AGENDA
JOINT MEETING OF
RENO CITY COUNCIL
SPARKS CITY COUNCIL
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
THE WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION

8:30 a.m.
Monday, May 11, 2009
WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
1001 East 9th Street, Bldg. A
Reno, Nevada 89512

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If you should require special arrangements, please contact the Washoe County Manager’s Office at (775) 328-2000, 24 hours prior to the date of the meeting.

Pursuant to NRS 241.020, the Agenda for the Joint Meeting between the Cities of Reno and Sparks, Washoe County School District and the Washoe County Commission has been posted at the following locations: Washoe County School District (425 E. 9th St), Washoe County Administration Building (1001 E. 9th St.), Washoe County Courthouse-Clerk’s Office (Court and Virginia Streets), Washoe County Central Library (301 South Center Street), Sparks Justice Court (630 Greenbrae Drive), Reno City Hall (1 East First St.), City of Reno Community Development Building (450 Sinclair St.), Liberty Center Building (350 South Center St.), Sparks City Hall (431 Prater Way), Sparks Legislative Building (745 - 4th St.), Sparks Police Department (1701 East Prater Way), Sparks Recreation Center (98 Richards Way), Alf Sorensen Community Center (1400 Baring Blvd.) and Sparks Branch Library (1125 - 12th St.), and further, this agenda will be posted on the official websites for the City of Reno at www.cityofreno.com; City of Sparks at www.cityofsparks.us; Washoe County School District at www.washoe.k12.nv.us, and, Washoe County at www.washoecounty.us

**Unless otherwise indicated by asterisk (*), all items on the agenda are action items upon which the Washoe County School District Board, Board of County Commissioners and/or Reno and Sparks City Councils may take action.**

*1. Call to Order.

*2. Salute to the flag. (Led by person designated by the Chair.)

*3. Roll call for each entity.

4. Approval of the agenda for the Reno and Sparks City Councils, the Washoe County School District and the Washoe County Commission Joint Meeting of May 11, 2009.

*5. Public Comment (three-minute time limit per person) – (Additional Public Comment on specific agenda items will be limited to three-minute time limit per person after each agenda item and must be related to the specific agenda item.) Comments to be addressed to the Chair of the meeting and to the Reno and Sparks City Councils, Washoe County School District, and the Washoe County Commission as a whole.
Joint Meeting of Reno and Washoe County

1. **LDC09-00037 (Echeverria Silver Lake Property)** - This is a request for a Master Plan Amendment (within the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan) from: General Rural - Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan (GR-RSCJP) on ±289.6 acres to: OS (Open Space)-RSCJP on ±219.09 acres, I (Industrial)-RSCJP on ±66.47 acres and HDR (High density Rural) - RSCJP on ±4 acres. The City of Reno base Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same. The ±289.6 acre site is located on the east side of Red Rock Road, ±1,450 feet north of the Red Rock Road/Moya Boulevard intersection. The property is currently zoned GR (General Rural) per the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan. This project is located in a Joint Planning Area and Cooperative Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions. *This public hearing may also include an appeal of the decisions made by the Joint Planning Commissions of Washoe County and the City of Reno regarding this project per Washoe County development code.

2. **LDC08-00205 (RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property)** – This is a request for a Master Plan amendment to remove ±98.06 acres of property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. The Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same. The site is located ±294 feet to the northwest of the intersection of Lemmon Drive and Sky Vista Parkway with a portion of the northern end of the property fronting on Lemmon Drive. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions. The zoning designations for the property are GC (General Commercial); LDS/RR (Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential – 2.5 to 1 acre lots); HDS/LDR (High Density Suburban/Low Density Residential – 3 to 7 du/acre); and OS (Open Space) in Washoe County, and are AC (Arterial Commercial); CC (Community Commercial); LLR1 (Large Lot Residential – 1 acre); SF6 (Single Family – 6,000 square foot lots) and OS (Open Space) in the City. *This public hearing may also include an appeal of the decisions made by the Joint Planning Commissions of Washoe County and the City of Reno regarding this project per Washoe County development code.

