she further questioned if input could be gathered so the policy could be amended accordingly to reflect any possible significant changes. Ms. Hurley indicated that would be a possibility and believed an employee survey would be launched during the year. She offered to add a question regarding the policy and speak to legal counsel or the WCEA. She added she was willing to comply with any of the Commissioners' directions and thought any action would be possible. Commissioner Andriola understood the changes were not that significant and noted an additional condition to seek feedback. In response to her follow-up question regarding how long it would take to collect information from

employees, Ms. Hurley thought the process could be quick, and she stated she could work with the WCEA to determine how long it would take to solicit that input. Furthermore, the employees could be allotted a period of time to review the policy and provide feedback. She noted the greatest obstacle was itemizing the matter for a BCC meeting.

Commissioner Andriola inquired whether there was a reason employees' responses were not requested within the past year. Ms. Hurley said there were more questions surrounding the training when the matter was brought before the Board at the February 14, 2023, BCC meeting. She apologized for not obtaining the feedback that Commissioner Clark wanted the staff to solicit and confirmed Commissioner Clark did not believe there was a need to make the proposed changes based on the people he spoke to. Ms. Hurley mentioned she told everyone at that time the WCEA reviewed the amended policy and did not relay any concerns, as it was an existing policy. She clarified if there was direction to obtain employee feedback, she unintentionally overlooked it in February 2023.

Commissioner Andriola believed it was noteworthy that the WCEA vetted the Code of Conduct policy. She pointed out the WCEA was the body that represented the County's employees. She deduced potential concerns would have been addressed and vetted. She said there was comfort in knowing the WCEA represented the employees' best interests and examined the policy. Commissioner Andriola noted the policy was sitting or proceeding through the process for a year.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned the feedback from the February 14, 2023, BCC meeting was more so in regards to the training aspect. She asked a clarifying question concerning whether the Board would be able to proceed with the proposed motion as written for the agenda item. She also asked if an element would be added to indicate a question regarding the upcoming WCEA survey would be integrated. Ms. Hurley responded she would need to consider the matter with WCEA.

Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards believed it was appropriate for the HR staff to have pursued input through the WCEA, as the Board would first need to determine the threshold for soliciting feedback directly from the employees. He noted going through the WCEA removed any risk of a claim being made about attempting to negotiate around the WCEA. He advised the Commissioners could move forward with directing the HR staff to coordinate with WCEA to gather input from the employees. He did not recommend directing the staff to solicit feedback directly.

Ms. Hurley clarified the staff followed the same process for implementing policies.

Commissioner Clark referenced Ms. Hurley's remark regarding the difficulty of itemizing a matter on a BCC agenda and suggested the Commissioners thoroughly consider the agenda item. He asked if there was a dramatic increase in bullying in the previous year that needed to be addressed. He inquired about any changes that occurred and questioned why the action needed to be taken on the matter at this time. Ms.

Hurley stated there were waves that occurred with any type of action that happened with employees. She talked about the conduct at the County, the discourse that was observed from the Board, and individuals describing to Ms. Hurley their inability to report poor treatment. She said there was no real way for individuals to feel as though their concerns would be acknowledged. Ms. Hurley indicated she had heard similar concerns and pointed out there were fewer staff members who attended the BCC meetings nowadays. She recognized her admission might have been risky, but she wished to be honest with Commissioner Clark. She referenced the County's environment and conveyed the HR Department's helplessness as well as the WCEA's possible impotence when receiving the type of concerns that were referenced due to the inability to address them. She stated the HR staff did not have the capacity or a manner to investigate should any individual representing the County misbehave.

Chair Hill noted the Code of Conduct policy was a tool for the HR Department. She reported she was informed by staff members about appointees behaving inappropriately, to which she said even volunteers needed to treat the County's staff with respect. She believed language addressing such conduct needed to be incorporated in writing so individuals associated with the County were aware of the proper treatment of one another regardless of how they were introduced to the County.

Commissioner Clark was pleased with Ms. Hurley's response and indicated he understood what bullying was. He spoke about the claims related to the Registrar of Voters (ROV) receiving violent threats and said he was in possession of a document stating there were no documented threats of violence. He questioned if people were worried about working for the County and asked if there was already enough protection in place. He wished to review input from the employees, not management, if changes were going to be applied to the Code of Conduct policy. Commissioner Clark repeated he was unable to support the amended policy as written until more input was gathered. He confirmed he asked about one subject during the February 14, 2023, BCC meeting because he had been recently appointed. Since that meeting, he formed additional thoughts on the policy. Commissioner Clark referenced an instance involving Korn Ferry that the ordinary County employees did not believe was fair as well as phone calls and emails he received. He observed the employees had not been listened to previously and indicated that it appeared the County would not consider the employees' feedback for this matter. He expressed disbelief that the progressive Commissioners were not aligning themselves with the workforce. He acknowledged his perception could be incorrect and suggested seeking input from the individuals who would be operating under the conditions established in the proposed policy.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock stated she did not see a District Attorney's (DA) opinion on the agenda item, which she believed was critical in this environment. She questioned what the details relating to bullying and fairness meant. She noted anybody could make a charge. She expressed concern regarding the inclusion of the Commissioners in the proposed Code of Conduct policy and informed they were governed by the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) under the Nevada Commission on Ethics. Ms. Brock was uncertain why the Commissioners should be included in the policy and

