

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

TUESDAY

10:00 A.M.

OCTOBER 25, 2022

PRESENT:

Vaughn Hartung, Chair

Alexis Hill, Vice Chair

Bob Lucev, Commissioner, via Zoom

Kitty Jung, Commissioner

Jeanne Herman, Commissioner

Catherine Smith, Chief Deputy County Clerk

Eric Brown, County Manager

Nathan Edwards, Assistant District Attorney

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners convened at 10:06 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, Chief Deputy County Clerk Catherine Smith called roll and the Board conducted the following business:

22-0805 **AGENDA ITEM 3** Presentation and discussion by Dana Searcy, Division Director - Housing and Homeless Services, Washoe County, regarding updates on the Nevada Cares Campus.

Housing and Homeless Services Division Director Dana Searcy conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Homeless Services Cares Campus; Status & Direction; Status (2 slides); Direction; Washoe County Regional Homelessness Plan; What we have implemented; Cares Campus: A closer look at the investment; Cares Campus Site Plan – Oct 2022; Cares Campus Capital Budget – Oct 2022 (3 slides); Cares Campus Operating Budget (3 slides); Consequences of Inaction (5 slides); Results & Benefits (9 slides); Data for the Cares Campus.

Ms. Searcy spoke about the investment in the Cares Campus. She observed a lot of the presentation materials and slides were shared and discussed over the past year. She said the materials were combined into one presentation, and she would also provide details about the construction budget.

Ms. Searcy stated that during the workshop with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) in January, discussion occurred regarding the need in the community. She observed there were unprecedented increases in average rental rates and that affordable housing units were stagnant. Along with other economic and pandemic-related factors, this resulted in an increase across the nation in unsheltered and sheltered homeless counts. She referred to a chart on the first “Status” slide, noting it was obtained from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). According to the

HUD data, Nevada was ranked tenth in the nation for the rate of homelessness per 10,000 individuals in the population. She highlighted the Continuum of Care (CoC) rankings, stating NV 501 was the Reno/Sparks/Washoe County area. In NV 501 there were about 26 individuals experiencing homelessness for every 10,000 in the population, which she stated was a pretty significant number.

Over the past five years, Ms. Searcy informed, many of the care facilities and group homes closed, with West Hills being the most recent. She shared that the community and the system felt the impact of the closures. She observed the community decided to make a commitment and do some research to figure out which direction to go. As the County worked with subject matter experts in homeless services and housing across the nation, it learned there were set best practices. She shared the regional priorities for homelessness, stating they reflected those best practices. The priorities included: centralized, shared client data; unified, regional outreach; housing clients faster; sheltering the unsheltered; accessible care for all; regional approach to affordable housing. She indicated regional outreach was seen through the use of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Homeless Outreach Proactive Engagement (HOPE) Team and the Clean and Safe team with the City of Reno. Referring to the priority of housing clients faster, she stated this was the housing first approach, noting housing first was not housing only. She remarked that sheltering the unsheltered meant getting individuals off the streets and into programs with supportive services, and accessible care for all was about having enough case managers. Regarding the regional approach to affordable housing, she said the County was focused on the supportive housing piece.

Ms. Searcy asserted the County accomplished quite a bit, noting between the opening of both Our Place and the Cares Campus (CC), shelter bed capacity in the region tripled over the past three years. She referred to the "Cares Campus Site Plan" slide, stating Phase 5 Support Housing was the only item that was not in the budget. It was the extra acre of land that was gained at the campus by filling up the Governor's Bowl with soil. She shared that an application was submitted to Home Means Nevada to make the Phase 5 opportunity a reality as this item was not currently covered by the CC budget.

Ms. Searcy informed the Cares Campus capital budget was updated since it was shared in April. The two items that were not presented in April were the Reno Housing Authority (RHA) Property Purchase and the Demo of Existing Buildings/Fuel Tank Remediation. Other than those items, the County had not seen much of a price increase in cost estimates, and the total estimate for the entire CC was approximately \$78 million. She pointed out a pie chart, which broke down where the funding was going. There was a significant investment in both the services and housing aspects of the campus. She reminded the BCC that the updated budget was presented in April along with the reasons why the number was higher. She stated the increase was in part due to inflation and escalation, but it was also a result of the CC wanting to avoid future maintenance concerns, increasing the amount of space for staff, and the RHA property purchase.

Of the \$78 million, Ms. Searcy indicated that \$59 million was already identified and she pointed out the breakdown of where the funding was coming from. She spoke about the pending funding, noting the CC anticipated about \$3 million from the capital campaign, and it hoped to hear from Home Means Nevada regarding its application for \$20 million for 50 units of supportive housing. She shared that the pie chart broke down the different jurisdictions and types of funding. She said there were private, federal, local, and State dollars, stating it was truly a collaborative project.

On the operations side, Ms. Searcy observed the Homeless Services budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 was \$31.8 million, which included \$17.4 million for the Cares Campus. The Homeless Services budget also included other programs such as Our Place, CrossRoads, the WCSO HOPE Team, housing initiatives, and the CoC. She stated the goal was to stabilize the campus and noted there was a lot of support from the Board. She said over the past budget year the Board asked for funding to be able to put staff and services in place that were desperately needed. The next step was potential revenue, which meant identifying funding streams to ease the burden on the General Fund. She remarked Medicaid reimbursement was a huge opportunity and would be the first initial focus.

Ms. Searcy asserted the Cares Campus addressed a lot of the barriers the County was aware of throughout the community, but it was also the only option for many people. She said the CC was more than just a shelter bed; it was also about services and professional staff onsite, with all the support leading toward a permanent housing option when an individual left the campus. Regarding the cost per bed night, she commented it was difficult to pinpoint because the campus was not always full and there were a lot of different variables. She said if the \$16 million budget for the shelter was divided across the beds that were there, the cost per bed night would be approximately \$73.

Ms. Searcy highlighted some of the average costs of services in the region that were frequently used by the people the CC served. She observed according to the National Alliance to End Homelessness, a person experiencing chronic homelessness would cost the average taxpayer about \$44,000 per year. She said there was a circular system that did not result in the housing outcomes the County was hoping for. She compared the average costs of the chronically homeless to the cost per bed night at the CC. She opined moving people into a campus, providing appropriate services, and moving them into permanent housing was more effective than not.

Ms. Searcy shared the Cares Campus saw over 4,000 unique individuals since it opened in May 2021. Referencing a request for the age breakdown, she said 43 percent of people at the campus that day were 55 or older. She informed that 50 percent of the individuals at the campus had a cognitive or physical disability and 29 percent were uninsured. She noted the numbers were updated on the CC's website each month (<https://www.washoecounty.gov/homeless/Cares-Campus/index.php>). She asserted the campus was seeing things move in the right direction. Calls to emergency services were going down and permanent housing placements were going up.

Ms. Searcy opined there were a couple of reasons things were moving in the right direction, one being the Board's support for funding for needed staff. The CC was at appropriate staffing ratios but did have a few vacancies it was working to fill. All the County staff, with the exception of one counselor, were in place. She observed the County provided a variety of shelter options, stating a lot of people were not comfortable in a congregate shelter and other options had to be provided to meet different needs. As construction continued, she asserted more shelter options would open up and she hoped the County would see more people choose to get off the street and come into the campus. She acknowledged the importance of having a lot of programs, pointing out the programs and partners that were currently in place at the campus or had agreements in progress. She remarked the CC could not do things alone and that the partnerships were critical to the success of the campus. She mentioned the benefits to the community which included: clean river and water supply, reduced impact on the emergency services system, decreased property damage to businesses, increased economic development, and improved quality of life and dignity for all. She stated despite the current housing market in which affordability was difficult to navigate, the Cares Campus was able to double its permanent housing placements. She believed the CC was moving in the right direction because of support from the Board and the community.

Commissioner Jung was impressed with the performance measures presented by Ms. Searcy. She spoke about the housing market, stating it was an international issue because of investment in technology and a lack of investment in employers. She informed that Commissioner Lucey, Assistant County Manager Kate Thomas, and Human Services Agency (HSA) Director Amber Howell devised the plan to approach the unsheltered issue with no money and two cities that did not think they had a stake in the issue. She opined permanent housing placements would double again in two to three years when the housing market settled down.

Commissioner Jung believed the Cares Campus needed more sustainable funding that was not just from the County and municipalities. She asserted many agencies were saving money because the County stepped up to take care of indigent individuals, including the following: hospitals; jails; police for the Cities of Reno and Sparks, the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), and the Reno-Tahoe International Airport (RTIA); the Regional Emergency Medical Services Authority (REMSA); the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC); Reno's business improvement district; and fire for Reno and Sparks and the RTIA. She thought the County needed to create a development team to ask those agencies for money. She commented the Sheriff would not be against this because he was compassionate and thought jail was the wrong place for vulnerable individuals.

Commissioner Jung spoke about the river, stating she walked it year-round and she did not think it had ever been this clean in the 23 years since she moved to the area. She commented there used to be fences around the river and the water was dirty, noting the Board was told it was because fish and game did not want to patrol the river. She remarked there were no camps or tent communities along the river now. She hoped the Board would reach out to the agencies that were benefitting from the CC. She thought the agencies would support the Cares Campus because they knew it solved many problems in

the community and improved the quality of life. She thought the Board should do a happiness quotient for its constituents. She believed seeing people off the streets would lead to greater happiness and higher quality of life for the community. She thought the County made a giant step forward to show that it cared about the most vulnerable. She asserted homelessness could happen to anyone and had more to do with addiction and the opioid crisis than anything else. She expressed appreciation for Ms. Searcy's report and thanked the Board for its willingness to do something about this issue. She observed she had never had a manager like Mr. Brown, stating others would quit if things were difficult. She mentioned Clark County was asking Washoe County how it accomplished what it did. She commented Ms. Searcy made the County look good.

Chair Hartung said he could not agree more regarding Commissioner Lucey's leadership on this issue. He observed the Board was a compass and it was the job of staff to map out the way. He expressed appreciation for the work staff had done.

Vice Chair Hill thought Commissioner Jung said much of what the Board was feeling. She remarked it was a tough journey, but Ms. Searcy dug in and continued to do the work. Regarding the PowerPoint presentation, she expressed appreciation that it highlighted the fiscal impacts of homelessness on the community and mapped out what the County was spending. She believed it provided transparency for taxpayers. She shared that the goal was to permanently house 50 people per month and the CC was currently close to the 30s. She asserted the team was getting there and by working with the RHA they would continue to move forward. She expressed excitement to be part of the journey.

Commissioner Herman thanked Ms. Searcy for the presentation and her hard work.

Chair Hartung wondered how to get individuals out of homelessness and back into a scenario where they could care for themselves. He referred to the 317 permanent housing placements. He asked what the process was after a person was placed in permanent housing and if the CC followed up with them. Ms. Searcy responded the Cares Campus was working on a systemwide recidivism report now that the campus had been in place for one year. The County could look at the data over the next year to see how many of the 317 individuals placed in permanent housing were still housed, which would indicate if the housing was appropriate. She believed a lot of this was about appropriate assessment. She said one year ago the County could tell the Board there were 600 people at the campus, but it could not explain how many needed supportive housing because of cognitive or physical disabilities, or how many could get back on their feet with a bit of job training and support. Chair Hartung indicated he was most interested in the retraining process.

Chair Hartung spoke about a conversation he had with Washoe County Sheriff Darin Balaam regarding people drying out while they were held in the detention facility. He asked if the County followed up with those individuals to ensure they received appropriate assistance to avoid entering the detention system or the Cares Campus. Ms. Searcy replied there were case managers inside the campus who worked together with non-profits and organizations as a community to provide each person with their own custom set

of services. She said the next piece the County was looking at was what happened when a person moved into permanent housing. Through Emergency Rental Assistance (ERA) 2 funding and the partnership with Built for Zero, the County was developing tenancy support. She said this support provided ongoing care to check in with people in permanent housing once a week. If a person showed signs of getting off course, the County could intervene right at the beginning. Chair Hartung opined interns from UNR could be used for this and Ms. Searcy agreed. Chair Hartung shared that he, Manager Brown, and Commissioner Lucey attended meetings with UNR intern programs for people who wanted to go into case management and social work.