3. Update and possible discussion regarding the amendment or deletion of the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

4. Adjournment.
WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION
RENO CITY COUNCIL
SPARKS CITY COUNCIL
WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES

JOINT MEETING

MONDAY 8:30 A.M. MAY 12, 2008

PRESENT:

Bob Larkin, Washoe County Commissioner, Chairman
Bonnie Weber, Washoe County Commissioner, Vice Chairman
Jim Galloway, Washoe County Commissioner*
David Humke, Washoe County Commissioner*
Kitty Jung, Washoe County Commissioner

Robert A. Cashell, City of Reno, Mayor
Dwight Dortch, Reno City Councilmember
Dan Gustin, Reno City Councilmember
Pierre Hascheff, Reno City Councilmember
Jessica Sferrazza, Reno City Councilmember
Sharon Zadra, Reno City Councilmember*

Geno Martini, City of Sparks, Mayor
John Mayer, Sparks City Councilmember
Ron Schmitt, Sparks City Councilmember
Ron Smith, Sparks City Councilmember

Barbara Price, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, President
Dan Carne, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees Member
Nancy Hollinger, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees Member
Jonnie Pullman, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees Member

ABSENT:

Dave Aiazzi, Reno City Councilmember
Mike Carrigan, Sparks City Councilmember
Phil Salerno, Sparks City Councilmember
Barbara Clark, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, Vice President
Lezlie Porter, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees Member
Jody Ruggiero, Washoe County School District Board of Trustees Member
The Commission, Board, and Councils met in joint session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada, with City of Reno Mayor Robert Cashell presiding. Also present were Washoe County Manager Katy Singlaub, Assistant District Attorney Melanie Foster, County Clerk Amy Harvey, Reno City Manager Charles McNeely, Reno City Attorney John Kadlic, Reno City Clerk Lynnette Jones, Sparks City Manager Shaun Carey, Sparks Senior Assistant City Attorney Wendy Chavez, Sparks City Clerk Linda Patterson, Washoe County School District Superintendent Paul Dugan, and Washoe County School District Lead General Counsel Randy Drake.

Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerks called the roll for their respective entities, and the Commission, Councils, and Board conducted the following business:

08-400 AGENDA ITEM 4

Agenda Subject: “Approval of the agenda for the Reno and Sparks City Councils, the Washoe County School District and the Washoe County Commission Joint Meeting of May 12, 2008.”

In response to the call for public comment, Sam Dehne addressed the Boards and Councils.

It was moved, and seconded, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Galloway, Commissioner Humke, Councilmember Aiazzi, Councilmember Zadra, Councilmember Carrigan, Councilmember Salerno, Trustee Clark, Trustee Ruggiero and Trustee Porter absent, that Agenda Item 4 be approved.

On motion by Mayor Martini, seconded by Chairman Larkin, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Galloway, Commissioner Humke, Councilmember Aiazzi, Councilmember Zadra, Councilmember Carrigan, Councilmember Salerno, Trustee Clark, Trustee Ruggiero and Trustee Porter absent, Item 10 was moved forward in the agenda.

08-401 AGENDA ITEM 10

Agenda Subject: “Staff Report: presentation, discussion and possible acceptance of the Regional Housing Task Force Report. (All Entities)”

Mark Sullivan, Chairman of the Regional Housing Task Force, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the County Clerk. He commended all of the individuals who served on the Task Force Committee, which was put together in August 2006. He indicated the Committee brought together 25 different entities and individuals who reviewed the barriers to affordable and workforce housing, and came up with the recommendations presented in the Regional Housing Task Force
Report. He reviewed the structure of the main Committee, as well as three subcommittees that worked to address finance, regulatory and development, and legislative issues.

*8:40 a.m.* Councilmember Zadra arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Sullivan stated the Committee’s overarching goal was to coordinate regional activities and eliminate duplication of efforts on affordable and workforce housing, and its overarching recommendation was to establish a Regional Housing Commission. He emphasized all of the Task Force decisions and recommendations were made by a consensus of the Committee. He pointed out the Legislative Committee’s recommendation was to examine legislation and to support legislative changes that were consistent with the goals of the Task Force. He said there was no proposed legislation or specific legislative language from the Committee, but the intent was for each of the entities to approach the Legislature. Mr. Sullivan related concerns recently expressed by the Chamber of Commerce, which was restricted under its own policies from supporting legislation unless something specific was brought to their board for approval. He indicated there had not been time to change the Committee’s legislative recommendations after they became aware of the issue.

Mr. Sullivan referred to the recommendation on page iv of the staff report, which asked the Boards and Councils to accept the Task Force Report and to direct staff to continue working on the issues with the Task Force.

Councilmember Sferrazza thanked all of those involved for their hard work. She pointed out one of the Committee’s goals was to make sure their recommendations did not sit on a shelf somewhere. She highlighted a few of the Committee’s recommendations and said one of the biggest barriers would be for the entities to talk about reallocation of the room tax and other funds. She stated the current economic challenges would make it difficult for the entities to do that at the current time. She acknowledged it would take staff some time to implement the recommendations, but said the Committee’s hard work had finally produced a document that would allow everyone to move forward.