viewed the matter as a potential ethics violation. She voiced her intent to possibly file an ethics violation in the event the Board approved the amended policy. She requested that the Board table the agenda item and carry out the actions Commissioner Clark and Vice Chair Herman wished to pursue. Ms. Brock indicated the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) handbook outlined the responsibilities of the Commissioners. She revealed there was nothing in the handbook stating the Commissioners must oversee the Code of Conduct, and the Code of Conduct was to be done by the HR Department for the employees. She asked that the Commissioners think carefully before approving the proposed policy because there were some serious questions about revising the Code of Conduct.

Ms. Valerie Fiannaca thanked Ms. Brock and remarked that her input was enlightening. She commented that bullying was a subjective term. She claimed the meeting's attendees were bullied for 45 minutes while waiting for Chair Hill to arrive at the meeting. She stated 50 people sat and waited for Chair Hill to take a photograph with the President of the United States (POTUS). Ms. Fiannaca expressed regret that the residents, whom she referred to as the employers, were unable to send County employees for training due to observed dysfunction during the meeting. Addressing integrity, she noted only one Commissioner asked for a thumb drive of 3,400 emails proving the County's library system was dysfunctional. She opined there were employees who all needed to receive training, including every employee referenced in the emails. Ms. Fiannaca declared she was not being dishonest and offered to provide the proof. She stated she knew who she would send for training if she could because quality public service did not involve forcing one's employers to wait 40 minutes while acquiring a campaign photograph. She observed it was obvious that the Board and many other public bodies within the community were becoming as dysfunctional as the Washoe County School District (WCSD) Board of Trustees and the federal government. Ms. Fiannaca wished she had a solution to the issue and thought it was an inherent aspect of the current situation in the County. Nevertheless, she did not believe everyone needed to accept it and thought everybody could speak to one another with more respect while the Board set the example because of its authority. She noted the residents had authority by voting and expressed gratitude for the ability to vote.

Ms. Val White commented that fear was horrible, and nightmares were not enjoyable. She talked about the vivid imaginations of paranoid individuals, adding they were frequently experienced by people with a guilty conscience or a mental disorder. She referenced the statements of a Commissioner expressing fear for multiple reasons on several occasions. She expressed displeasure in observing an individual suffering and suggested the Commissioner resign. Ms. White said some people did not possess the disposition to handle complicated discussions or the pressure of representation. Chair Hill asked Ms. White to address the full Board, to which Ms. White asserted she was addressing the entire Board and demanded Chair Hill stop interrupting her. Ms. White stated the Commissioner in question sought special treatment for paranoid feelings. Chair Hill reiterated her request for Ms. White to address the full Board. Ms. White continued,

suggesting counseling and filing police reports with supporting evidence. Chair Hill stated Ms. White's input was inappropriate.

ADA Edwards said Ms. White's public comment did not appear to be addressing the topic of the agenda item.

Ms. White continued and asserted she was speaking on the topic. She also asked for time back for her public comment. Chair Hill wanted Ms. White's feedback regarding the Code of Conduct policy. Ms. White stated the policy should not be approved because it was denying the free speech of the employees. She said it was instilling an environment of fear. She declared there were deniers of freedom on the Board who were using the policy by refining it. She observed the Board developed a pattern of denying free speech when it caused distress for someone and did not align with a personal definition of respect. Ms. White explained the term respect was subjective. She remarked that feelings were not equivalent to facts, and feelings related to being fearful could be attributed to various conditions. Addressing ADA Edwards, she indicated the policy should not be refined at this point. She echoed Commissioner Clark's feedback regarding the employees' input, as the policy would significantly impact their speech and behavior. Ms. White described anybody who voted in agreement with the extreme left-leaning element on the Board as a freedom denier. She conveyed the dissatisfaction of the constituents for preventing freedom, and she stated the proposed policy would limit how members of the public could interact. She expressed excitement regarding the end of some of the Commissioners' terms.

Commissioner Andriola reiterated there was already a Code of Conduct policy in place, and the changes were insignificant. Additionally, all employees were represented by the WCEA vetting the proposed policy, and the process involved with the amended policy was the same one that would be followed for any other HR-related policy. In response to her question about whether the statements she made were correct, Ms. Hurley confirmed they were. She added the staff did not deviate from the established process. She also clarified the proposed policy was scrutinized by legal counsel three times. Referencing ADA Edwards's guidance, Commissioner Andriola confirmed with Ms. Hurley that the process the staff followed ensured there was no breach of compliance. Commissioner Andriola asked if the proper process would be to include the possibility of the WCEA soliciting and compiling feedback on the amended policy in the motion. Ms. Hurley explained she would ensure WCEA President Justin Norton received the updated policy, and she would request that he share it with the association. She assured the WCEA could coordinate with the staff in the event changes needed to be made.

Chair Hill suggested ensuring the information from the different trainings on the policy was communicated to the WCEA.