Chair Hartung opined private entities could often do things cheaper than the government could. He asked about providing smooth transitions from the County to facilities within the system. Ms. Searcy replied that was the work of Built for Zero and the CoC. She said that was why it was important for the County to work collaboratively with nonprofits. She asserted it was critical to know how many people at the campus needed which types of services, and it was critical to support and strengthen those services. She acknowledged the County would never be able to do it all and was not an expert in everything. It was important for the County to support its nonprofit partners and identify which key services it needed more or less of, and find and support the funding and the staff. Chair Hartung hoped faith groups would come forward to provide assistance.

22-0806 **AGENDA ITEM 4** Public Comment.

County Manager Eric Brown advised that many of those in attendance to provide public comment would be speaking about Agenda Item 11 regarding the community reinvestment grants.

Ms. Skyler Dillon shared she was the Resource Development Director for Big Brothers Big Sisters Northern Nevada. She thanked the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) for its consideration of Agenda Item 11. She informed the organization had been in the community since 2001, and it worked to recruit, screen, and train volunteer adult mentors to pair with at-risk youth living at or below the federal poverty level. After a year of weekly activities together, big impacts were seen on the youth's social and academic success both now and as an adult. Over the last two years, the program saw 100 percent of age-eligible Littles graduate high school. 90 percent of adult program alumni said their Big provided stability when they needed it, and 81 percent said their Big changed their perspective on what they thought possible in life. She remarked that with youth mental health challenges on the rise, getting the support and encouragement of a mentor was more important than ever. Nearly a quarter of youth in the program significantly improved their depressive symptoms last year. Through the community reinvestment funds, the program was asking the BCC to support a version of its program called Bigs with Badges. The program worked with the Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) and the Reno Fire Department (RFD) to recruit Big Brothers and Big Sisters from the first responders who served Washoe County. She asserted the program would build strong, positive relationships between first responders and the communities they served and help the Littles in the program view first responders as friends. She expressed

excitement for the positive impacts the first responders could make on their Littles by sharing their sense of leadership and duty. She believed the program would lead to a stronger community for everyone. She thanked Washoe County Sheriff Darin Balaam and Manager Brown for supporting the program and thanked the BCC again for its consideration.

Ms. Bonney Brown indicated she was in attendance to speak on behalf of the community revitalization grant for the nonprofit Options Veterinary Care on Longley Lane. She stated research showed the physical and mental benefits of pets on senior citizens and children, noting many seniors depended on their pets for companionship and emotional support. She shared that the cost of preventive veterinary care could be out of reach for many low-income pet owners. The cost of a single unexpected veterinary visit could be devastating for low-income families, seniors on limited incomes, and people living with disabilities. She asserted when people could not afford needed veterinary care, they often surrendered their pets to local animal shelters which increased the burden on those agencies. Sometimes they euthanized their pets at the local veterinary clinic because they could not afford care. She believed access to veterinary care reduced strain on local animal shelters and was an important element of public health and safety for the community. She informed Options worked with the Washoe County Regional Animal Services (WCRAS) and many other human services and animal welfare agencies, nonprofits, and governmental entities across the community. She gave an example, stating Options provided veterinary care to pets of individuals who were utilizing the Cares Campus and other housing for the homeless. The funding that was being considered would help 450 vulnerable seniors and families to provide veterinary care to a beloved pet and would contribute to community health and safety. She thanked the members of the Board and hoped they would vote in support of the item.

Mr. Mark Neumann spoke about Agenda Item 8C1. He indicated he was an alternative member of the Senior Services Advisory Board and was asking for the BCC's support to replace a permanent member who resigned. He spoke about the developers of the Chocolate Drive apartment complex and the route they would be taking for dumping. He opined emergency vehicles would have to go all the way down Sun Valley Drive, up Second Street, then back to Gepford Parkway just to get into the apartment complex. He believed Gepford Parkway would need to be improved. He said he spoke with Ken Krater, the general contractor for Highland Village Phase 1, who said the Washoe County School District (WCSD) did not need a school zone on Highland Village. Mr. Neumann claimed he spoke with the school board and was informed that it was an issue for the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), not the WCSD; however, RTC said it was up to the WCSD if it wanted to have a school zone in that area. He expressed frustration that no one was taking responsibility and kids would have to continue to cross dangerous traffic.

Dr. Michael Selby thanked Washoe County and the BCC for the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding. He shared that his organization had worked with youth in the County for the past 24 years and it made a big difference in people's lives, one child at a time. The organization ran a ropes challenge course and other experiential elements for children and adults, which helped them develop more resilience in their lives. He said

some of the kids he worked with were walking miracles because of the things they had gone through. He observed the kids were often a statistic, whether it was incarceration, institutionalization, or homelessness. The organization empowered them to make better decisions, use better judgment, and realize that their lives made a difference. He informed the kids became part of a working team when they worked with the organization and their behaviors were dealt with. The organization wanted to help the kids realize their attitudes, behaviors, cognitions, and decisions mattered each day. He remarked that the kids got better as they went through this experiential process. He read the Washoe County motto. He stated every dollar the County invested in his organization and many other nonprofits made a difference in children's lives. He thanked the BCC for the funding, and he hoped to continue working with the Board to make the County better.

Mr. Kelby Peeler stated he was in attendance to speak about Agenda Item 18 regarding the Washoe County Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF). He thanked the Board for the series of steps it took to establish the fund. He opined the housing market would face more pressure as the County continued to develop, and more people would be threatened with homelessness. He was glad to see the County was stepping up and taking advantage of a diverse range of tools to address and manage homelessness in the region. He expressed support for the amendments that prioritized permanent supportive housing for those with extremely low income. He thanked the BCC for making the distinction between low-income and extremely low-income. He thought making this distinction was important if the County wanted to ensure the most vulnerable populations benefitted from all its efforts. He shared he often volunteered at the Society of St. Vincent de Paul which regularly delivered food to unsheltered individuals and residents in weekly motels. As a volunteer, he had the opportunity to speak with a lot of people, and he learned many of them were employed but just did not make enough money or needed a little extra help. He believed the County was setting the stage for a fund that was justly targeted and implemented. He urged the Board to seek out a dedicated funding source for the fund. He remarked the County could look at other cities and counties for best practices. Whatever the next steps were, he encouraged the Board to take them.

Ms. Betty Bishop expressed support for Agenda Item 18. She shared she was the president of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. She said St. Vincent's mission was to offer person-to-person service and to work for social justice. She stated needy and suffering people called the organization and it responded according to their needs. She indicated she witnessed the affordable housing crisis in Washoe County firsthand. She asserted housing was unaffordable for low-wage workers and rents continued to increase. Low-income renters were cost-burdened and often did not have money left for other bills and necessities. Those living on fixed incomes, especially seniors, the disabled, and single moms who needed childcare, frequently faced eviction and the possibility of homelessness. She commented thinking about society and the children's future kept her up at night. She was especially concerned for homeless individuals who suffered from mental illness. She spoke about an experience in Paradise Park with a man with a mental illness. She observed there were many people on the streets who had mental illnesses which made it difficult for them to earn a steady income. She believed permanent supportive housing was a way to assist those with mental disorders and provide them with the dignity they deserved. She

encouraged the Board to amend the Washoe County Code (WCC) regarding the AHTF, research permanent funding sources, and move forward quickly to develop affordable housing.

Ms. Chasity Martinez thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak about Agenda Item 18 regarding the amendments to the AHTF. She was happy to see the prioritization of permanent supportive housing solutions for those with extremely low income. She believed it was the right move because every day more and more individuals were living on the streets of the City of Reno and Washoe County unsheltered or were on the verge of becoming homeless. The pandemic along with rising rental costs made the situation worse, which she acknowledged was not unique to Washoe County. She stated each individual had their own story and issues that caused them to become homeless and noted it could happen to anyone. She reminded for some individuals shelter was not enough; they also needed supportive services to maintain stability. She felt compelled by her faith to be in attendance to support the fund. She asserted it was not enough to rely on charity, direct services, or churches; it also required upstream resources to create long-term sustainable solutions to address the housing crisis. She believed the AHTF was just one piece of the solution to this complex issue. She looked forward to seeing the Board put forth the necessary resources and find a permanent revenue source for the fund so it could be as effective as possible in transforming the community.

Mr. Michael Tang shared he was born and raised in Nevada. He expressed support for Agenda Item 18 regarding the AHTF. He spoke about working on the streets registering people to vote and providing them with assistance as needed. He stated he heard a lot of stories from people on the streets. He saw many veterans who were discouraged because it seemed as if it was acceptable for society to shun and shame individuals on the streets. He asserted sometimes these people did not have control of their lives or were indecisive and needed a little push. He commented they were sometimes misrepresented and vulnerable to abuse. He shared an example of someone at a metro transit station obtaining information from vulnerable individuals under false pretenses. He reiterated that sometimes individuals needed a push and assistance to make decisions to help them better themselves.

Ms. Dennyse Sewell stated she was the Executive Director of the Pioneer Center for the Performing Arts. She asked the Board to vote in favor of Agenda Item 11. She informed the Pioneer Center was a performing arts center in the heart of downtown Reno in operation since 1968. She noted she was not in attendance to speak about unsheltered issues but wanted to acknowledge she saw those challenges every day and appreciated the complexities of the situation. Regarding the ARPA funding, she encouraged the Board to vote in favor of the many nonprofits in attendance, including the Pioneer Center, who would use the community reinvestment fund to benefit citizens in the County. She explained the vision of the Pioneer Center was to bring the performing arts to vulnerable populations who did not have the ability to go to the theater due to barriers such as a lack of transportation or funds. According to a 2022 report regarding the quality of life for seniors in Washoe County, 76.5 percent felt isolated, 77.1 percent felt left out, 76.5 percent had barriers to community participation, and the suicide rate for seniors in the

County was more than double the national average. She believed there was an opportunity for the arts to provide a vehicle for togetherness and a sense of community. The Pioneer Center would use the funds to put together an outreach program to send performers into places where seniors gathered such as assisted living facilities, senior centers, library branches, and potentially the Cares Campus. If approved, she said the seed funding would provide for two full years of the outreach program at no cost to any of the participating venues. The Pioneer Center would be able to hire local performing artists to impact the quality of life for seniors. She noted everyone on the agenda that day did great work, and she believed the nonprofits and the Board working together could make a meaningful difference in the County.

Mr. Dalton Boutte said he was in attendance to advocate for Agenda Item 18 regarding the AHTF. He congratulated the Board for establishing the fund, noting he thought it was a step in the right direction. He advocated for permanent funding. He spoke about the list of entities mentioned by Commissioner Jung and thought the BCC needed to find a way to make them contribute. He shared that two years ago he volunteered to distribute food to the homeless and was touched by the conditions some of the people were living in. In 2006 he and his wife bought their property in Washoe County and saw incredible growth in the region over the years. He said a lot of that was due to decisions made by the Board. He thought it did a wonderful job, but it could do better.

Ms. Melanie Dolezal thanked the BCC for its consideration of Agenda Item 11. She stated she was in attendance in support of the Terry Lee Wells Nevada Discovery Museum's project Survival of the Slowest. She explained Survival of the Slowest was a counterintuitive exhibit focused on 15 live animals. She opined that as the community recovered from social isolation, learners of all ages were starved for hands-on experiences. After years of Zoom meetings and distance learning, The Discovery brought collaborative learning back to science, technology, engineering, the arts, and mathematics (STEAM). She asserted an investment in The Discovery was an investment in the quality of life of the community. She observed The Discovery's target community included children and families from low-income and at-risk households, visitors with disabilities, English language learners, and rural communities. Those audiences were largely affected by the economic impacts of COVID-19. She said The Discovery's mission was to be the place to experience science. She stated science was not supposed to be unreachable, it should be inclusive and envelope society. She believed bringing Survival of the Slowest to The Discovery was a strategic investment in the community, would increase visitation to the museum and would increase the understanding of science in the community.

Ms. Katie Pace thanked the Board for its support of the ARPA funding and the applicants in attendance that day. She shared she was from Rebuilding Together Northern Nevada (RTNN), whose mission was to repair homes, revitalize communities, and rebuild lives. She informed RTNN did this at no cost to the homeowner, who was of little means. In 2021, RTNN helped 32 households and provided over 150 repairs. She reported RTNN was on target to double that for 2022, and if the funding was approved, RTNN hoped to pass its goal. She observed it also helped with the preservation of housing.