Mayor Cashell asked about the estimated financial impact on the entities. Mr. Sullivan explained the financial analysis had not yet been done and the Committee was waiting for the entities to accept the recommendations. Given the current resources, he indicated the Committee understood that the things they wanted to happen might not happen at this time. He reiterated the recommendation in the staff report was to accept the Task Force Report and direct staff to work with the Committee on implementing the priority recommendations. He stated the financial impacts and Task Force recommendations would come back before the Boards and Councils for approval or disapproval.

*8:48 a.m.* Commissioner Humke arrived at the meeting.
Councilmember Sferrazza noted the Reno City Council set aside $100,000 to help with permit fees on affordable housing projects and about $17,000 had been spent to date. She asked whether those funds would be carried over to the next fiscal year. Charles McNeely, Reno City Manager, assured her the funds would carry over.

For the City of Reno, on motion by Councilmember Sferrazza, seconded by Councilmember Gustin, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Aiazzi absent, Mayor Cashell ordered that the recommendations be approved.

For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Mayer, seconded by Councilmember Smith, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Carrigan and Salerno absent, Mayor Martini ordered that the recommendations be approved.

For Washoe County, on motion by Commissioner Jung, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Galloway absent, Chairman Larkin ordered that the recommendations be approved.

For the Washoe County School District, on motion by Trustee Pullman, seconded by Trustee Carne, which motion duly carried with Trustees Clark, Ruggiero and Porter absent, President Price ordered that the recommendations be approved.

In response to the call for public comment, Sam Dehne indicated, although the financial impact had not been analyzed, there would be a lot of money involved. He questioned how “affordable housing” was defined and hoped a way could be found to build housing for less than $100,000 within the community.

*8:52 a.m.* Commissioner Galloway arrived at the meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM 5**

**Agenda Subject:** “Public Comment (three-minute time limit per person) – (Additional Public Comment on specific agenda items will be limited to three-minute time limit per person after each agenda item and must be related to the specific agenda item.) Comments to be addressed to the Chair of the meeting and to the Reno and Sparks City Councils, Washoe County School District, and the Washoe County Commission as a whole.”

There was no public comment.

**AGENDA ITEM 6**

**Agenda Subject:** “Update on the Final Report and Actions of the SB 154 Committee. (Washoe County School District)”

Paul Dugan, Superintendent for the Washoe County School District (WCSD), conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the
County Clerk. He said it became clear in 2004 that revenue from a rollover bond passed by the voters in 2002 was not going to be enough to deal with future new school construction and older school revitalization. He attributed this to an extreme rise of over 35 percent in construction costs, as well as Property Tax Caps that went into effect in 2005. He displayed a chart summarizing revenue sources for all of the counties in Nevada and pointed out Washoe County was the only school district with no revenue sources in addition to property and government service taxes. He reviewed some of the legislative history surrounding the issue, which led to the 2007 formation of the SB 154 Committee chaired by Senator Randolph Townsend. Mr. Dugan related the Committee’s decision to focus its efforts on finding additional revenues for older school revitalization and technology, which led to an estimate of $393 million that would be needed from 2008 to 2014. After a comprehensive discussion of revenue sources, he said the Committee unanimously recommended placing a question on the November 2008 ballot for voters to approve an increase of 0.250 percent in the sales tax and a 1/2-cent government services (vehicle registration) tax. He indicated it would not be necessary to go back to the Legislature if the voters passed the question, and the increases would take effect in January 2009. Mr. Dugan stated the next steps would be to develop a campaign to convince the voters and to get critical input from the WCSD Bond Oversight Committee.

Mayor Cashell questioned why an increase in the vehicle registration tax was selected rather than the real property transfer tax. Mr. Dugan stated it was felt the revenues should not be dependent on a single sector such as housing or casinos. The Committee felt the real property transfer tax was single-source focused and there was not enough support for it among Committee members. Trustee Pullman pointed out the WCSD already received some revenue from the government services tax.

Councilmember Dortch asked how the ballot question campaign would be funded. Mr. Dugan said it would have to be privately financed. He indicated the Campaign Committee recently held its first meeting and planned to meet every week until the November 2008 election.

Chairman Larkin pointed out the question had to be placed on the ballot by the County Commission and the language would need to be brought before the Commission prior to the July 2008 deadline. Mr. Dugan said Senator Townsend would present the language by way of a resolution and ordinance to the WCSD School Board on May 21, 2008, and the matter would go before the County Commission following the School Board’s approval.

Councilmember Gustin asked about the basis for estimating sales tax revenues. Mr. Dugan indicated the numbers were generated by the Legislative Counsel Bureau and outside bond counsel, based on 2007 data. They believed the estimate was a low figure that took the economic situation into account.

In response to the call for public comment, Todd Campbell encouraged the Washoe County Commission to place the question on the ballot so the voters could decide.
Sam Dehne suggested the SB 154 Committee should have included a regular citizen and a student.