Commissioner Garcia moved that the updated Washoe County Code of Conduct policy be approved, which listed expectations of officers and employees and their interactions with the public and each other. Chair Hill seconded the motion.

Commissioner Andriola asked that the motion be amended to include contacting the WCEA to solicit feedback from the employees. Commissioner Garcia agreed to amend the motion.

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 18 be approved.

24-0159 **AGENDA ITEM 19** Introduction and first reading of an ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 approving a development agreement between Washoe County and North Pyramid Investors LLC for Blue Oaks, a residential subdivision (Tentative Subdivision Map Case No. WTM19-003).

The purpose of the development agreement is to extend the deadline for recording the first final map from January 7, 2024, to January 7, 2026, and to adopt amended conditions of approval (WAC24-0001). The project is located along Campo Rico Lane, east of Pyramid Highway. The project encompasses a total of approximately 9.88 acres, and the total number of residential lots allowed by the approved tentative map is 10. The parcels are located within the Spanish Springs Planning Area and Washoe County Commission District No. 4. (APN: 534-600-23).

And, if approved, schedule a public hearing, second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance for April 23, 2024, and authorization for the Chair to execute the Development Agreement. Community Services. (Commission District 4.)

County Clerk Jan Galassini read the title for Bill No. 1906.

Vice Chair Herman asked whether the City of Sparks was providing its own water and sewer. Planning and Building Division Senior Planner Katherine Oakley stated that, based on her understanding, an interlocal agreement between Washoe County and the City of Sparks needed to be updated, which was one of the delaying factors requiring an extension of time. She confirmed that the interlocal agreement was updated, so the project would proceed with that sewage service.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Janet Butcher encouraged resolving the existing issues with Pyramid Highway and noted continuous construction in the area. She observed the apartment complexes in the area were not full yet and expressed displeasure about the outcome when they reached capacity. She acknowledged growth was positive but advised completing the infrastructure before progressing to other projects. Ms. Butcher commented that the Commissioners who might approve the project were unaware of the situation. She recalled witnessing three vehicular accidents due to the construction.

Bill No. 1906 was introduced by Commissioner Andriola, and legal notice for final action of adoption was directed.

24-0160 **AGENDA ITEM 20** Public Hearing: Appeal of the Washoe County Planning Commission's denial of Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA23-0008 and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA23-0009 (Thompson Family Trust) which seeks to amend the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan, a component of the Washoe County Master Plan, to redesignate 8.36 acres of two parcels totaling 81.83 acres (APN's 041-650-04 and 041-650-05) from Rural (R) to Suburban Residential (SR); and which seeks to amend the Southwest Truckee Meadows Regulatory Zone Map, to redesignate 8.36 acres of the same parcels from General Rural (GR) (1 dwelling unit/40 acres) to Low Density Suburban (LDS) (1 du/acre).

The appellant and applicant is David Thompson. The subject parcels are located southeast of the intersection of Hunters Peak Road and Hunter Fall Circle within the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan, have a master plan designation of Rural and a regulatory zone designation of General Rural.

The Board of County Commissioners (Board) shall consider the appeal based on the record on appeal and any additional evidence submitted at the Board's public hearing. The Board may affirm the Planning Commission's decision, as recommended by staff, or may reverse the Planning Commission's decision. If the Board reverses the Planning Commission's decision and adopts the proposed amendments, then the Board shall also consider approving a resolution to sponsor an amendment to the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan to change the Land Designation of the 8.36 acres of APN 041-650-04 and 041-650-05 included in master plan amendment WMPA23-0008 from Tier 3 to Tier 2. The County's adoption of the proposed master plan and regulatory zone amendments would only take effect after a determination that the master plan amendment conforms with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by the regional planning authorities. If adopted, the Board must authorize the Chair to sign the resolutions to this effect. Community Services. (Commission District 1.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

Planning and Building Division Senior Planner Katherine Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: WMPA23-008.WRZA23-0009 (Thompson Family Trust Master Plan and Regulatory Zone Amendment Appeal) (3 slides); Background/Requests; MPA Request; RZA Request; Appeal; MPA Findings; RZA Findings; Development Constraints (2 slides); Availability of Facilities; MPA Findings – Planning Commission; RZA Findings – Planning Commission; Possible Options; Thank you.

Ms. Oakley indicated the agenda item was an appeal of the Thompson Family Trust request for a Master Plan amendment (MPA) and regulatory zone amendment (RZA). She oriented the Board as to the location of the subject site, noting the location was in the foothills in the southwest area of Reno near existing suburban development. She added there was not much vegetation on most of the parcel. Ms. Oakley explained that the request was to redesignate 8.36 acres on two parcels, totaling 81.83 acres, from rural residential (RR) to suburban residential (SR) for the Master Plan designation. Additionally, a regulatory zone amendment was requested to redesignate the 8.36 acres from general rural (GR) to low density suburban (LDS) for the zoning district. She indicated that was from a density of one dwelling unit (DU) per 40 acres to one DU per acre. The parcels were currently undeveloped, and the majority of them were comprised of slopes over 30 percent. The overall increase in density would be from two total units to nine units. Ms. Oakley referenced a side-by-side map showing where the zoning and master plan changes would be located, which was on the northern end of both parcels adjoining the adjacent development to the north.