Mr. Mike Keeney shared it was his first time at a BCC meeting, and he was impressed. He introduced his dog, noting his dog was the honorary Mayor of Reno about a month before. He indicated he was in attendance as a friend of Options Veterinary Care and his dog was a patient. He said he pictured a big pie and how many slices could be made from it, and he did not envy the Board's task. He asked the Board to consider helping Options. He informed he was living on disability and his dog was critical to him. He said he would not be able to look at his dog and say he was sorry he did not have the money to keep him alive. He remarked he went to veterinary clinics and could not get care for his animals because he could not pay. He did not blame them and understood they had a business to run. He said Options did not say no; it was a place where low-income people could go and get help. He opined things that went wrong with pets were not simple and they could be costly. He believed it was critical to the community to have a resource like Options, noting it was the only clinic of its type he had seen before. He stated he was not affiliated with Options but his pets were patients. He again asked the Board to consider Options.

Mr. Nick Tscheekar said he was the Community Engagement Officer with the Community Foundation of Northern Nevada (CFNN). He expressed support for Agenda Item 11. He informed the CFNN was seeking funding for its caregiver support initiative which helped people who were caring for aging family members. He spoke about the CFNN's partnership with the County, noting the idea for the caregiver support initiative came from Grady Tarbutton, the former Director of Washoe County Senior Services. Mr. Tarbutton told the CFNN the County provided great support for seniors but had not done much to support family members. The CFNN looked into this and realized that in partnership with the County it could help improve the lives of family caregivers so they could better help their care recipients. The CFNN partnered with Leslie Williams, formerly of Washoe County Senior Services, and organized its first convening at the Senior Center on Ninth Street. He said the CFNN's role was to listen and learn from family caregivers. The CFNN learned caregivers were often unaware of what resources were available and where they could go for support. As a result, the CFNN developed a caregiver's guidebook, and thousands of copies were distributed around the community at locations such as senior centers and libraries. He remarked the CFNN's role was to be a catalyst, and it was excited to ultimately transition the work to an organization that could take it to the next level. In this case, that organization would be the Sanford Center for Aging based out of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). He commented the CFNN was also looking into partnering with the Better Business Bureau (BBB) on the issue of elder financial abuse. The CFNN would collaborate with other organizations to share information directly with seniors who were isolated and vulnerable to cases of financial abuse and exploitation. He expressed appreciation for the partnership between the CFNN and the County and encouraged the Board to support Agenda Item 11.

Mr. Sean Hill stated he was the Executive Director of Sierra Nevada Journeys (SNJ), and he was in attendance to support the funding in Agenda Item 11. He observed SNJ had been in the community since 2006 and served about 15,000 elementary and middle school students per year in Washoe County. He commented SNJ was in more than two-thirds of elementary schools in the WCSD. SNJ focused on science, technology,

engineering, and mathematics (STEM); outdoor education; and collaboration amongst students. He shared the following statistics: 72 percent of students SNJ served the previous year were from families or schools with financial barriers, 15 percent of students were children living with disabilities, and 70 percent were students of color. He opined an investment into SNJ would be put directly back into students. The ARPA funding would help SNJ expand its new STEM Explorers after-school program to three high-needs schools in the community. He asserted a pilot program like this would help SNJ obtain investment from the school district. SNJ hoped the WCSD would help the program move forward in two years once the ARPA funding was gone. He believed the pilot program would also serve as a data point for SNJ to seek other funding sources in the future. He thanked the Board for its consideration.

Mr. Kenji Otto thanked Commissioner Herman for her help with the traffic calming and pedestrian safety program project, which began last year and was now complete. He displayed a document, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He spoke about the program, noting he met with Community Services Department Licensed Engineer Mitch Fink, Engineering and Capital Projects Division Director Dwayne Smith, Manager Brown, and Commissioner Herman. The goal was to find a solution for Crystal Canyon Boulevard. He thanked everyone who was involved but said he had problems with Mr. Fink. He claimed Mr. Fink told him there would never be crosswalks in that area and the project probably would not be completed. He noted the crosswalks were put in place. He indicated there were a lot of communication problems with Mr. Smith, stating he was promised the project would be done in May, but it was not completed until October. He believed that from a government standpoint it was done in a timely manner since it was completed in less than one year. He remarked the cost of the project was supposed to be \$60,000 but he thought it was over \$80,000. He wanted to know the exact cost of the project. He asserted it was the first major project in Cold Springs and all the residents appreciated it. He said it appeared people were now doing the speed limit and everything seemed to be working, but they would find out for sure once a study was conducted in a few months. He recommended a citizens' committee be established regarding roads and other projects.

Mr. Tom Clark thought the programs listed under Agenda Item 11 were incredible. He shared he was the past president of Friends of Black Rock High Rock (FBRHR), which was the nonprofit that oversaw the national conservation area of 1.2 million acres of Black Rock Desert. He asserted the Black Rock Desert was an amazing place that was a lot more than Burning Man (BM). He informed the ARPA funds would support hiking and biking trails and guided environments so people could learn about the history and understand the geography of the area. He noted the Black Rock Desert was a Dark Sky area. He believed the programs that would be funded by ARPA would help people break away from the idea that the Black Rock Desert was just the place where BM happened. He thought hiking and biking tours would get people away from the playa to see other things like Soldier Meadows and the paths immigrants took. He assured the FBRHR would use the money wisely and he encouraged people to come out and enjoy the Black Rock Desert. He noted it might be the last time he was at the dais while Commissioner Jung was still on the Board, and he wanted to thank her.

Ms. Sandra Quiroz shared she was the Executive Director of Tu Casa Latina (TCL). She thanked the Board for its consideration of TCL for a community reinvestment grant. She informed TCL was a local nonprofit established in 2014 to assist victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking. TCL served the undocumented immigrant community. She remarked the work was accomplished through direct services, case management, victim advocacy, community partnerships, and outreach. The ARPA funding would allow TCL to hire an outreach coordinator to go to events, provide trainings, cultural competency, cultural humility, and Know Your Rights. The funding would also assist with additional hours for the victim advocate that TCL recently brought on board to assist victims and other immigrants who needed help. She informed the Cares Campus (CC) was a resource, noting TCL was able to refer undocumented people who were living on the streets to the CC. The funding would allow TCL to continue its work assisting vulnerable populations and immigrants.

Chief Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith stated emails were received from Ms. Diane Dupsky and Ms. Elise Weatherly, which were placed on file.

22-0807 **AGENDA ITEM 6** Presentation and Update on FY 22/23 First Quarter Status Report for the Washoe County Regional Detention Facility to include security of the jail, conditions of confinement, staffing and medical care of inmates housed at the Washoe County Sheriff's Office; acknowledge receipt of Report. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

11:28 a.m. **Commissioner Jung left the meeting.**

Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) Captain Tim Mosley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Jail Status Report; COVID-19; Washoe County Detention Facility Health Risk; Welfare of the Inmates; Welfare of Inmates, 1st Quarter; Each completed program qualifies; Welfare of Inmates; Medical Information; NaphCare Medical Data (2 slides); 22/23 1st Quarter Jail Stats (2 slides); 22/23 1st Quarter Bookings (2 slides); FY 22/23 1st Quarter Jail Data; FY 22/23 Fights; FY 22/23 1st Quarter Inmate Assistance Program (DSU) Cost Savings (2 slides); Staffing Update.

Captain Mosley shared there were no active cases of COVID-19 (C19) in the jail. He indicated this was largely due to the rigorous screening done by the WCSO's medical provider, NaphCare, and answering all medical requests while inmates were in custody. He thanked NaphCare and its staff. He shared there was a heroin overdose for this quarterly report, and there was an uptick in Fentanyl in the detention facility. The WCSO was taking measures to address those concerns and ensure the safety of those in custody. He said staff came up with different techniques to identify individuals who brought drugs into the facility.

Captain Mosley reported there were two graduations coming up for the Getting Ahead while Getting Out program. He spoke about the program, noting it taught life skills to inmates such as how to fill out forms for Medicaid or Medicare, how to apply

for an identification (ID) card, and how to apply for other services in the community. This enabled individuals to be more productive once they were released. He shared the WCSO was working with the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to allow inmates to pursue State IDs before they were released or soon after.

11:33 a.m. Commissioner Jung returned to the meeting.

Regarding the medical refusals, Captain Mosley explained those were related to the screenings NaphCare conducted before inmates were allowed into the WCSO's custody. The refusals could be for a myriad of reasons such as high blood pressure, an overdose, or an injury. He commented NaphCare did a good job ensuring individuals received proper medical screenings before being allowed into the WCSO's care.

Captain Mosley pointed out that the numbers for the average daily population (ADP) of male and female inmates in September on the "22/23 1st Quarter Jail Stats" slide were flipped. The ADP for male inmates was 1,082, and the ADP for female inmates was 235. He mentioned the total ADP continued to grow monthly. He believed the County inmate count reached 1,382 two weeks ago and noted he had not seen it that high in his 23 years with the WCSO. He asserted it was in part due to the region's growth and he expected the numbers to continue to rise. He opined that by the end of the year the WCSO would see an ADP number it had never seen before. He assured the WCSO was working diligently to maintain the safety of its inmates and staff but acknowledged it was difficult with the ADP increasing monthly.

Captain Mosley highlighted the fight statistics for the previous quarter. He remarked there were 70 averted fights, which was partly due to inmates stepping in to break them up or staff being diligent in preventing fights. He reminded there was one in-custody death during the previous quarter which was due to a heroin overdose. There were no completed suicide attempts.

WCSO Captain Scott Iacoboni spoke about the Inmate Assistance Program (IAP), noting adjustments were made and there had been a lot of progress since July. He indicated the WCSO was taking a more proactive approach while collaborating with the courts and programs. He reported there was an uptick in the number of inmates the WCSO was able to assist with smooth transitions back into the community. He noted the WCSO had many partners but was always looking for more. Captain Mosley asserted the IAP did a great job and provided significant cost savings to the County. He said the IAP was very proactive whenever it was contacted for needed services. He noted there was a tremendous workload due to the number of inmates in custody. He thanked the IAP, the Detention Services Unit (DSU), and Captain Iacoboni.

Captain Mosley shared the WCSO currently had five deputies in its field training program, four of whom he believed were lateral transfers from other agencies. They were scheduled to complete their training in mid-November, and he thought all of them would be assigned to the detention facility.

Commissioner Jung mentioned she and Commissioner Lucey met with NaphCare back when the Board was looking at another vendor. She stated one of NaphCare's biggest data points was nutrition. She pointed out how much the behavior of the inmates and the behavior of the jail changed when doctors drew blood and got the inmates on the right vitamins and minerals. She urged the WCSO to keep an eye on nutrition.

Commissioner Jung thought the WCSO was doing a great job with the different reality the County was in now. She heard from detention line staff that the jail was getting overwhelmed and was not designed for safety. She opined the next big thing the Board would have to work on was building a new jail. She remarked the County was like the rest of the U.S. and delayed capital improvements because it had no money or resources. She thought it was time for everyone to rally around a new jail. She asserted according to the Constitution people were innocent until proven guilty and should not be held in a wretched facility. A person should have all their rights, features, and benefits until they went before a jury or reached a settlement. She believed the WCSO was doing a great job with fewer resources and a changing and dynamic time in detention. She opined the jail lasted this long because staff invested themselves in fixing it. She stated people did not want to talk about how expensive jails were. She noted schools developed wear and tear, but not 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 365 days per year, and advised jails needed to be fortified. She surmised that in general, the jail was a holding place for innocent people.

Vice Chair Hill understood Washoe County Sheriff Darin Balaam was working on obtaining data for the Board regarding why stays were increasing. She inquired if there was any anecdotal information about this issue. Captain Iacoboni responded the WCSO was looking at a variety of different data markers. He indicated the County was still coming out of the C19 pandemic so there was a backlog, and the court system was still bogged down. He indicated there were people in the jail for two or more years awaiting trial, some of whom were being held for federal crimes. He informed the Washoe County jail was a reflection of the community. The same things that were being experienced locally and nationally were also being experienced on a smaller level in custody. He highlighted the following issues: treatment to competency, an uptick in mental health, and a lack of resources at the State level. He noted there was movement, but in certain categories, people were staying a lot longer than they used to.