Councilmember Sferrazza requested a breakdown of where improvements would be made to the older schools. Mayor Cashell asked Mr. Dugan to forward such information to all of the officials.

For the City of Reno, on motion by Councilmember Dortch, seconded by Councilmember Hascheff, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Aiazzi absent, Mayor Cashell ordered that the update be accepted.

For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Mayer, seconded by Councilmember Smith, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Carrigan and Salerno absent, Mayor Martini ordered that the update be accepted.

For Washoe County, on motion by Commissioner Jung, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried, Chairman Larkin ordered that the update be accepted.

For the Washoe County School District, on motion by Trustee Carne, seconded by Trustee Pullman, which motion duly carried with Trustees Clark, Ruggiero and Porter absent, President Price ordered that the update be accepted.

08-403  
**AGENDA ITEM 7**

**Agenda Subject:** “Staff Report: Discussion, direction and possible adoption of the Regional Level of Service Standards as defined in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan and potential update on the Blue Ribbon Task Force. (All Entities)”

Derek Morse, Deputy Executive Director of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the County Clerk. He explained the Level of Service (LOS) Standards were a key tool for managing congestion within the community and for identifying necessary road projects. He reviewed the current LOS Standards, which designated almost everything inside the McCarran ring as LOS D and almost everything outside the McCarran ring as LOS C. He pointed out the standards had become less appropriate as areas outside of the McCarran ring evolved and there was inconsistent treatment of areas with similar development densities. Mr. Morse noted there were significant long-term costs associated with sustaining the current LOS standards, as well as negative impacts to some neighborhoods while projects were underway. He indicated the proposed changes to the LOS Standards were consistent with those used by several other communities. He stated the proposed LOS standards were developed in consultation with the Public Works Departments of Reno, Sparks and Washoe County, and had been endorsed by the RTC Board in December 2007. He reviewed the proposed changes to the standards and their long-term impacts. He indicated the average per capita traffic delay was expected to increase by
about 1-1/2 minutes per day and there would be an estimated savings of $488 million in infrastructure costs through the year 2040.

Mr. Morse said the RTC’s final recommendation was for the City of Reno, City of Sparks and Washoe County to adopt the proposed LOS standards. He observed this would require eventual revision of land use plans and ordinances as they were updated. He recommended that design activity for projects that were already underway should be continued under the old standards and design activity that started after adoption should be guided by the new standards.

Chairman Larkin asked about the average wait time for people in the community. Mr. Morse said the increase in the average per capita wait time was projected through the year 2040, with less of an increase in the earlier years and more as time went on. He agreed with Chairman Larkin that most commuters were unlikely to see a demonstrable change over the next five years.

Councilmember Zadra inquired whether there was any opportunity to improve on motorists’ delay times by improving the synchronization schedule, which looked at each intersection every three years within the City of Reno. Mr. Morse suggested three years was a reasonable period of time for most intersections. He said it was possible to identify extremely busy intersections that might benefit from more frequent optimization of traffic signals.

Commissioner Humke requested a brief description of current RTC initiatives to update developer impact fees, as well as an overview of the work being done by the Blue Ribbon Task Force. Mr. Morse explained the RTC Board formed a Blue Ribbon Committee (BRC) on transportation funding, which was composed of approximately 30 community leaders from a wide variety of occupations and interests. He said they had been meeting every two weeks since the beginning of February 2008 to look at transportation funding issues within the community for streets, highways and public mass transit. The BRC looked at needs, revenues, shortfalls and potential solutions at the federal, State, regional and local levels for all activities. Among several key issues identified by the BRC, Mr. Morse indicated there were enormous shortfalls in transportation funding for future needs, primarily caused by inflation. He pointed out revenues collected in the last five years at the State and federal levels were 30 percent less than in 2003 for every mile driven within the local jurisdiction. He stated there were similar losses at the local level, although they were not as severe because indexing was in place for local taxes. The BRC realized that inflationary erosion of revenues would get worse until the fundamental problem was addressed, and the numbers were too big to bring to the voters as a single step solution.

To protect gas and diesel fuel taxes from inflation, Mr. Morse said the BRC recommended moving to a Producer Price Index for street and highway construction at local, State and federal levels, with shadow indexing to be used at the State and federal levels. He stated the BRC also recommended to the RTC Board that there be periodic review of the new revenue stream to ensure that collections did not
exceed needs. The BRC wanted to see public outreach education regarding the transportation fees paid by developers and the entire transportation funding structure.