Ms. Oakley briefed the Board on the background of the appeal, indicating the Planning Commission (PC) denied both requests by a unanimous vote on January 2, 2024. The decision was in agreement with the staff's recommendation to deny the requests. On January 17, 2024, the applicant, Mr. David Thompson, filed an appeal. The reason alleged for the appeal was a lack of substantial evidence to support the denial; therefore, the PC misused its discretion in denying the applications. She explained the PC's decision was largely based on two of the findings for the MPA and RZA. The findings were for consistency with the Master Plan and availability of facilities, although the PC could not make most of the findings.

Ms. Oakley explained there were significant development constraints on the properties, particularly in the area where a request to change the Master Plan and regulatory zone designation was made. She stated the slopes were steeper than 30 percent on 64 percent of the properties. The slopes composed approximately 25 percent of the proposed LDS area, which was 2.1 acres, and accounted for two of the seven additional requested DUs. Ms. Oakley added this was a significant component of the request. She informed the development constraints area (DCA) was recognized in the Master Plan and the Development Code. The DCA included slopes steeper than 30 percent and other developmentally constrained areas. The Master Plan and the regional plan indicated the constrained areas were appropriate for a maximum residential density of one unit per 40 acres, which was their current zoning. She referenced Article 424 of the Master Plan and the Development Code for Hillside Development stating slopes steeper than 30 percent were not suitable for development, which was aligned with DCAs only being appropriate for densities for one unit per 40 acres. This was included in the Intent of General Rural. Ms. Oakley conveyed the staff's concern regarding the development constraints with the steep slopes in the area that was requested for a zoning increase in density. Furthermore, granting the request would be inconsistent with zoning throughout the County. She mentioned the Engineering Division recommended denial based on site characteristics and concerns about developing at the proposed density on the steep slopes. Therefore, the findings pertaining to the MPA and RZA could not be made due to the encroachment into

the steep areas. Ms. Oakley indicated the Master Plan and the zoning were a tool to articulate the purpose of future land use. She explained it would not be appropriate to change the designation or the zoning district for lands that were not physically suitable for the density of the development that was being requested.

Ms. Oakley addressed the concern regarding the availability of facilities, noting water and wastewater facilities did not currently extend to the project site. She mentioned the development to the north of the subject site, Ridges at Hunter Creek, would allow for facilities to be close to the project site if completed. Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) communicated to the staff that the facilities might not be large enough to accommodate the proposed development, even if improvements were made by Ridges at Hunter Creek. Facilities were also not planned to be extended to the subject site, so the staff and the PC could not make the finding that facilities were available, adequate, or planned to be adequate.

Ms. Oakley highlighted the potential options for the Board's consideration, which were to deny the appeal and affirm the PC's decision or grant the appeal and reverse the PC's decision.

Vice Chair Herman thanked Ms. Hurley for her presentation. She expressed intrigue in the proposed project and commented that it was creative. She commended the engineer. She noted the utilities were uncertain.

KLS Planning and Design Group President John Krmptic introduced Mr. Thompson, who was the primary investor of the subject property. Mr. Thompson thanked the Board for its time. He divulged he was 80-years-old and his wife was 70-years-old. He disclosed the agenda item was one of the steps he was pursuing to relieve his wife of the possible pressure from the matter not being resolved. He mentioned he lived in Nevada since 1966 and expressed his fondness for it. Mr. Thompson talked about his family's involvement in the City of Reno and identified the name of the trailhead was based on his son, Michael Thompson, who had passed away in 1988. He displayed photographs that were placed on file with the Clerk. He indicated he paid for the trailhead signage and donated it to the County. He constructed a parking area and restrooms at the trailhead so people could enjoy it. He also coordinated with the United States Forest Service (USFS) to connect the trails, allowing hikers to experience the waterfall that the trail led to. Mr. Thompson said many County residents used the trail.

Mr. Krmptic conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Thompson Family Trust; Site Map (2 slides); List of property owners; Zoning (E); Zoning (P); Master Plan (E); Master Plan (P) (2 slides); The slow numbers show (2 slides); No-Disturbance Zone; 30%+ slope overlay to Development plan, with lots, house footprints, road and no-build zone; Eagles Nest as it is developed today; TMRPS – Development Constraints Area (DCA) Map showing 30% slope; photo of house; Questions; map; Neighborhood Meeting Summary; Notice of Neighborhood Meeting; Map.

Mr. Krmptic pointed out the Michael D. Thompson Trailhead in relation to the subject site, which he clarified was 81.8 acres. He stated close to 10 percent of the acreage was being proposed for the SR and LDS designations for the Master Plan and the zoning. He noted the proximity of the project to the Eagle's Nest Subdivision. He informed a neighborhood meeting was organized, at which the Caughlin Ranch Homeowners Association (HOA) manager and a resident of the Eagle's Nest Subdivision attended, and their questions were addressed in October 2023. Referencing the existing and proposed zoning images, Mr. Krmptic demonstrated no leapfrog development zoning was intended, and the proposed LDS zoning was adjoined with the existing zoning on the 8.3-acre portion of the property. He pointed out 90 percent of the site that would remain an open space area.