Vice Chair Hill acknowledged the State was looking at moving forward with another forensic hospital in Southern Nevada which would help with Lake's Crossing. She expressed concern that there were people waiting in the jail for multiple years for their trials. She looked forward to seeing the details of the data so the County could push on its partners and the State for help. She voiced concern about the overdoses and drugs getting into the jail but was confident the WCSO was working on putting new systems in place just as it had for suicides. She observed the Board could see the outcome of its investments to prevent suicides in the jail. Captain Iacoboni responded the WCSO was putting new systems in place, stating it changed its mail system. Most of the mail now went to an outside facility and was scanned and emailed through the use of smart communications. He said that cut down on some of the drugs coming into the facility, but people were still creative.

He remarked WCSO staff held a meeting that morning and would have to meet with legal to discuss what could be done and what could be eliminated to continue to address this issue. He acknowledged it impacted the safety of everyone at the jail. Vice Chair Hill pointed out the budget was coming up. She asked the WCSO to let the Board know if there were opportunities for it to invest in the safety of the staff and the inmates. She mentioned she was looking forward to her next tour.

Commissioner Herman expressed appreciation for the WCSO staff, noting they did so much with so little. She believed there were ways the Board could help. She stated there were some facilities that were not full that could be used for long-term people waiting for trial, and there were other things that could be shuffled around. She thought the WCSO was shorthanded in the budget. She opined the WCSO did the dirty work of the County and kept the community safe in the process.

Chair Hartung expressed concern about the way the numbers were escalating. He observed when the community envisioned a regional detention facility, it did not envision how it would have to grow and how that would be funded. He said that was something the community would have to look at and determine how to deal with it. He acknowledged the hard work Commissioner Lucey put in regarding alternative sentencing and working with the courts to try to keep people out of jail. He stated Commissioner Lucey was the subject matter expert on alternative sentencing and expressed appreciation for all his hard work.

Chair Hartung wondered if the WCSO worked with NaphCare and regional partners on the issue of recidivism. Captain Iacoboni replied the WCSO worked with anyone willing to work with the clients it served. He remarked the issue was that the community was growing, therefore the clients' resources were also being used by the community. He opined the transition between partners was not as frequent as it used to be. He shared NaphCare developed good relationships with the hospitals and other local entities so the WCSO could try its best to have the wraparound services it desired. He pointed out there was only so far a detention center could go, noting it was not built to treat to competency. Protective custody was the fastest-growing population in the jail and mental health was the second. He commented there was an uptick in mental health, and it was the State's job to treat to competency. He informed the WCSO worked closely with the staff at Lake's Crossing. The WCSO did what it could for its inmates to try and decrease the amount of time they needed to spend at Lake's Crossing to treat to competency. He believed the amount of time the treatment took decreased at least a little bit. Chair Hartung observed the largest mental health facility in Northern Nevada was 911 Parr Boulevard.

There was no public comment or action taken on this item.

PROCLAMATIONS

22-0808 **AGENDA ITEM 7** Proclaim October 25, 2022 as Nevada Water Innovation Institute Day.

Dr. Krishna Pagilla thanked the Board, County Manager Eric Brown, Assistant District Attorney Nathan Edwards, Engineering and Capital Projects Division Director Dwayne Smith, and Assistant County Manager Dave Solaro for their support. He said the Nevada Water Innovation Institute (NWII) was formed by the County, the Cities of Reno and Sparks, the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA), the Western Regional Water Commission (WRWC), and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) Stormwater Bureau to collaboratively and regionally address water issues to improve water resiliency and water security. He introduced his team: Associate Professor and Associate Director of the NWII Eric Marchand, Associate Professor Keith Dennett, Master's Student Kevin Stewart, Research Scientist Lin Li, PhD student Madeline Carine, Research Scientist Laura Haak, and PhD student Niloufar Gharoon.

Chair Hartung said water research was important to the community. He commented Dr. Pagilla taught him it was very important for everyone to recognize that all water was recycled, it was just recycled in different ways. He stated the research taking place at the NWII was critical, noting Nevada was the most arid state in the nation. He remarked having young people work on solutions to ensure the water supply was stable and resilient was needed. He read the Proclamation and presented it to Dr. Pagilla.

Dr. Marchand thanked the County, the Board of County Commissioners, and all the NWII partners. He said doing research and solving problems for the community and educating the future workforce was progress. He stated the visionary approach of the Board, the Cities of Reno and Sparks, and the utilities was appreciated.

Commissioner Jung observed the NWII was Chair Hartung's initiative. The County would not have had COVID-19 tracking in the sewers without the NWII. She said Chair Hartung consistently advocated for innovation in the County. She commended Chair Hartung for being an innovator.

Dr. Dennett thanked the Board for its leadership, stating the faculty at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) appreciated the support. He said students benefited and the NWII accomplished good research. He looked forward to continued collaboration.

Chair Hartung noted the County no longer had a water resource department because it merged with TMWA. He expressed pride for the work that was done by the County with respect to moving effluent from the liability side of the balance sheet to the asset side. He mentioned the injection project taking place in American Flats which was a 7,500 acre-foot project. Water would be taken from a reservoir from the Reno-Stead Water Reclamation facility, treated to drinking water standards, and re-injected into the aquifer. He expressed pride for everything the County and the Cities of Reno and Sparks had done, noting it was truly a regional effort.

12:07 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

12:09 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Chair Hartung, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 7 be adopted.

22-0809 **AGENDA ITEM 5** Announcements/Reports.

County Manager Eric Brown introduced the County's new Chief Financial Officer, Abigail Yacoben. He said Ms. Yacoben came to the County from Las Vegas where she served as Deputy Finance Director since 2017 overseeing a \$2 billion annual budget. He noted Ms. Yacoben had a Master's degree in Public Policy, a Certified Public Finance Officer certification, and approximately 20 years of experience managing finances for local governments. He welcomed Ms. Yacoben to the County.

Ms. Yacoben thanked the Board for the opportunity, saying she was grateful and honored to serve the stakeholders and residents of Washoe County, the Board of County Commissioners, Manager Brown, and his executive team. She said she quickly learned the Finance Department staff was very skilled.

Manager Brown reported that Human Services Agency (HSA) Director Amber Howell had been busy prospecting for additional funds for various programs and the Interim Finance Committee approved over \$20 million in additional support the prior week. He said Ms. Howell modeled behavior he thought would become more prevalent in the organization, which included seeking additional resources from other agencies to help support programs in the community. He congratulated Ms. Howell for her efforts.

Manager Brown mentioned early voting started the prior Saturday and would continue through November 4. The general election would be on November 8 and the canvass of the vote would take place on November 18. He indicated additional information could be found at www.washoecounty.gov/voters/. He shared multiple individuals said they had not received their ballot, noting that staff was working with the local U.S. Postal Service (USPS) representatives to determine the issue. He said it appeared the mail was released in a shorter window of time. He stated the mail had gone out on the deadline, but the quantity of mail might have caused a delay. He directed voters to contact Washoe 311 if they were concerned about receiving their ballot and another ballot would be sent out. He advised registered voters could vote at early voting centers in person. Chair Hartung reminded people who received two ballots not to vote with both ballots.

Commissioner Herman asked whether a group of her constituents could use the Chambers to hold a meeting of approximately 200 people. Manager Brown said he could discuss the request with her.

Commissioner Jung asked whether Assistant District Attorney Nathan Edwards could work on a method for funding the Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF). She suggested establishing taxes or requiring increments from developers which would fund the AHTF, or requiring them to build a number of affordable housing units. She said Mr. Edwards knew development law thoroughly so she recommended he consider some possibilities. She suggested researching whether helping to fund the AHTF could provide a tax incentive for developers.

Chair Hartung mentioned the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) was performing the McCarran Boulevard Corridor Study. He said the community was invited to visit <https://www.rtcwashoe.com/> to see the proposed improvements and to submit comments or questions by calling (775) 335-1901 or via email at mccarranstudy@rtcwashoe.com.

Chair Hartung noted Ms. Andrea Pelto was named Nevada Senior Citizen of the Year for 2022. He congratulated Ms. Pelto, stating she was well deserving of the commendation.

Chair Hartung expressed frustration with the Washoe County School District (WCSD) because of the length of the school zone on Sky Ranch Boulevard, which he said was very short. He inquired about the intransigence regarding putting a school zone on Highland Ranch Parkway. He asked staff to provide information about the process for determining the location and length of a school zone.

Chair Hartung reminded everyone of the upcoming ribbon-cutting ceremony for the Nevada Veterans Memorial Plaza (NVMP) in the City of Sparks, which would take place on November 4 at 3:00 p.m. He noted the NVMP was located at the Sparks Marina. He mentioned the NVMP was the vision of former City of Sparks Mayor Ron Smith, and Councilmember Kristopher Dahir had done an excellent job spearheading the project. He encouraged everyone to visit the NVMP, stating it was astounding and sure to be a gem in the community.

Commissioner Lucey acknowledged Manager Brown's comments regarding early voting which started the prior Saturday. He commended Manager Brown, interim Registrar of Voters (ROV) Jamie Rodriguez, and ROV staff for their work on the election. He said he looked at the new ROV website and he approved of its functionality. He thanked the ROV staff, both paid and volunteers, for working towards a successful election.

Commissioner Lucey noted October was Breast Cancer Awareness Month. He said the County usually had a Proclamation for breast cancer awareness. He urged women to get a mammogram, noting breast cancer was a serious concern.

Commissioner Lucey commended Ms. Howell for her diligence in finding funding to help support the ongoing challenges at the HSA. He noted the County was committed to supporting residents from birth to death, which presented some financial

challenges. He thanked Ms. Howell for her diligence and commitment to finding funding for those community services.

Chair Hartung asked staff to establish a calendar for yearly acknowledgments and Proclamations, so they were not missed. He thanked Commissioner Lucey for mentioning Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

Commissioner Jung thanked Commissioner Lucey for mentioning Ms. Howell's funding efforts. She said nobody else in the State of Nevada in HSA was able to obtain as much funding as Ms. Howell. She stated Ms. Howell brought billions of dollars into the County. She expressed approval of the culture change in the County which empowered employees to seek funding and ensure funds were spent responsibly. She commended Ms. Howell for her efforts and her successes in prospecting additional funding for the HSA. She observed Ms. Howell worked for the State prior to joining the County and she had a good understanding of State funding options. She noted fundraising was not part of Ms. Howell's job, it was something she did as part of her dedication to the HSA. She thanked Manager Brown for encouraging County staff to chart their own way in the areas they loved and for holding them accountable for getting things done. She said the cultural transformation would ensure funding for County services was sustainable.

Commissioner Lucey congratulated Kevin Schiller for his appointment as Clark County Manager the prior week. He mentioned Manager Schiller was previously an Assistant County Manager in Washoe County and would now be overseeing the largest urban County in the State. He looked forward to continuing the One Nevada approach to addressing State issues with the aid of Manager Schiller. Chair Hartung noted Manager Schiller started at the HSA when he first joined Washoe County.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS – 8A1 THROUGH 8F1

- 22-0810** **8A1** Approval of minutes for the Board of County Commissioners' regular meetings of September 13, 2022, and September 20, 2022. Clerk. (All Commission Districts.)

- 22-0811** **8B1** Recommendation to 1) approve roll change requests, pursuant to NRS 361.765 and/or NRS 361.768, for errors discovered on the 2020/2021, 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 secured tax roll 2) authorize Chair to execute the changes described in Exhibit A and 3) direct the Washoe County Treasurer to correct the error(s). [cumulative amount of decrease to all taxing entities \$214,509.19]. Assessor. (Commission Districts 1, 2, 5)

- 22-0812** **8C1** Recommendation to appoint Charles “Mark” Neumann from [Alternate] to [District 3] to the Washoe County Senior Services Advisory Board for the remainder of the term ending September 30, 2023. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

- 22-0813** **8D1** Recommendation to approve the acceptance of a FY 2021 Continuum of Care Planning Grant from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development to promote community-wide commitment to the goal of ending homelessness in the amount of [\$68,176, with a Washoe County in-kind match in the amount of \$17,044], retroactive from of July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023. Authorize the County Manager to sign award documents, and direct the Comptroller’s Office to make the necessary budget amendments. Manager’s Office. (All Commission Districts.)
- 22-0814** **8E1** Recommendation to acknowledge receipt of annual report of projected proceeds in the amount of \$437,000.00 and expenditures in the amount of \$250,111.00 in the account used for the acquisition and improvement of technology in the Office of the County Recorder for FY23. Recorder. (All Commission Districts.)
- 22-0815** **8F1** Recommendation to authorize the grant application for the 2022 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Award (CFDS#16.738), Office of Justice Programs, and Bureau of Justice Assistance through the Reno Police Department. With this funding, the anticipated award will be [\$80,704.80, no County match required] for the purchase of law enforcement equipment, law enforcement related training and travel; and approve the Interlocal Agreement between the City of Reno, on behalf of the Reno Police Department, Washoe County, on behalf of the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office and the City of Sparks, on behalf of the Sparks Police Department for the management and disposition of 2022 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program. Sheriff. (All Commission Districts.)