Mr. Morse indicated the BRC would consider the following additional issues at its final meeting on May 15, 2008:

- Placement on the ballot of additional funding sources for street and highway construction.
- A list of initial projects to address some of the worst areas in the community if revenues became available.
- A recommendation to address mass transit funding, which was facing significant cuts in service because of the downturn in the economy.
- Pursuing equity for transportation impacts caused by development in adjacent counties such as Storey County.
- Approaching the federal government to increase spending on transportation infrastructure (an ongoing RTC activity).
- A recommendation that the RTC Board continue moving to DMT fees as a future replacement for traditional funding of transportation infrastructure.
- Longer term actions to address the remaining projected shortfall in transportation funding.

Mr. Morse discussed work being done with respect to developer impact fees, for which the rates were being recalculated based on the construction and land inflation seen over the last couple of years. He stated the new fee rates would come before the RTC Board on May 16, 2008. He said there would probably be a five-year period to phase in the fees, given the burden placed on the building and construction industry by current economic conditions.

Commissioner Humke asked whether the BRC had taken into account the ballot initiative for K-12 education in Washoe County. Mr. Morse indicated the BRC was sensitive to the initiative, but he did not believe there was a conflict between the funding sources.

Councilmember Sferrazza inquired about discussions to consolidate the RTC Board and Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB). Mr. Morse explained a scope of work was suggested for subcommittees from the RTC and the RPGB to define the issues. He noted the solutions could include anything from more robust collaboration to some consolidation. He believed the subcommittees were having their first meetings in June 2008. Councilmember Sferrazza said she hoped there would be some determination before the 2009 Legislative Session, because the RPGB was State mandated.

Councilmember Sferrazza questioned whether there was any analysis of how much more it would cost to wait five years to fix the roads that were currently below the LOS C level. At current inflation rates, Mr. Morse pointed out any project would cost
about 30 percent more in five years. Councilmember Sferrazza noted the City of Reno decided to move forward with its street program because it was actually cheaper to do the bonding now. Mr. Morse stated the RTC could provide data regarding current and future project costs. He remarked there were some circumstances where bonding did not make sense because the size of the combined projects might overwhelm the industry and drive prices up. If new revenues were approved, he explained the RTC was considering an accelerated five- to ten-year program that would involve some initial bonding to speed a lot of projects up and would then rely on “pay as you go” funding. He pointed out this would keep a good steady pace of growth rather than creating spikes in the industry followed by lay-offs after the projects were done. He noted one of the problems at the State level was that they were bonded to the hilt.

Councilmember Sferrazza asked about the progress of the Veteran’s Parkway (Pyramid to Tahoe) project. Mr. Morse replied an alignment study was underway within the valley corridor. He estimated there would be initial reports to the RTC Board later in the summer about alignment alternatives, with a final alignment determination later in the year. Councilmember Sferrazza inquired as to whether there was funding for the project. Mr. Morse indicated the alignment study had been funded, but there were no specific funds earmarked or identified for the project at this time. He suggested the project might be considered for acceleration if revenues became available.

For the City of Reno, on motion by Councilmember Dortch, seconded by Councilmember Zadra, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Aiazzi absent, Mayor Cashell ordered that the staff report in Agenda Item 7 be accepted and the Regional Level of Service Standards as defined in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan be adopted.

For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Mayer, seconded by Councilmember Smith, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Carrigan and Salerno absent, Mayor Martini ordered that the staff report in Agenda Item 7 be accepted and the Regional Level of Service Standards as defined in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan be adopted.

For Washoe County, on motion by Commissioner Humke, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried, Chairman Larkin ordered that the staff report in Agenda Item 7 be accepted and the Regional Level of Service Standards as defined in the 2030 Regional Transportation Plan be adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 8

Agenda Subject: “Staff Report: Presentation, discussion and possible direction to staff on operations and oversight of the Homeless Services at the Community Assistance Center. (City of Reno)”

Jody Royal-Goodwin, Community Reinvestment Manager for the City of Reno, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the County
Clerk. She explained there were about 850 individuals in Washoe County who were homeless on any given night. She reviewed the costs associated with homelessness and described work done by the three jurisdictions and the Reno Area Alliance for the Homeless (RAAH) between 2001 and 2005 to identify needed services and facilities within the community. She explained Phase I of the Community Assistance Center (CAC) campus was completed in November 2005 to house the St. Vincent’s Dining Facility, the Reno-Sparks Gospel mission and the Men’s Drop-in-Center. Phase IIA was completed in March 2008 and included space for a Community Triage Center, Women’s Drop-in-Center and Crisis Intervention Team office. She indicated Phase IIB was scheduled to open in October 2008 and would house a Family Shelter and Resource Center. She referred to the plan adopted by the three jurisdictions in February 2007, entitled *Housing for All: A Plan to End Homelessness*, which was intended to improve the provision of services and to improve outcomes for persons experiencing homelessness. She summarized the anticipated programming and services to be offered at the CAC.