Mr. Krmptic referenced the approved development footprint of the second phase of the Ridges at Hunter Creek development and brought attention to the applicant's seven proposed lots that were adjacent to it. He explained the reason for the design of the layout was so the proposed development appeared natural as an extension of an existing approved subdivision with identical lot sizing. Mr. Krmptic explained the slope was compared to the approved ridges to the north of the project and identified the 30 percent slope using a topographic map on the tenth slide. He acknowledged the staff for their efforts and clarified slopes of 30 percent or steeper comprised less than one percent of the entire development area. He expressed confidence in stating it was nearly impossible to have lots in rolling and hillside terrain without a 30 percent slope in the lot area. He noted the areas where slopes of 30 percent or steeper were managed responsibly on the proposed zoning for the seven lots.

Mr. Krmptic had indicated to the staff and the PC that he and Mr. Thompson were committed to establishing the non-disturbance zone depicted on the twelfth slide. The areas shown were not eligible for development, grading, or landscaping and would sit in the back of the lots. He emphasized 2,500-square-foot footprints were scaled for lots one through seven with the civil engineering team. The lots would be two stories because of the hillside architecture that would be used, which reduced grading and resulted in approximately 5,000-square-foot homes in that footprint. He highlighted the minimal disturbance to the 30 percent slope and said it was a way of addressing the constraints in the Washoe County Code (WCC).

Mr. Krmptic commented that the Eagle's Nest Subdivision might be the best development successfully completed in the region and pointed out all the red areas indicating a 30 percent slope from the slope analysis map. He advised the 30 percent slope created impressive views when houses were constructed. He referenced the photograph on the sixteenth slide showing a house on the seventh lot from a street view, which was closest to the shared property line. He stated the development was concentrated at the front while the 90 percent open space was in the background. Mr. Krmptic believed the staff were only considering the zoning. He assured he and Mr. Thompson were proposing the seven lots for zoning, not nine. He mentioned he had been forthcoming about every stage of the process. He clarified the project was pre-development and emphasized the level of detail that was provided. Mr. Krmptic indicated 10 percent of the site was proposed for rezoning.

Mr. Krmptic stated the application was not a development proposal yet, as the civil engineer did not participate in zoning measures. He quoted the civil engineer acknowledging Articles 436 and 438 of the Development Code that needed to be fulfilled. He conveyed his trust in the civil engineer, who had 25 years of experience in land development, and said the civil engineer guaranteed the project's success. The civil engineer also communicated the project could not commence if the grading was unsuccessful.

Mr. Krmptic talked about the main factor in the approach, which was the minimal environmental disturbance. He highlighted grading restrictions and the absence of significant wildlife and trees in the lots' location. He commented that it was the nuance of efforts related to creativity. He believed the staff were mistaken by calling the project a development of a 30 percent slope based on the proposed math. He communicated his commitment to ensuring the project was completed as described in the zoning process.

In regards to facility planning, Mr. Krmptic said he never accomplished a zoning effort to the same degree as what was presented. He stated that, based on a water discovery report, seven lots were insignificant in the context of the consumption of water usage from a water tank. He explained seven lots would be shared on the tank that Mr. Thompson had completed many years prior. He confirmed if the Ridges at Hunter Creek did not extend to the north, there would be no project. Furthermore, the project should align with that concept, as it would use the same roadway infrastructure as well as the same water and sewage systems. He thanked the Board for its time.

Commissioner Andriola confirmed with Ms. Oakley that the tentative map for the Ridges at Hunter Creek was approved. If the proposed zoning for consideration proceeded, the project would be required to complete a tentative map process. Commissioner Andriola asked if Ms. Oakley would accept an agreement prepared by the appellant that, based on the presentation, committed to abstaining from construction on the 30 percent slope and preserving the non-disturbance area. In response to Commissioner Andriola's question, Ms. Oakley stated the Planning and Building Division's perspective was that zoning was the appropriate tool to articulate where certain densities of development should be constructed. She referenced the staff's policy indicating that the denser areas were only appropriate for slopes less than 30 percent. If the proposed redesignation was approved, the staff would continue to apply WCC and policies to mitigate development on the subject parcels. She expressed concern regarding the requested residential density for the steeper areas that was not appropriate for them. Commissioner Andriola mentioned her service on the PC. She asserted the contingency, if included in the approval, would mitigate the concern by preserving the policy. Additionally, the added condition would prevent construction on the 30 percent slopes. She observed the areas in the Ridges at Hunter Creek that adjoined the subject site were similar in that the lots were designated in various ways. Ms. Oakley clarified the lots located in the Ridges at Hunter Creek with slopes steeper than 30 percent were not zoned for more than one residential unit per 40 acres. She stated the zoning did not reflect the higher density, which was the reason why the staff indicated disallowing the higher density in the steeper areas would be consistent with the Planning and Building Division's established practice.