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

On motion by Vice Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8F1 be approved, authorized, directed, and acknowledged. Any and all Interlocal Agreements pertinent to Consent Agenda Items 8A1 through 8F1 are attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

BLOCK VOTE – 9, 10, AND 14

12:34 p.m. **Chair Hartung left the meeting.**

- 22-0816** **AGENDA ITEM 9** Recommendation to approve an Agreement for Services between Washoe County and Verus Associates Nevada LLC for the design, programming and construction engineering support for the Washoe County Sheriff’s Office Detention and Courts Security Control System Upgrade Project [in the amount of \$691,624.00]. The services include design and technical document development as well as construction

oversight to support a future construction project that meets minimum safety requirements for ingress/egress and facility controls at the 911 Parr Blvd. Detention Facility and at the 75 Court St. and 1 South Sierra Courts Facilities. Community Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Chair Hartung absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be approved.

22-0817 **AGENDA ITEM 10** Recommendation to award Request for Proposal (RFP) 3171-22 to New Hope Placement, L.L.C., d.b.a. Well Care Services to provide housing, property management and supportive services to the Men’s Crossroads Program, a Washoe County Human Services Agency (HSA) lead initiative providing a tiered/modified housing first approach, through effective programming services and community collaboration; the program has operated since 2011 and provides supportive housing and other services to men within the community's indigent population, retroactive October 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023, with the provision for four (4), one (1) year renewals, in the amount of [\$1,166,667.00] for the initial 9-month term Fiscal Year (FY) 2023; [\$1,400,000.00] for FY 2024; [\$1,442,000.00] for FY 2025; [\$1,485,260.00] for FY 2026 and [\$1,529,818.00 for FY 2027]; and if approved authorize the Purchasing and Contracts Manager to execute the Agreement. Human Services Agency. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Chair Hartung absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 10 be awarded and authorized.

22-0818 **AGENDA ITEM 14** Recommendation to approve the reimbursement of costs incurred by the City of Reno, the City of Sparks, and Washoe County for expenses related to and in support of the Enhanced 911 Emergency Response System and portable event recording devices, as recommended by the 911 Emergency Response Advisory Committee on July 21, 2022, and September 15, 2022, in an amount not to exceed [\$1,327,617.39] as specified within the adopted Enhanced 911 Fund’s operating budget. Technology Services. (All Commission Districts.)

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Chair Hartung absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 14 be approved.

12:36 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

1:30 p.m. **The Board reconvened with Commissioner Jung absent.**

County Manager Eric Brown said Agenda Items 11 and 12 would be opened together.

22-0819 **AGENDA ITEM 11** Recommendation to approve allocations of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds through the Coronavirus State Fiscal Recovery Fund and Coronavirus Local Fiscal Recovery Fund (SLFRF) for the following projects:

A. Recommendation, in accordance with NRS 244.1505, to approve allocations of ARPA-SLFRF in the amount of \$250,000 to (#41) Incline Village General Improvement District to support skate park enhancements, approve Resolution 22-118, and authorize the County Manager to sign necessary award documents.

B. Recommendation, in accordance with NRS 244.1505, to approve allocations of ARPA-SLFRF through the Washoe County Community Reinvestment Grant Program in the amount of \$1,021,113.33 for the following 12 subgrants and authorize the County Manager to sign necessary award documents:

- Options Veterinary Care - Access to Veterinary Care for Underserved Communities - Project (#42) in the amount of \$100,000 and approve Resolution 22-119. Funding supports veterinary access for low-income individuals and families.
- Big Brothers Big Sisters of Northern Nevada - Bigs with Badges - Project # (#43) in the amount of \$31,630.09 and approve Resolution 22-120. Funding supports mentorship for at-risk youth from the first responder community.
- Community Foundation of Northern Nevada - Caregiver Support Initiative – Project (#44) in the amount of \$210,985.48 and approve Resolution 22-121. Funding supports caregiver education and resources.
- Project Discovery - Youth Empowerment through Promoting Healthy Attitudes, Behaviors and Cognitions - Project (#45) in the amount of \$49,975 and approve Resolution 22-122. Funding supports youth programs related to attitudes, behaviors, and cognitions.

- Friends of Black Rock High Rock - Recreational Tourism - Project (#46) in the amount of \$49,864.79 and approve Resolution 22-123. Funding supports a new interpretive biking and hiking guide program in the Gerlach-Empire region.
- Tu Casa Latina - Immigrant Outreach and Advocacy - Project (#47) in the amount of \$23,450 and approve Resolution 22-124. Funding supports immigration outreach efforts and resources.
- Incline Village Education Fund - Project Lead the Way - Project (#48) in the amount of \$50,000 and approve Resolution 22-125. Funding supports Project Lead the Way Engineering equipment at Incline High School.
- Pioneer Center for the Performing Arts - Lifelong Learning! Live on Stage! – Project (#49) in the amount of \$66,500 and approve Resolution 22-126. Funding supports performing arts programming for Washoe County seniors.
- Rebuilding Together Northern Nevada - Safe and Healthy Homes for Washoe – Project (#50) in the amount of \$100,000 and approve Resolution 22-127. Funding supports home renovations for low-income households.
- Sierra Nevada Journeys - STEM Explorers - Project (#51) in the amount of \$177,655 and approve Resolution 22-128 to expand STEM education at three WCSD schools.
- Terry Lee Wells Nevada Discovery Museum - Survival of the Slowest - Project (#52) in the amount of \$100,000 and approve Resolution 22-129 to support a portion of the current interactive exhibit costs.
- Community Services Agency - Victims of Crime Support - Project (#53) in the amount of \$61,052.97 and approve Resolution 22-130 to support victims of crime programs.

C. Recommendation to approve allocations of ARPA-SLFRF in the amount of \$250,000 to support (#54) Gerlach Affordable Housing a priority initiative identified by the Gerlach General Improvement District.

And, if approved, direction to the Comptroller’s Office to make necessary net zero cross-fund and cross-functional budget appropriation transfers. Manager’s Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Community Reinvestment Manager Gabrielle Enfield stated sections A and C of Agenda Item 11 dealt specifically with the general improvement district (GID) awards. She indicated each award was for \$250,000 and the funds were used for needs specific to each of those communities. Section A was the award for the Incline Village GID and its decision to enhance local recreation activities at its skate park. Section C addressed the award for the Gerlach GID. She noted the Gerlach GID would not receive a sub-grant, it would be funding administered through the County with the assistance of Assistant County Manager Dave Solaro. She said the Gerlach GID award would support affordable

housing efforts in that community, specifically a project which would determine how an 18-acre property owned by the GID could be used for affordable housing.

Grants and Community Program Analyst Carissa Bradley thanked the non-profit leaders who attended the meeting. She mentioned she joined the County in January with the knowledge that the position would be very dynamic and would allow her to give back while learning about the community. She said the ARPA-SLFRF program was an open and competitive grant solicitation program funded by the County's allocation of ARPA and SLFRF funds. She indicated the Board directed staff to find approximately \$4 million of non-profit programs to support. She said the application was open between June 1 and July 15, 2022, and staff received over 75 eligible applications. She noted the community identified areas of need through the application process and staff did their best to balance those needs and the initiatives addressed by the Board. Applicants were asked to identify how their program or service would advance equity in the community and help respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. The program was marketed through social media and email exchanges with non-profits in the community. She said staff provided ongoing technical support to any applicant who was interested in discussing and strengthening their application. She explained the selection criteria, which included alignment with priority areas and pandemic recovery efforts. She said staff also looked for projects that collaborated strongly with existing County services. She noted staff considered the population being served and the geographic distribution of where services were provided by the non-profits. The long-term sustainability of those programs was also considered because the grants were one-time funds, so the non-profits were encouraged to seek other funding sources as well. She said this item presented 12 non-profit subgrants in the amount of \$1,021,113.33. She stated the remaining sub-grants would be presented to the Board in November or December.

Vice Chair Hill said she was impressed with how staff reviewed the grant applications and provided feedback to applicants who did not make it through the first round. She expressed excitement about supporting essential services the County could not fund. She commended Ms. Bradley.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

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

22-0820 **AGENDA ITEM 12** Recommendation to accept Local Assistance and Tribal Consistency Funds (LATCF) allocation from the United States Department of the Treasury in the amount of [\$9,427,223.08; no county match], retroactively authorize the County Manager to sign award documents, and direct the Comptroller's Office to make the necessary budget amendments. LATCF was established by the American Rescue Plan Act to allocate money to eligible counties for use on any governmental purpose except for lobbying. Eligible uses include things like public

services, infrastructure, and personnel. The LATCF is in addition to the State and Local Fiscal Recovery Funds (SLFRF) in the amount of [\$91,587,038] that the County has been previously allocated. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Community Reinvestment Manager Gabrielle Enfield said the LATCF allocation was another new funding source under the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). She noted the Department of the Treasury portal was unique, which was why the acceptance was retroactive. She said the County received \$4.7 million the prior week; the funds were in addition to the ARPA-SLFRF funding. She noted the funds were very broad, so the County had more flexibility in the use of those funds and no restrictions for an end date. She said the funds could be used for general governmental services or programs; the only exception was lobbying which was true of any federal funding. She indicated the next step would be to meet with County leadership to gather input on priorities and direction for use of those funds.

Chair Hartung applauded staff for their efforts in navigating the governmental portals while seeking funding. He thought Ms. Enfield and Grants and Community Program Analyst Carissa Bradley provided excellent recommendations.

Commissioner Jung echoed Chair Hartung's comments. She believed Ms. Enfield was likely the best grants manager in the State and had taught her much about grant funding. She had confidence in Ms. Enfield's and Ms. Bradley's recommendations because they were knowledgeable and professional. She highlighted the areas of interest based on public feedback: youth, pets, affordable housing, arts and culture, improved housing conditions, respite for caregivers, supervision of children before and after school, the Black Rock Desert area, and the Latina organization that provided immigrant outreach and advocacy. She noted labor trafficking did not receive as much attention as sex trafficking, but it was a serious issue that equated to modern-day slavery. She believed staff cared about grant funding and had a good understanding of which organizations performed well for the community. She commended Manager Brown for excellent teamwork, working with staff, and addressing constituent needs. She said non-profits helped identify areas where government services needed improvement. She noted there were areas where the government was able to provide services more efficiently and at a lower cost, such as in printing. She thanked Ms. Enfield for her expertise in grant funding and for ensuring the most vulnerable people in the community had representation.

Ms. Enfield thanked her excellent team and Ms. Bradley for all her work with the non-profits.

Chair Hartung clarified his comments referred to the level of volunteerism in the community, which he believed was a force multiplier for the County. He asked Ms. Bradley what university she attended. Ms. Bradley said she received her undergraduate degree from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), and she was pursuing a Master's in Public Administration from the University of Southern California (USC) through its Sacramento campus.

Manager Brown commented he had the opportunity to tour Burning Man with Ms. Bradley earlier in the year. He asserted Ms. Bradley would someday do the work he was doing. Chair Hartung observed Ms. Bradley was very talented and the County was fortunate to have her on staff.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Vice Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 12 be accepted, authorized, and directed.

22-0821 **AGENDA ITEM 13** Recommendation for discussion and possible action in regards to the appointment and/or reappointment of Commissioners to boards and commissions, alteration of terms of service on boards and commissions where legally permissible, and such other action as the board of commissioners may desire to take in regards to those administrative matters. Boards and commissions for which possible changes to appointments could be made under this item include all of the boards and commissions listed at the end of this agenda as the “various” boards and commissions that commissioners may be members of or liaisons to. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

Chair Hartung stated this item was previously addressed during a Board of County Commissioners (BCC) workshop held at the Truckee Meadows Fire & Rescue headquarters. He observed he offloaded a couple of his boards, giving the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) and the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) to Vice Chair Hill.