Ms. Royal-Goodwin identified long-term operations and oversight of the CAC as the primary reason for the item currently under discussion. She stated there was a significant funding gap due to increased operating costs and an increased range of services. She indicated staff was looking to formalize the roles and responsibilities between the jurisdictions for contracting and oversight of services at the CAC. She emphasized the intent of the CAC was to help individuals and families to recover from homelessness, rather than to give them a place to stay for 30 days and then return them to the streets. She reviewed some of the cost-saving measures that were being investigated to reduce the estimated funding gap from over $2 million to under $1 million for fiscal year 2008-09. She talked about the opportunities identified by the City of Reno to support CAC operations. She indicated staff was looking into the creation of a long-term endowment to fund future operation of all three shelters and the resource center, as well as maintenance and security for the facility.

**9:49 a.m.**  Councilmember Dortch left the meeting.

Gabrielle Enfield, Community Support Administrator for Washoe County, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the County Clerk. She reviewed several of the opportunities identified by Washoe County to support operations and reduce costs. She listed cash and in-kind contributions for operation of the CAC by Washoe County, the City of Reno and the Restart Family Shelter Endowment. She discussed grant opportunities and donations that were still being pursued by staff. She cautioned that several assumptions were made in order to reduce the funding gap and it would be necessary to work with a non-profit vendor on the plans to provide services. She anticipated success in finding volunteers to implement several of the programs. She concluded there were three primary challenges to be addressed: the fiscal year 2008-09 operational funding gap, operational oversight and coordination for the complex campus of providers and services, and fiscal and contractual oversight to coordinate a complicated mix of funding sources and funding regulations.
9:58 a.m. Councilmember Schmitt temporarily left the meeting.

Commissioner Jung asked whether there was a breakdown of how many veterans received services at the CAC campus. Ms. Royal-Goodwin said there was not a firm number, but a range of 10 to 35 percent was estimated based on various types of data. Commissioner Jung wondered whether any type of reimbursement was being pursued from the Veteran’s Administration or from service agencies such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars or the American Legion. Ms. Royal-Goodwin replied that grant and per diem funding could be analyzed more closely once the project got going. She cautioned that 75 percent of the population served had to be veterans in order to qualify for some funding sources, and there was no reimbursement available from the Veteran’s Administration, although they would provide case management services.

10:01 a.m. Councilmember Schmitt returned to the meeting.

Commissioner Jung suggested the staff contact Northern Nevada HOPES, a Ryan White Act federally funded program, to assist with the proposed HIV/AIDS testing and counseling services. Ms. Royal-Goodwin said it was anticipated that foundations located within the community would be providing those services.

Commissioner Jung inquired as to whether those served at the CAC also received assistance with filling out their income tax returns, particularly those with children who qualified for earned income tax credits. Ms. Royal-Goodwin noted there were currently no family populations receiving services, but tax assistance information was provided through the RAAH and a network of other providers. Commissioner Jung requested data about how many people were helped to fill out their income tax returns.

Commissioner Jung confirmed with Ms. Royal-Goodwin that the $3,722 average cost of an emergency room visit was a national average rather than a local number. Ms. Royal-Goodwin also identified that the cost provided for one day spent in jail was based on local data and the cost given for a detoxification stay was based on a national average. Commissioner Jung requested all of the information in terms of local dollars. She thanked all of the staff members for their great work.

Councilmember Sferrazza referred to fiscal equity studies previously done between the Cities and the County, and said the County relied on the rationale that it provided social services. She suggested the County was saving a lot of money because operation of a homeless shelter led to reduced jail time for individuals who might
otherwise be booked into civil protective custody. She requested an analysis of the cost savings to the County associated with an operational homeless shelter, as well as the elimination of the County’s Homeless Evaluation Liaison Program (H.E.L.P.) officer. She remarked the County should be stepping up to the plate because homeless services were an area of social services. She said the City of Reno built and constructed the facility, but was not in the business of providing social services.

Washoe County Manager Katy Singlaub stated Washoe County increased its funding for homeless services from $283,000 in 2006-07 to more than $1 million in 2008-09 by providing social workers to work on site. Additionally, she pointed out the County increased the amount provided from the General Fund and was making a $250,000 allocation from the Indigent Medical Assistance Fund. She noted the County was being asked to support three shelters, as opposed to the one that had traditionally been provided in the community. She characterized the enhanced level of service as wonderful for the community and absolutely the right thing to do for the region. She observed that all of the governing entities had needs they were unable to completely fulfill. She said the County was stepping up to the table and explained she met with staff all last week to identify additional resources that could be provided and allocated to the shelters. Ms. Singlaub remarked the resources were not a bottomless pit for any of the entities, whether they were responding to police emergencies or trying to meet any of their other responsibilities in the region. She stated the command staff of the jail did not anticipate a significant reduction in jail days and those who came to the jail were there because they committed a crime.