She further explained an agreement from the appellant would not guarantee that construction would not occur in the steep areas. Furthermore, the zoning and Master Plan changes were not conditional, so once the approval was granted, the appellant had the residential density on the referenced portions of the parcel. Commissioner Andriola pointed out the appellant would still need to produce a tentative map and visit with the TMRPA. She noted the matter was the beginning stage of a larger process that would need to proceed before construction would commence. She believed there were measures in place to ensure compliance with the process, and the project could be halted at any point. Commissioner Andriola noted there was a lot of work that would follow approving the agenda item.

Planning and Building Division Planning Manager Trevor Lloyd indicated the request was for nine units in total despite Mr. Krmptic's conceptual drawing.

Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards added zoning could not be conditioned in Master Plan approvals, but conditions could be included for projects.

Vice Chair Herman commented that the project was at an early stage and was somewhat of a courageous step. She understood Mr. Thompson's reasoning behind the proposal and believed it was an element of a beautiful prospect. She thought the Board could assist Mr. Thompson in accomplishing his goal.

Referencing Vice Chair Herman's input, Chair Hill stated she could meet the findings for the Master Plan and the regulatory zone map.

On motion by Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 20 be affirmed, approved, and authorized, based on the ability to make all the findings required by Washoe County Code Sections 110.820.15(d) and 110.821.15(d) in addition to the findings in Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan policies SW.20.1 and SW.20.3.

24-0161 **AGENDA ITEM 21** Public Hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Ordinance 1615, Washoe County's Requirements and Schedule of Rates and Charges for Sanitary Sewer Service, to amend connection fees within all service areas; and other matters properly relating thereto. The Sanitary Sewer Connection Privilege Fee Charges (Connection Charges) will increase from the current rate of \$5,900.00 per equivalent residential unit (ERU) to \$9,477.00 per ERU with a change to the annual rate adjustment from \$50.00 per ERU to the annual averaged Engineering New Record Construction Cost Index (ENR-CCI) percentage for the previous calendar year; the Connection Fee for each Weighted Fixture Unit (WFU) will increase from the current rate of \$320.00 to \$379.00 with a change to the annual rate adjustment from \$5.00 per WFU to the annual averaged Engineering New Record Construction Cost Index (ENR-CCI) percentage for the previous calendar year. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1713, Bill No. 1903.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Penny Brock noted the occurrence of inflation as well as the increase in prices for fuel, groceries, and property taxes. She displayed her sewer bill and clarified she had not compared rates of other counties. She indicated the sewer rate would increase by nearly double the original rate based on the information provided in the staff report and urged the Board to consider that. Ms. Brock stated at least two of the Commissioners lived outside of the city limits with septic systems and did not understand the impact of the sewer bills for residents who lived within the city limits. She questioned the significant increase for bills when the cost of groceries increased by 25 percent. She asked the Board to reconsider raising the sewer bills by the amount referenced in the staff report. Ms. Brock acknowledged Ms. Janet Butcher was monitoring the Commissioners' votes and suggested the Commissioners consider that.

Chair Hill clarified the agenda item pertained to connection fees.

Vice Chair Herman believed the amendment and the fee increase for connection charges were necessary, noting the charges were a developer or builder fee. She said the agenda item was necessary because of the information presented by Planning and Building Division Senior Planner Katherine Oakley. She explained the item was supposed to keep the sewer bills low and expressed concern for the North Valleys due to rate increases. She speculated the agenda item might slow the increases. Vice Chair Herman thought the agenda item was a good idea.

Commissioner Clark affirmed voting in favor of the agenda item was necessary. He informed the information related to the agenda item was the reason affordable housing was not reasonably priced. He stated the charges would be passed onto the buyer or renters of a new property or apartment, respectively, as the developer would not pay for the charges in order to earn a greater profit. Commissioner Clark mentioned the expense of treating raw sewage was a factor in affordable housing being costly.

Commissioner Andriola spoke about the regionalization of sewer and wastewater treatment and was looking forward to the opportunity of that subject being presented before the Board. She stated it would create efficiencies and save costs, including those associated with construction. She noted every jurisdiction had connection fees as well as different charges and billing departments. She indicated the regionalization might save taxpayer dollars. Commissioner Andriola said her efforts on the matter were long-term. She also supported the agenda item based on the other Commissioners' input.

On motion by Vice Chair Herman, seconded by Commissioner Andriola, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1713, Bill No. 1903, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

24-0162

AGENDA ITEM 22 Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) by modifying various sections in Division Three-Regulation of Uses and Division Four- Development Standards, in order to update regulations related to accessory dwelling units, detached accessory structures, manufactured housing, and battery-charged fences. These updates include deleting a section specifying the procedure and findings for placing a manufactured home that is less than 1,200 square feet in size; and modifying various sections to: allow detached accessory dwelling units as an allowed use by right in certain residential regulatory zones; require detached accessory dwelling units on parcels ½ acre in size or smaller to be subject to the administrative review permit process in Article 809; update the maximum square footage for both attached and detached accessory dwelling units; define “minor accessory dwelling unit”; modify permitting requirements for detached accessory structures; update the minimum square footage for manufactured homes; and add provisions related to battery-charged fences as required by NV SB 208 (2023); and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. Community Services. (All Commission

Districts.)

Chair Hill opened the public hearing.