Commissioner Jung said she did not have very many boards and was happy to offload Senior Services and Parks and Open Space to Vice Chair Hill until the new Commissioners came on board. She did not think she had any additional boards except those for which she served as an alternate. Vice Chair Hill mentioned Animal Services. Commissioner Jung asked if Vice Chair Hill wanted to serve on the Animal Services Advisory Board and Vice Chair Hill responded yes. Commissioner Jung informed she was not offering Senior Services and Parks and Open Space to Commissioner Herman because she had already served on those boards. She thought new people needed to serve on those boards.

Vice Chair Hill understood another reason this item was placed on the agenda was that Commissioner Lucey was looking to offload some of his boards. Chair Hartung responded it was a redo of the initial meeting when some of the members of the Board were out of town. He pointed out Commissioner Lucey’s main boards were the District Board of Health (DBH), the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), and the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA). He said he had no desire to serve on the DBH and he was already on the RTC board. Commissioner Jung thought Vice Chair Hill would be a good fit for the DBH and Vice Chair Hill replied yes. Chair Hartung

noted he was the interim vice chair for the RTC and once the new Commissioners started, the BCC could go through the process of putting the right person on that board. He expressed interest in the RSCVA board, stating he had done sales and marketing for his own company as well as a local pest management company.

Commissioner Herman wondered if the BCC was waiting until January to assign the rest of the boards. Chair Hartung responded yes, noting there were some boards that needed representation now. He asked Commissioner Herman if there were any boards of interest to her. Commissioner Herman indicated she would like to serve on NACO and Chair Hartung remarked Commissioner Lucey was coming off the Board in January so there would be an open NACO seat. He commented he had no desire to continue serving on the NACO board.

Commissioner Herman shared she sent in all her paperwork for the State Land Use Planning Advisory Council (SLUPAC). Chair Hartung stated the SLUPAC was appointed by the Governor. Commissioner Herman believed an appointment would have to be approved by the BCC. Commission Support Program Assistant Alexandra Wilson informed the appointment did not have to be approved the previous year because it did not end until 2025.

Regarding the Western Regional Water Commission (WRWC), Chair Hartung pointed out that Commissioner Lucey served as the liaison for the South Truckee Meadows General Improvement District (STMGID) which was appointed through the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA). He said the BCC would have to reach out to TMWA's new Executive Director, John Zimmerman, to ensure he was aware. Then TMWA would go through the appointment process. Ms. Wilson assured she would send out letters to any appointments or removals that took place during the meeting.

Chair Hartung asked Ms. Wilson if she kept track of the board movements that were discussed. Ms. Wilson listed the following changes: the Animal Services Advisory Board was moving from Commissioner Jung to Vice Chair Hill, the DBH was moving from Commissioner Lucey to Vice Chair Hill, EDAWN was moving from Chair Hartung to Vice Chair Hill, and Chair Hartung would serve as the primary for the RSCVA. Chair Hartung indicated the RSCVA had no alternate per its bylaws. Ms. Wilson continued, stating the Open Space and Regional Parks Commission and the Senior Services Advisory Board were moving from Commissioner Jung to Vice Chair Hill. Chair Hartung inquired about the RTC. Ms. Wilson thought Commissioner Lucey served as an alternate and Chair Hartung asserted he was the primary. He commented Commissioner Lucey's seat would go to Vice Chair Hill, so she would now serve as the primary instead of as an alternate. Ms. Wilson noted things changed previously so all remaining Commissioners were alternates if they were not primaries.

Chair Hartung asked Assistant District Attorney Nathan Edwards if a motion was needed and Mr. Edwards responded yes.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Jung, seconded by Commissioner Lucey, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that the board appointments be switched as outlined by staff.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2:03 p.m. Chair Hartung left the meeting.

22-0822 **AGENDA ITEM 15** Public Hearing: Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA21-0004 and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA21-0003 (Larson Family Trust).

Recommendation to:

(1) Adopt an amendment to the North Valleys Area Plan, a component of the Washoe County Master Plan, to redesignate the master plan designation from Suburban Residential (SR) to Commercial (C) on 1 parcel (APN: 552-190-01) totaling ± 2.76 acres; and

(2) Subject to final approval of the associated Master Plan amendment and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by regional planning authorities, to adopt an amendment to the North Valleys Regulatory Zone Map to change the regulatory zone from Medium Density Suburban (MDS - 3du/ac) to Neighborhood Commercial/Office (NC - 5du/ac with approval of a Special Use Permit) on 1 parcel (APN: 552-190-01) totaling ± 2.76 acres.

If approved, authorize the Chair to sign the resolutions to that effect. Community Services. (Commission District 5.)

Commissioner Herman observed no one was able to attend the meeting because it was held at 5:30 p.m. while most of the meetings in the North Valleys were held at 6:00 p.m. or later. She wanted to have these types of meetings back on the Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) meetings because they always met at a certain time.

Vice Chair Hill acknowledged Commissioner Herman's comment, stating the Board was looking for ways to improve the process to ensure everyone was included.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

2:06 p.m. Chair Hartung returned to the meeting.

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

22-0823

AGENDA ITEM 16 Public Hearing: Appeal of the Community Services Department (CSD) Director’s rejection of the submittal entitled “Merger and Re-subdivision TM of St. James Village-May 2022” which was intended to constitute the first final map submittal for Sierra Reflections (Tentative Map Case Number TM06-001). The submittal was rejected due to the timing of submittal and substantive issues. The appellant is World Properties, Inc.

The project is a 938-lot, single-family residential subdivision. The project site is located in the Pleasant Valley area, and is bordered on the north by Pagni Lane, on the east by US Highway 395 South and to the south is Little Washoe Lake. The project encompasses 29 parcels that total approximately 759.6 acres. (APNs 046-060-45, 47 & 55; 046-080-40; 046-090-01, 04 through 18, and 23 through 26; and 046-100-02 through 04, 07 and 10).

Appeals of CSD Director’s decisions involving final maps are authorized in Section 110.610.50(f) of the Washoe County Code. The Board of County Commissioners (Board) may affirm, reverse or modify the decision of the CSD Director. Community Services. (Commission District 2.)

Chair Hartung explained he would give County staff and the appellant each 15 minutes to present to the Board. If the Board had questions along the way, the 15 minutes would be stopped. He acknowledged there was a lot of information and material to get through.

Planning and Building Division Director Kelly Mullin informed she would be presenting information regarding the appeal of the CSD Director’s rejection of the final map submission for Sierra Reflections. She noted the staff report and slides were very detailed, and she would not cover all the items in her presentation. She conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Discussion Summary; Background; Reasons for Rejection of Final Map; Reasons for Rejection; Proposed Resolution Letter; Summary; and Possible Motions.

Ms. Mullin explained the final map was the last step after a tentative subdivision map was approved. It allowed the lots to be created and sold to homeowners. State law required the first final map to be recorded within four years of the approval of the tentative map. Any subsequent maps were to be recorded within two years after that unless the governing body entered into a development agreement to extend the expiration date. She said it was important for the agencies to be given 60 days for review to ensure the final map met code standards and conditions of approval. If deficiencies were found, the 60 days would allow time for corrections. She noted the preliminary submittal was standard prior to the submittal of the rest of the final map.

Engineering and Capital Projects Division Director Dwayne Smith conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Reasons for Rejection; Sanitary Sewer

Considerations. Mr. Smith informed that a standard first final map submittal should follow the requirements of the Development Agreement, the conditions, and the entitlements of the tentative map approval process. It should also provide the ability to ensure elements were conformed and captured. He said that step was critical and allowed the developer to move immediately into construction, development, roadway construction, and grading. The step also allowed stakeholders to review the submittal to ensure it conformed to their requirements. He noted the non-conforming submittal the CSD received did not include the above-listed technical elements, which would make it difficult for County staff and the staff of other organizations to review for conformance of requirements. He noted the submittal focused solely on land parcels. The main element the CSD focused on was that the submittal did not include a requirement for environmental work. He informed that in 2020 there was a Development Agreement approved by the Board that updated conditions for the tentative map and included the requirement for an environmental site assessment. For the CSD to consider parcels for dedication or an offer of dedication, an environmental site assessment was necessary to make sure the environmental work had been done before the County could assume the obligations.

Regarding sanitary sewer considerations, Mr. Smith assured the County had a collaborative role every time there was a question, idea, or concept presented for review. He explained the County entered into an agreement in 2016 with World Properties, Inc. (WPI). The agreement obligated the developer for Sierra Reflections to build the Pleasant Valley Interceptor (PVI) Reach 4, and it identified the County's obligation to build PVI Reach 3. He noted the County's obligation was a sewer solution for Sierra Reflections, as well as other developments.

Chair Hartung said he thought the project had started in the 1990s and the original request was around 2002. Ms. Mullin replied the tentative map for Sierra Reflections was approved in 2006. She said there had been conversations between the County and the City of Reno for alternative types of development, but the final map submittal was approved by the Planning Commission in 2006.

Attorney Garrett Gordon, representing WPI, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, that included slides with the following titles: Background on Project; Property Originally Downzoned; Sanitary Sewer Interceptor; Public Outreach; Development Agreement Extended Time; Submission Timeline (2 slides); Staff Rejection; First Final Map Was Timely Submitted (3 slides); What Happens When a Contract is Ambiguous; First Final Map Contains More Than Five Lots (3 slides); Other Supposed Deficiencies; Summary; Proposed Compromise (2 slides); Fiscal Impact Analysis; October 2022 Fiscal Analysis Updated; Request for Staff Meeting; Requested BCC Action (2 slides); Questions.

Mr. Gordon explained the question in front of the Board that day was if County staff should accept the final map application so the appellant could work with them moving forward. He noted his presentation was split into two parts: the legal analysis of why the map should have been accepted, and the compromise to move the project forward in a timely manner. The land had a large amount of open space, with multi-use trails that

connected to Steamboat, Galena Canyon, Pleasant Valley, and the historic Virginia/Truckee trail. The project would consist of multiple stages of infrastructure. He said the PVI Reach 3 could not be built without PVI Reach 4 being built; therefore, the extensions were all warranted. He agreed with Mr. Smith that the County had worked with the appellant on the PVIs, and he thought it was great that PVI Reach 3 was 30 percent designed. He stated WPI was ready to move forward on Reach 4 when the County finished Reach 3.

Mr. Gordon referenced the April 28, 2020, staff report in which the Board approved an extension. It stated, “the agreement extends the deadline for filing the next in a series of final maps.” He emphasized the word “filing” and noted Ms. Mullin used the term “recording” very loosely. He said State law and the Development Agreement did not require recording by that deadline, but both said filing. In his 16 years of experience, filing meant the application would be filed with staff, and then work would begin with them to record the final map. He opined WPI had met the deadline. He reminded the property was titled for a hotel and casino, but the property owner voluntarily downzoned the property to a less intensive residential use on the condition that the City of Reno would agree to retract the Sphere of Influence (SOI) from the area. If staff would accept the map, WPI would be happy to work with them on any deficiencies and additional requirements. He noted he had reached out to County staff numerous times and was told to wait until the Board gave direction on the issue.

Regarding the “Sanitary Sewer Interceptor” slide, Mr. Gordon said the left side of the slide showed PVI Reach 3, which was the area the County was responsible for. The right side of the slide showed the area WPI was responsible for. He said if Reach 3 did not get done, WPI would not ask for any more extensions. If the final map was accepted by staff that day, he stated WPI would not ask for any more extensions.

Mr. Gordon noted Commissioner Herman previously said it was important to get input from the Citizen Advisory Boards (CAB). He informed the extension went to the CAB last year to extend the deadline for filing. The CAB unanimously approved extending the filing deadline to June 14, 2022. He noted Chambers was not filled with people objecting to what WPI was asking for because WPI had done its due diligence with public outreach. He reminded the applicant came before the Board a couple of months prior to request an extension to the deadline from 2022 to 2024 for the Development Agreement. The Board denied the extension. He opined WPI had submitted or filed the first final map by the deadline of June 14, 2022.