10:13 a.m. Mayor Martini temporarily left the meeting.

Washoe County Assistant Sheriff Lisa Haney explained the resources for the County’s H.E.L.P. officer were reallocated to help with homeless individuals inside the jail because of the severe budget crisis. She estimated, on average, that 10 percent of the inmate population was considered homeless. She cautioned that a lot of inmates said they were homeless in order to qualify for a public defender and avoid having to reimburse their medical care, so it was hard to judge the accuracy of the number.

Assistant Sheriff Haney clarified that civil protective custody was for individuals found on the street who could not care for themselves. She said such individuals were usually intoxicated and were kept in the jail for less than 48 hours or until they reached a certain blood alcohol level. They were then released and given bus tickets back into town. She pointed out those who were mentally impaired were not supposed to come to the jail.

Mayor Cashell noted this was another prime example where some form of consolidation or interlocal agreement needed to work.

Chairman Larkin pointed out the region had made considerable strides over the last decade in the realm of homeless services and the community should be very appreciative of the City of Reno’s efforts. He said the task now was to determine how to
operate and maintain the facility and how to provide oversight for it. He asked about the
daily population at the Men’s, Women’s and Family Shelters. Ms. Royal-Goodwin
replied there could be 322 people staying overnight at the shelters, although 850 were
considered to be homeless within the community.

Chairman Larkin questioned what was meant by the terms “range of
service” and “expanded service.” Ms. Enfield explained the Men’s Shelter was the only
one that was currently operational and it was primarily a safe shelter from the cold. She
said a limited number of service providers came in on a semi-regular basis, such as to
sign people up for food stamps. She indicated there was currently no staffing or funding
for a case manager who could follow individuals to identify their needs, determine what
benefits were available, or work to find permanent housing. She stated the model for the
Family Shelter and the Women’s Shelter was to provide such services, as well as more
ancillary services to help families move out of homelessness. She clarified that many of
the supportive services were expected to be partnerships with other providers. Ms.
Enfield attributed the primary cost increases to case management for social services and
professional staff for management and operations of the facility. Chairman Larkin
inquired whether the decision on the basic service model was made through the oversight
of an elected body. Ms. Enfield replied the change from merely providing housing to
providing supportive services that would assist people to move out of homelessness was
based on a best practices model. Chairman Larkin said he would like to see more
information on the best practices. Ms. Enfield pointed out that most communities utilized
a model of providing case management and assistance. She indicated the average cost for
a night’s stay in shelters across the country was between $30 and $50 per night, while the
cost estimates for the CAC were significantly lower. Chairman Larkin requested
information about costs and services provided in communities of roughly the same size.
He noted it was a significant change to move from a budget of $250,000 in 2007-08 to
over $1 million in 2008-09. Ms. Enfield stated the current shelter was operated by a
Mission organization that did not utilize a lot of paid staff. Chairman Larkin suggested
there might be some elements of the current model that were still applicable. He asked if
any of the numbers had been audited. Ms. Enfield stated the numbers were estimates and
had not been audited. Ms. Royal-Goodwin clarified the budget was developed by looking
at how many shelter monitors were needed to maintain control at various times of the day
based on how other shelters were staffed, applying that to the anticipated number of beds,
and then whittling away at what could be provided by volunteers or in-kind donations.
She observed much of the budget was also related to food costs. Chairman Larkin
remarked that food and energy costs would undoubtedly play a significant role.

10:18 a.m. Councilmember Zadra temporarily left the meeting.

Chairman Larkin referred to staff’s recommendation to accept the report
and give direction for staff to continue working together and come up with a usable
regional model for oversight and management. He asked how the oversight model would
be developed and what elements staff was already looking at. Ms. Royal-Goodwin
replied staff had just been working through budget numbers up to this point. Chairman
Larkin suggested staff would probably bring back a report at the fall quarterly joint
meeting and wondered whether oversight would be done by elected officials or professional staff. Ms. Royal-Goodwin said staff was looking for direction and input as to what the Boards and Councils wanted to see within the model.

10:20 a.m. Mayor Martini returned to the meeting.

Chairman Larkin pointed out there were some very successful models in terms of how agencies and governments worked together within a community. He requested staff look at those and bring more oversight back to the joint bodies. He emphasized the importance of moving forward with the suggested models, but indicated the costs needed to be scrutinized more closely. He commented there were other communities with different philosophies and approaches.

10:24 a.m. Councilmember Zadra returned to the meeting.