County Clerk Jan Galassini, read the title for Ordinance No. 1714, Bill No. 1905.

On the call for public comment, Mr. Scott Finley read from a document that was distributed to the Board and placed on file with the Clerk.

Ms. Pat Davison indicated she lived on Clydesdale Drive and commented that there was sufficient evidence supporting a shortage of affordable housing in her area. She was aware the population would grow, resulting in an increase in the competition for affordable housing until the County could attain a larger supply. She asserted the County needed to offset the overwhelming shortage with several prepared actions and solutions. Ms. Davison expressed optimism regarding the Board acting in a tangible way by voting in favor of the agenda item. She said the Board was inspiring hope for individuals who were directly and indirectly affected by the housing shortage. She asked the Commissioners to support the proposed amendments.

Commissioner Andriola moved to adopt Ordinance Number 1714, which was an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) by modifying various sections in Division Three Regulation of Uses, and Division Four Development Standards. She also moved to affirm the four findings of fact that the Planning Commission (PC) made on January 2, 2024, as recorded with Resolution Number 24-05 and attached to the staff report for this item. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Herman informed she did not review all the details related to the agenda item. She requested information regarding the location of the structures, whether they needed to be on a sewer, and whether they could be constructed in a rural area on septic. She mentioned she was inquiring about the details on behalf of other residents. Planning and Building Division Senior Planner Katherine Oakley clarified her understanding was based on the rules established by the Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH) District Board of Health for regulating septic. She stated the staff were involved in discussions with the District Board of Health, and two acres was generally necessary for an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) because it would require a second septic tank in areas not served by sewer. In areas served by sewer, there was an option to connect, which provided a possibility to construct ADUs on smaller lots. Ms. Oakley confirmed the lot size determined whether a second septic was necessary. Vice Chair Herman commented that it was difficult to find one location that would work.

Vice Chair Herman had been notified that if the structure was on a sewer, there was no requirement for a second sewer hookup. It was Ms. Oakley's understanding that there would not need to be a second direct connection to the main sewer line when there was a branch off of the line that traveled through the lot to serve the second dwelling unit. Vice Chair Herman indicated there were few locations of sufficient size that were on sewers. Ms. Oakley stated the staff had observed several ADUs that were on smaller lots, such as one-third acre lots.

Vice Chair Herman inquired about Ms. Oakley's opinion regarding if the proposed amendments would be challenging to apply. Ms. Oakley thought the main benefit of the changes was the removal of a potential barrier to people pursuing an ADU, which was the discretionary permit required by the Planning and Building Division. She added there were no changes proposed for sewer or septic regulations. The amendments were improving the process so it was more efficient for homeowners and the Planning and Building Division. In response to Vice Chair Herman's question, Ms. Oakley confirmed the changes applied entirely to the County.

On motion by Commissioner Andriola, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1714, Bill No. 1905, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100. She further moved to affirm the four findings of fact that the Planning Commission made on January 2, 2024, as recorded within Resolution Number 24-05 (Attachment C).

24-0163 **AGENDA ITEM 24** Public Comment.

Ms. Penny Brock noted the public heard Commissioner Clark discussing the Registrar of Voters (ROV) and problems relating to trust. She had requested copies of contracts for Dominion, Runbeck, and the temporary agency in Las Vegas for election staff. She mentioned she requested one of the contracts in January 2024, her request for which was sent to the District Attorney's (DA's) Office. She asked for a copy of that contract. Ms. Brock stated Washoe 311 provided her copies of incomplete contracts, and she was informed it would take a long time for her to obtain the copies because they needed

to be collected from many different sources. Her understanding was that the County had a purchasing department that stored all the contracts, so she did not understand why there was a problem with providing copies of contracts to the voters and taxpayers who paid for them. She requested that the Board ask Washoe 311 to expedite the process of sending her the contracts. Ms. Brock stated the Dominion voting machines would be heard by the Supreme Court, and there was an injunction to stop the use of the electronic voting systems, including from Dominion. She commented that if the United States (US) Supreme Court honored the injunction, it would be immediate. She suggested the ROV prepare to vote by paper ballots and hand counting. She mentioned the organization Cause of America had devised a model for the County to use, and it offered internet trainings. She commented that transitioning to hand counting should be easy. Ms. Brock referenced Commissioner Clark's request to place the matter on a Board of County Commissioners (BCC) agenda.

Mr. Nicholas St. Jon displayed a document that was placed on file with the Clerk. He read from Chair Hill's official oath as a Commissioner. He indicated he dropped off a packet for each Commissioner containing an acceptance of their oaths that would become a binding contract in commerce after the 10-day testing period. He explained any violation resulted in a breach of contract. He wanted to ensure the packets were on record as being delivered, and he communicated to the Commissioners that the matter was time-sensitive. Mr. St. Jon stated the Commissioners had 10 days to rebut the document. He said he reviewed the oaths for the Second Judicial District Court and conducted extensive research. He stated he researched the official oaths for all of the sixteen District Court judges through the Clerk's Office and the Recorder's Office, none of which could be located. The Office of the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS) had indicated it did not possess the official oaths, despite Mr. St. Jon having been told they were provided to the SOS's Office. Mr. St. Jon emphasized the significance of the matter. He said if the official oaths existed, someone needed to present them, as they needed to be filed with the Clerk's Office. He mentioned he delivered a document related to the official oaths to Nevada Governor Joe Lombardo, Nevada Lieutenant Governor Stavros Anthony, and Nevada Attorney General Aaron Ford.