Mr. Gordon reviewed the “Submission Timeline” slides and thought it was important the Board realized WPI did not simply wait and do nothing until the deadline date. He referenced a May 31, 2022, letter from the CSD and said WPI was told there were three issues with its submittal, which included: the deadline not being met, the lack of the five required residential lots, and deficiencies in the submittal. He claimed he had learned more about the deficiencies in the application that day than he had since he became involved in the project. He said the staff report mentioned there was a request for a Phase One before the recordation of the map. He was willing to work with staff to complete that.

The staff report further mentioned engineering conditions, and he stated WPI could comply with those conditions also. He said the letter WPI received from the CSD did not state the deficiencies, but now that WPI was aware of the deficiencies, it would be happy to correct them. WPI opined the map was submitted to the CSD on time. He noted that nowhere in the Washoe County Code (WCC) did it say the word “residential” next to the lots required. The WCC, he explained, simply said to create a lot and WPI had created nine lots. He searched for the word “residential” and did not find it anywhere in the Development Agreement, or the WCC. He stated he would back off his position that the lots did not need to be residential and WPI would create residential lots.

Regarding the CSD’s assertion that the map was not timely, Mr. Gordon believed WPI presented the final map per State law prior to the date required. The ordinance the Board approved to extend said to file the map by 2022. The Development Agreement said to file and submit the map. The CAB’s approval said to submit the map. The Development Agreement referred to State law which said “present,” and he opined the County should follow State law. He noted the Development Agreement used the word “record” one time, but also said the words “present,” “submit,” and “file.” He said in the world of legal contracts, the language was ambiguous. State law said the preferable interpretation of an ambiguous contract should result in a fair and reasonable contract. He believed if the Board directed staff to accept the map so WPI could work with them, it would be a reasonable and fair result. If the Board denied the appeal, then the project would be dead, and the property would lose 950 lots. There would be no WPI Reach 4 if the project was stopped. He noted WPI was willing and able to find a compromise with staff, and he believed it would be a harsh and unreasonable contract interpretation if the Board voted to uphold the CSD’s decision.

Mr. Gordon displayed a letter to the CSD from Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg regarding the proposed resolution of the appeal and litigation. The letter was submitted prior to the appeal coming to the Board in an attempt to get feedback from the CSD. He stated the petition for judicial review would be dismissed if the Board directed the CSD to accept the map. He recalled when he previously met with staff, staff said if the Board directed them to accept the map, they would have to work with WPI to record the map in 60 days. CSD staff was concerned about the short turnaround time, as they were already overburdened with work. His proposal in the letter was to allow staff 120 days to review the map, which he thought would help CSD staff. He opined that the proposal was mistaken by the CSD as an attempt by WPI to get an extension on time. He stated WPI would comply with the 60 days required by code, but if CSD staff needed additional time WPI would allow that. He discussed conditions 97 and 98 in his letter which were not current conditions but would modernize the application.

Mr. Gordon explained that over 20 years, the project would create \$18 million for the General Fund and generate \$1.8 million for the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD). He recalled at the last extension meeting the Board said the application needed to be modernized. His solution to that was to offer \$500 per home to help fund the new fire station.

Vice Chair Hill asked CSD staff to explain the ambiguity that was presented by the appellant regarding the terms “presenting,” “filing,” and “recording.” She asked for clarification on the 60 days required by State law, what that period of time was for, and the intent of those timelines. She asked staff to explain what happened when an applicant came in with a final map. Ms. Mullin explained that Article 610 of the Development Code laid out the terminology and steps for submitting a final map. She displayed a document titled “Chronological Steps/Terms Related to Final Maps,” a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. She explained the preliminary submittal was a very important step of the process and that the 60 days allowed time for the reviewing agencies to look at the final map, backup documentation, studies, financial assurances, and improvement drawings. This process ensured that what was being proposed would meet the standards of the Development Code and the conditions of approval.

Ms. Mullin said the preliminary submittal was generally provided on a large roll of paper and the County and the different reviewing agencies did an evaluation against the conditions and code requirements. A red-line meeting was then held to discuss the potential deficiencies the applicant would need to correct. She explained that was a back-and-forth process until the final map was ready to be created on mylar. The mylar showed the documents to be recorded with the Recorder’s Office, such as the tract map that created the lot. The document was the corrected version of the map with all the signatures from the reviewing agencies. After all the agencies signed the document, the Director of Planning and Building would sign. She explained the different terms had specific meanings and occurred in sequential order. Filing could occur the same day or very close to the actual recordation of the map.

Vice Chair Hill asked if CSD staff confused the language when writing the staff reports and therefore did not make it clear to the applicant what needed to be submitted to the County. Ms. Mullin stated the Development Agreement discussed the filing of the map. She opined if a person did not look at Article 610 and the terms of the meanings of the words, things could be interpreted differently. She believed the important piece of the issue was that the preliminary submittal was received three weeks prior to the filing date; therefore, it did not meet the requirement that it be submitted 60 days prior to the filing date. That requirement, she reminded, was in place so staff and the reviewing agencies could ensure the map met code standards.

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson explained the Development Agreement was a contract between the County and the developer. When looking at the timeline, the contents of the Development Agreement had to be examined because the contents controlled the deadline. The word “present” in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 278.360 stated unless there was a development agreement, the normal timeline for a developer to submit the first final map was within four years of the tentative map approval. If the parties decided to extend the deadline and enter into a development agreement, it would cause the contents of the development agreement to control the deadlines. In the Development Agreement between the County and WPI, Section 2.1.9 was the section that controlled the timing. That section read that the next final map, to be a minimum of five lots, shall be recorded on or before the date of expiration of the agreement.

Commissioner Lucey asked how many extensions had been granted for the project since the initial tentative map. Ms. Mullin responded there had been a total of seven extensions since the approval in 2006, which were a part of four Development Agreements with the Board. Commissioner Lucey asked if there were reasons given by the project owner for the purpose of the extensions. Ms. Mullin responded she would need to investigate her information for the reasons.

Commissioner Lucey recalled Mr. Smith had stated the sewer reach agreement between the County and WPI was entered into around 2012, or after the initial tentative map was introduced. He asked if that was correct. Mr. Smith responded the agreement for sewer infrastructure was approved in 2016 by the Board. That agreement detailed specifics regarding obligations and requirements, including schedules to keep the County aware of the pace of development so the County could act accordingly. Commissioner Lucey said the previous extensions between 2004 and 2016 had different reasonings from the current ask for an extension. Mr. Smith replied that it appeared so.

Commissioner Lucey asked what the reasoning was for the sewer extension agreement, other than for the County to provide the reaches out so that infrastructure would be in place by the time WPI initialized development. From his understanding, PVI Reach 3 was well underway and would serve the Toll Road area, the Hidden Valley area, and the northern parts of Pleasant Valley. He believed those reaches would not go down the roads, but those areas could choose to hook up.

Regarding a previous comment Mr. Gordon made, Mr. Smith clarified the 30 percent design that was submitted had been submitted by WPI to the County for the Reach 4 portion. For Reach 3, the County completed the design, developed the funding needs through State Revolving Fund (SRF) loans, obtained permits from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) for working in Nevada waters, worked with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) for crossings underneath the NDOT right away, completed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process including environmental assessments, completed the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) compliance requirements, and done ethnographic studies with the tribes. The CSD was in the process of securing a final easement to allow it to proceed to bid. He expected the County would bid the Reach 3 portion of the County's obligation in January 2023.

Commissioner Lucey recalled in the 2016 negotiations with WPI, one of the extensions of the negotiation points was the offer to meet the County halfway and do sewer infrastructure. He said he now felt like that was being used against the County because the County had not completed its portion yet. He wondered if that was a fair and just way of doing business, as that was an offer by WPI to get an extension and entice the County to move forward with the project. He disapproved of that argument being brought to the Board and agreed with previous comments made by Commissioner Jung that there was not enough historical information being added.

In response to Commissioner Lucey's point, Mr. Gordon said WPI was not asking for an extension. Rather, WPI was asking for staff to accept the final map with WPI's commitment that no more extensions would be requested. Regarding Vice Chair Hill's comments, he agreed with Ms. Gustafson that the Development Agreement should be used for defining terms such as "present" or "file," not the WCC. He noted the Development Agreement used the word "record" once and also used the terms "present" and "file" by that date. He said there was no cross-reference to the WCC for the definition and the ordinance said WPI had to file by a date. The neighborhood advisory board approved unanimously to submit by that date. He opined WPI's interpretation was fair and done in good faith after it was denied an extension by the Board. He noted the 60-day requirement was not in the Development Agreement; however, it could be put in and WPI would do it. He relayed that WPI was not placing any blame on the reaches.

Chair Hartung recalled that in 2008, during the economic turndown, the County could not get a permit from anyone. When he took office in 2013, the Board, in an effort to assist the developers, did not require payment until certain things had occurred, such as a Certificate of Occupancy (C of O), hookups, equivalent residential units (ERU) for sewer, roof payments, and meter connects from Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA). He said many things happened during that time frame in order to assist developers to stay afloat because many developers had large inventories of houses they could not sell. He noted Mr. Gordon had asked for a list of deficiencies to address. He wondered why County staff had to go through the deficiencies for seasoned developers, as the president of Krater Consulting Group, Mr. Kenneth Krater, had been around for many years.

Mr. Gordon reminded that Ms. Mullin said in any tentative map application with conditions, there was a back-and-forth to ensure the developers did things correctly for the County. He asserted the first time he saw a list of the deficiencies was in the staff report for that meeting. He was confident WPI could hit all those deficiencies within the next 60 days. He noted that with nearly 100 conditions, there would always be a back-and-forth. Chair Hartung requested to view slide three from the CSD presentation. He pointed out the tentative map expiration date of June 14, 2022, and called attention to a letter from Attorney Douglas Brown from Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg (attachment B, page 4, in the April 26, 2022, staff report). He read from the letter regarding the Lumos Study and the lack of staffing to complete it. Chair Hartung opined it was not the County's fault the study could not be completed in time. He said the developers could not get houses sold so they asked for extensions, then the market boomed, and they needed more extensions because they could not find the staff to do the work. He wondered at what point the situation would rectify itself. He noted many conditions had changed from the time the map was put into play in 2006. There had been numerous changes in the region, including changes to traffic patterns and roads. He believed the County ran into problems when approving extensions because it had to retrofit for previous codes.

3:02 p.m. Vice Chair Hill left the meeting and continued her participation via Zoom.

Chair Hartung referenced the letter from Mr. Brown that stated, “the Development Agreement would provide for one more two-year extension of time such that the first final map must be recorded by June 14, 2024.” He noted Mr. Brown understood the difference between filing and recording. He had a hard time understanding the semantic differences between filing and recording in the case.

Mr. Gordon said after the Board denied the extension, WPI attempted to come up with some conditions to modernize the application. This included bringing the sewer up to St. James, at the cost of WPI. He recalled that bringing an effluent line out to the project and participating in the new fire station was important to the Board. He informed Mr. Brown was present to answer questions regarding the letter Chair Hartung read from, but his understanding of the letter regarding recording was to remove the ambiguity so there was no longer a question about when that date was. He believed the Board needed to look at the Development Agreement and what case law said about interpreting contracts in a fair manner. He explained WPI put everything it could into getting the final map application submitted by the due date and requested the Board direct staff to accept it.

Commissioner Lucey asked if the Board were to allow staff to work with the appellant on the final map revisions, could additional conditions be placed in the Development Agreement to modernize the project. Assistant District Attorney Nathan Edwards thought the Board could impose some conditions on a decision to reverse the denial of the map; however, he varied in what he meant by conditions. He did not recommend the Board accept the proposed conditions that were proffered that day, such as the additional improvements and the fire station. While he appreciated where WPI was coming from with its good-faith gesture, he believed it was beyond the scope of what the Board was doing that day. He cautioned against an open-ended decision and said staff needed latitude in terms of what they would require if the decision was reversed. He further advised against adding additional benefits to the project.

Commissioner Lucey asked if the matter could be brought to the Board at a later date to have conditions added to the Development Agreement. Mr. Edwards said a decision to reverse the rejection of the final map was required in order for anything viable to come back to the Board. If the Board did not reverse the rejection all proceedings on the map would be terminated.

Commissioner Jung believed Chair Hartung unintentionally contradicted himself earlier regarding the Board doing favors for developers. She recalled when she took office in 2007, the Board started doing favors for the developers because the developers had no money and were scared to develop land. The County accommodated the developers because it needed them to develop houses. She thought Chair Hartung’s comment that it was not the fault of the County if the developers did not have staff, labor, or materials was inconsistent. She believed it was not the fault of the developers because it was the reality of what citizens were living in, especially with the embargo on materials during COVID-19. She stated the County was dynamic, expanding, collapsing, and moving with all the different issues that were going on. She believed staff had done a good job with the changes.

Commissioner Jung stated she did not want to live in a community that only millionaires could afford to live in because there would be a lack of arts, culture, and diversity. She opined the County was dynamic and it expanded and contracted with the development community, and that was why the Board gave the CSD Director the right to accept or deny. She noted that during the great downturn a review was done, and the County could have raised the rates for developers, but it chose to put a pause on rate increases. She acknowledged developers brought money in which paid CSD staff, and she believed staff always worked in partnership with developers. During the great downturn, the Board shuffled many planners around to keep them employed. She kept an eye on Zillow and noticed it was the first time in the last quarter she had seen foreclosures and price reductions. She opined part of being a good Board was to be able to react to the times and move with the community and its investors. Chair Hartung said his comments were meant to inquire at what point was a perfect place where all the stars aligned.

Commissioner Lucey agreed with Commissioner Jung's comments, saying the County needed to get to yes instead of no. He believed he and Chair Hartung worked diligently with the CSD because they both realized within their first years in office that the code was antiquated, redundant, and confusing. He noted Chair Hartung had spent many hours working to update chapters of the code. The matter in front of the Board, he opined, was a perfect example of the ambiguity in the WCC. To have words that say "file," "record," and "present" was challenging because it was not consistent throughout. He believed the developer had plenty of extensions on tentative maps and needed to take the matter seriously, as it was 16 years into the project. He said although the map was not exactly the way the CSD wanted it, WPI had made a concerted effort to submit a final map to the County. He was amenable to giving WPI a number of days to address the CSD's concerns if staff was agreeable to working with WPI to ensure the final map adhered to present times. He recommended a new development agreement with amendments to include potential concessions, constraints, and conditions be brought to the Board. He noted the traffic pattern had changed significantly since the project started, and the community had previously not been in need of the infrastructure that it needed now.

Chair Hartung asked Mr. Edwards to give guidance to the Board. Mr. Edwards said the Board was to decide whether to uphold or reverse the decision to reject the final map submission. If the Board desired to overturn the decision, he advised it be subject to reasonable requirements of staff and within a certain time period. He clarified that reasonable requirements referred to things that backed up the information in the final map, like drawings, schematics, engineering reports, and the five residential lots required. He viewed the Development Agreement as a secondary piece that he was not sure should be joined up to the decision on the final map. He stated the Development Agreement was something WPI could come back to the Board with at a later date, and he suggested another development agreement be done to modernize the provisions from the original maps to form more closely to the changes that had occurred in the Development Code. He noted staff was present and had heard the comments regarding updating the Development Agreement. He opined staff could pursue that separately but on a parallel track with the final map submission.

Chair Hartung asked if a supermajority was required. Mr. Edwards replied a simple majority was required. He said he was not offering his comments in an advocacy position but offering them from a position of guidance. He opined the concerns of CSD staff were legitimate concerns and that they were not wrong to bring them forward. The situation was a novel scenario, and he could not recall ever seeing a sequence of events take place where an extension was denied, then there was a rush to bring in a final map, and then a question about whether the final map was final enough. He said the situation was not the easiest, but staff had done the best they could. He explained planning law could include substantial evidence that favored either outcome, even though the outcomes were opposite. The courts allowed for that, and it did not matter if the evidence in the record would have supported, for example, option A and the Board chose option B. As long as there was substantial evidence to support option B as well. The scenario where staff raised substantial evidence points about why their concerns were legitimate could be true, and the appellant raising genuine points about why their concerns were valid could also be true. He noted the Board had heard visceral and legal arguments that day and had to make a tough decision.

Chair Hartung wondered if a precedent would be set if the Board were to overturn the decision. He questioned how the decision would set the Board up for future decisions. Mr. Edwards said there was no actual binding precedent, or *stare decisis*, where the Board was bound by past decisions it made. There was a practical precedential effect, and he advised that other developers may attempt to take advantage of that. One of the maxims of real property was that every piece of property was unique, and that was why it was one of the only contracts in law where a court could order someone to specifically perform instead of giving damages. He was not concerned about a negative precedent being created because there could be arguments made in the future that a new case was like this one, but there could also be counterarguments that it was different.

Vice Chair Hill opined the Board had put staff in a tough position because, undoubtedly, the developer would come in and try to file the map. She thought the Board also put the developer in a tough situation because they had to rush in and file the map. After hearing Mr. Edward's thoughts, she leaned toward Commissioner Lucey's position on the Board working with the developer. She thought the Development Agreement's different language put everyone in a bind.

Ms. Mullin said if the Board wished to approve the appeal, she would request a five-minute recess to discuss the terms with legal counsel. Commissioner Jung reminded Mr. Edwards said terms and conditions should not be discussed that day. Ms. Mullin stated the request was to discuss timing. Mr. Edwards clarified he had said it was not the right place to add conditions, modifications, or improvements to the subdivision. Chair Hartung confirmed Ms. Mullin was requesting a recess to discuss timing issues.

3:25 p.m. **The Board recessed.**

3:35 p.m. **The Board reconvened with all members present.**

Commissioner Lucey thanked everyone for their participation. He noted he had led the charge previously with his frustrations regarding rural properties and the continuous requests for extensions the project received over the past 16 years. He understood there were societal and economic changes that led to the need for constant extensions until maps could be filed and projects started; however, he opined WPI took advantage of certain situations until the Board decided not to allow any further extensions. The County asked WPI to either perform or not, and he believed WPI had performed but not as it should have. He opined a viable solution needed to be found that was a win-win for everybody. He made a motion that the Board reverse the denial of the CSD director's decision to deny the final map for Sierra Reflections, and he allowed for a reasonable amount of time for issues to be addressed. He proposed a period of 60 days.

Ms. Mullin explained that during the recess, staff had discussed allowing for a preliminary submittal within 180 days from that day, due to the amount of work and additional documentation that would need to be provided. The submittal would need to meet the conditions of approval from the tentative map and the 2020 amended conditions of approval from the Development Agreement, including the five residential lots and recordation within 60 days after the preliminary submittal. She said the total time period would be 240 days, which included the 180 days until the preliminary submittal deadline, and 60 days following that, the map would need to be recorded. This would also allow for a 60-day time frame for staff to complete their review.

Commissioner Lucey amended his motion based upon the recommendations of staff to give 180 days for preliminary submittal and a following 60 days for recordation of the submittal. Commissioner Jung seconded the motion.

Chair Hartung asked if that was the final date, and no more extensions were allowed. Commissioner Lucey replied that was correct and said WPI had 240 days to get it finished. Chair Hartung asked Commissioner Lucey to make that a part of his motion. Commissioner Lucey amended his motion, stating there would be no more extensions to be asked for and the current litigation would be dismissed. Commissioner Jung agreed.

Ms. Mullin asked that the motion require all the 2020 amended conditions of approval from the Development Agreement to be part of the requirement, as well as a requirement to ensure that five residential lots or more were submitted with the preliminary submittal. As the motioner, Commissioner Lucey agreed that the 2020 Development Agreement amendments should stay intact, and the five residential lots were a portion of that agreement.

Chair Hartung asked Mr. Gordon to approach the podium. Commissioner Jung pointed out there was a motion on the floor and called for a vote. Chair Hartung commented he wanted to hear what WPI was going to come back with to ensure it was not part of the current motion. Mr. Gordon said WPI was willing to comply with the conditions that were in his presentation. He explained WPI would work with staff to incorporate it into the submittal, or WPI could come back to the Board. Mr. Edwards recommended representations be kept separate from what was happening that day. He noted he had not

heard that as part of the motion and understood the points being made. He said if WPI wanted to bring its representations forward, it knew how to do that. He advised that the Board's agenda was not broad enough to settle the litigation that day; however, he opined the litigation would be moot if the appeal was approved and the final map was extended. Chair Hartung asked if the litigation piece had to be removed from the motion, and Mr. Edwards replied yes. Commissioner Lucey explained he was simply restating what was in the letter from Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg that said the matter would be dismissed. Mr. Edwards understood Commissioner Lucey was pointing out what Lemons, Grundy & Eisenberg had represented, and he believed WPI's counsel knew how to make good on the representations made. He recommended Commissioner Lucey remove the litigation piece from his motion.

Commissioner Lucey amended his motion and removed the dismissal of the litigation. Commissioner Jung agreed as seconder and called for a vote.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Lucey, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote, it was ordered that Agenda Item 16 be reversed.

3:44 p.m. Commissioner Jung left the meeting.

22-0824 **AGENDA ITEM 17** Public Hearing: Second reading and adoption of an Ordinance pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 278.0201 through 278.0207 adopting a Development Agreement as required by the Warm Springs Specific Plan (WSSP) at WSSP.8.1, to utilize the regulatory zone designation specified on the Warm Springs Specific Plan - Land Use Plan for:

Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM22-0009 (Murphy) - Which is a tentative parcel map dividing a ±40.23-acre parcel (APN 077-140-03) into three parcels of ±30.23 acres, ±5.0 acres, and ±5.0 acres.

In order to develop any property in the WSSP more densely than General Rural (1 dwelling unit/40 acres), the specific plan requires that a development agreement be approved. Among other things, the development agreement adopts development standards for the property in conformance with the Warm Springs Specific Plan Development Standards Handbook Framework, a component of the Washoe County Master Plan, such as standards relating to uses, accessory structures, building requirements, setbacks, heating and fireplaces, architecture, landscaping, fencing, lighting, utilities, and other matters concerning the development of the land. The development agreement also specifies the denser development potential available on the property, which in this case would result in one residential parcel of ±30.23 acres and two residential parcels of ±5 acres. Finally, the development agreement provides for the participation of future property

owners in any assessment district or general improvement district providing services, facilities and/or maintenance for the specific plan area.

The applicants and property owners are David & Joanna Murphy. The subject site is approximately ±40.23 acres in size and is located at 1555 Sharrock Road. The Assessor's Parcel Number is 077-140-03. The Master Plan Category is 62% (±24.94 acres) Suburban Residential (SR) and 38% (±15.28 acres) Rural (R), and the Regulatory Zone is 62% (±24.94 acres) Low Density Suburban (LDS) and 38% (±15.28 acres) General Rural (GR); and

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

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

Chief Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith read the title for Ordinance No. 1693, Bill No. 1884.

On motion by Commissioner Herman, seconded by Commissioner Lucey, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Jung absent, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1693, Bill No. 1884, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

22-0825 **AGENDA ITEM 18** Public Hearing: Second reading and possible adoption of an ordinance amending Washoe County Code Chapter 45 (Public Welfare) by adding a section defining “low-income households”, “very low-income households”, “extremely low-income households”, and “permanent supportive housing”; and by amending provisions related to: the establishment and purpose of the Washoe County Affordable Housing Trust Fund (“the Fund”); the administration of the Fund, which is to be administered by the Housing and Homeless Services Division of Washoe County rather than a non-profit contractor; the use of a fiscal agent to collect, hold, manage and disburse Fund assets; the potential funding sources and availability of monies in the Fund; the use and disbursement of monies in the Fund; the location of units/projects to be assisted with Fund monies; and requirements for the annual evaluation; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto; and, if supported, set a public hearing for the second reading and possible adoption of the ordinance on October 25, 2022. Manager's Office. (All Commission Districts.)

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

Chief Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith read the title for Ordinance No. 1694, Bill No. 1883.

On motion by Vice Chair Hill, seconded by Commissioner Herman, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Jung absent, it was ordered that Ordinance No. 1694, Bill No. 1883, be adopted, approved, and published in accordance with NRS 244.100.

22-0826 AGENDA ITEM 19 Public Comment.

Chief Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith stated an email was received from Ms. Elise Weatherly, which was placed on file.

22-0827 AGENDA ITEM 20 Announcements/Reports.

There were no announcements or reports.

* * * * * * * * * * *

3:52 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

VAUGHN HARTUNG, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

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

*Minutes Prepared by:
Evonne Strickland, Carolina Stickle, & Lauren Morris, Deputy County Clerks*