Ms. Candy Greene indicated her name was mentioned during the meeting and added she had been returning comments to the media related to the matter. She complimented Chair Hill and her husband, noting Chair Hill's kindness. She mentioned her mother was 98 years old. She commented that her house was likely similar in appearance to Commissioner Garcia's due to the number of people who visited her residence to harass her. Ms. Greene noted there were many sides to the matter. She expressed sadness about being confronted on numerous occasions at the City of Reno to the extent that she no longer attended the meetings. She divulged she had a business. She claimed she was monitored after helping a friend with a logo and a tagline.

Mr. Scott Finley displayed documents that were placed on file with the Clerk and read from one of the documents.

Ms. Janet Butcher referenced Mr. Finley's input and stated the comments regarding the Truckee Meadows Public Lands Management Act (TMPLMA) were hidden.

She added the reason was to prevent the public from seeing who was opposed to the TMPLMA and why. Referencing Agenda Item 9, she said there were likely four individuals on the Library Board of Trustees (LBT) who resided in District 1. She noted there were 28 applicants from Districts 4 and 5. Ms. Butcher thanked the Board for demonstrating that paper ballots and hand counting could work. She added the only aspect that was missing was reviewing voter identifications (IDs).

24-0164 **AGENDA ITEM 25** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager Eric Brown shared information with the Commissioners that was provided by Human Services Agency (HSA) Director Ryan Gustafson. He noted the recent complaints about the quality and flavor of the food served at the Senior Services building. The information showed there were guidelines and restrictions on nutritional content. The food that was served at the Senior Services facility was lower in salt, sugar, and saturated fats, which impacted the flavor, for the long-term health of the senior population being served. Additionally, the meals were funded through the Nevada Aging and Disability Services Division (ADSD), which ensured compliance. Manager Brown noted the food would taste differently than that served at such organizations as the Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada (CCNN). He added he or Mr. Gustafson could respond to any questions related to the matter.

Vice Chair Herman encouraged the rest of the Board to place an item on a Board of County Commissioners (BCC) agenda concerning the elections resolution she proposed. She stated it needed to be judged to the same degree as everything else. She believed it was fair to serve the public correctly and ensure there were no doubts during the election. She spoke in support of ensuring an honest election. She added the Board would disappoint a lot of people by not including the matter on an agenda for deliberation. Vice Chair Herman recommended adding the item to the next BCC agenda for a vote.

Commissioner Clark asked Assistant District Attorney (ADA) Nathan Edwards whether discussing a matter without responses from other Commissioners constituted an Open Meeting Law (OML) violation. ADA Edwards stated that the instance Commissioner Clark mentioned generally did not result in an OML violation. Commissioner Clark confirmed with ADA Edwards that two Commissioners would not have violated OML by discussing a similar topic unless a third Commissioner was involved. ADA Edwards added the facts of a specific situation would dictate the analysis and indicated it would be classified as a violation of the Board rather than one or three Commissioners being held responsible for the violation.

Addressing Manager Brown and Mr. Gustafson, Commissioner Clark stated it was disingenuous to cloak the characteristics of the food served at the Senior Services building by referencing a regulation. He noted the County likely followed the same regulations that were established for Douglas County and Carson City related to the services for senior citizens. He mentioned the residents of the Cares Campus were served by the CCNN. He did not believe it was acceptable to fault the government regulations for the quality of the food. Commissioner Clark suggested viewing and tasting the food served

by the CCNN, Douglas County, and Carson City, which he commented looked and tasted better. He spoke in opposition to justifying the quality of the food by using the chemical analysis of the public's food compared to the food served at the Senior Services building. He challenged everyone present at the Dais to visit surrounding communities to observe the quality of service they provided. Commissioner Clark declared the County could do better or attempt to improve the quality of its food. He informed he visited all the places that served food to senior citizens.

After meeting with the Nevada Secretary of State (SOS) and the District Attorney (DA), Commissioner Clark wanted an agenda item outlining the voting process in Nye County to be placed on a BCC agenda for deliberation. He wished to determine whether the County could emulate Nye County's process with voting, tracking, testing, and sampling ballots and checking the integrity of the election. He clarified he was not demanding that the process be implemented in the County. He mentioned he requested the agenda item at the start of the meeting.

Referencing Commissioner Clark's statement about having met with the SOS, ADA Edwards clarified Commissioner Clark met with representatives of the SOS's Office rather than the SOS himself.

24-0165 **AGENDA ITEM 23** Possible Closed Session for the purpose of discussing labor negotiations with Washoe County and/or Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District per NRS 288.220.

3:31 p.m. **The Board recessed to a closed session for the purpose of discussing negotiations with Employee Organizations per Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 288.220.**

* * * * *

4:01 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:
Danielle Howard, Deputy County Clerk*