Mayor Cashell observed the federal government had already come up with a program for trying to end homelessness within a ten-year period that was being adopted by communities nationwide. He suggested the City and County Managers get together and come up with some form of interlocal agreement and an equitable funding solution.

Trustee Pullman pointed out the WCSD provided services for 1,400 to 1,900 homeless children each year, and that did not include high school students who were able to hide the fact that they were homeless. She said the WCSD was committed to working with the Cities and the County, and would be providing transportation to the school of origin for homeless kids staying in the Family Shelter. She did not want to see the kids overlooked in the discussion and remarked that education was the only way to really end the cycle of homelessness. She thought the jurisdictions had already adopted the ten-year plan referred to by Mayor Cashell.

Councilmember Mayer said he was very disturbed by the proposal to move block grant money to the homeless program. He indicated it would only take money away from a service that was greatly needed in the community and put it toward something else. He believed it would only compound the need and it was not the right thing to do. He suggested the block grant money be declared off bounds and the money be found someplace else.

Reno City Manager Charles McNeely agreed the managers and staff could look at best practices, scrutinize the budget and provide some recommendations to the jurisdictions. He said there was no question the County had stepped up and done a great job. He agreed with the County Manager that costs were increasing and were already a significant chunk of the budget, but pointed out costs were increasing everywhere. He emphasized the fundamental question of who was responsible for providing the service and how funds were to be allocated was a policy call that needed to be made among the joint bodies.
Mayor Cashell stated it fell under the County’s jurisdiction, but a way needed to be found for the Cities to contribute and help balance the budget. He requested the three managers pull together whatever staff they wanted, get together and figure it out so everyone was paying their fair share.

Councilmember Sferrazza commented the Reno Housing Authority was no longer taking applications for its Section 8 waiting list because the list was already too long and public housing was full. She noted there would be more of a demand for services at the CAC facility as the cost of goods and gasoline continued to rise. She reiterated her belief that, according to how the governments were set up, the County had a fundamental obligation to provide social services in the community.

Ms. Singlaub stated that counties were governed by Nevada Revised Statutes with respect to the services they must provide. She indicated Washoe County functioned under Dillon’s Rule, which meant it could only provide the services specifically dictated by the State Legislature. She pointed out many of the services provided at the homeless shelters were mandated services of the County and those were the things the County was stepping up to provide within its budgeted resources. She noted some of the proposed services, although excellent for the community, went beyond the scope of what counties were authorized to provide within the State of Nevada and were really part of the gap that everyone had to work through together as a region. She said it was necessary to determine the role of nonprofits and private donations. She agreed with Mr. McNeely’s comments and observed everyone working together at the staff level was anxious to engage the community in the ongoing discussion of how funding would work. She noted for the public record that the $1,035,000 the County was putting into operations for 2008-09 did not include the $300,000 capital contribution the County was making every year for five years toward the cost of construction.

Mayor Cashell suggested staff should look at the things that were mandated, talk about how to fund the rest, and then come back to the joint bodies without delay. He requested fast tracking the issue for an expedient discussion and resolution.

Councilmember Hascheff clarified the total amount listed in Table 3 of the staff report was incorrect, and should be about $497,000 (see Table 1) rather than $1.5 million. Ms. Royal-Goodwin agreed and explained the Triage Center should not have been included in the total because it received hospital funding.

In response to the call for public comment, Elizabeth Dorway, Director of Family Promise and Chair of the RAAH, thanked the members of the joint bodies for considering such an important issue. She recognized a number of the service providers seated in the audience who supported efforts to fund the shelters. She commented that everyone was seeing huge increases in the number of people who needed help and there were people staying in shelters who would never have imagined they would be homeless. She said it was important to recognize that construction workers who had been gainfully employed and people who lost their homes to foreclosure were now sleeping in shelters. She reminded everyone how important it was to consider the human element as decisions
were made about the money. She added there were many in the community who had been working toward the case management model in order to move people from homelessness and into permanent housing. She pointed out that 88 percent of the families served through Catholic Community Services, Project Restart and Family Promise were able to move into permanent housing when the case management model was used. She emphasized it was the only way to end homelessness. Ms. Dorway thanked everyone for all of their hard work.

Mayor Cashell pointed out that churches needed to be brought into the fold. He talked about passing out food during Thanksgiving along with Mayor Martini and seeing people go to multiple locations that were also providing food. He indicated he had already talked to the Reno City Manager about getting together with the people at the churches and consolidating the help being provided.

On motion by Mayor Cashell, seconded by Chairman Larkin, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Aiazzi, Councilmember Dortch, Councilmember Carrigan, Councilmember Salerno, Trustee Clark, Trustee Ruggiero and Trustee Porter absent, the Boards and Councils directed the City and County Managers to get with their staff people, identify what could be done, come up with a funding mechanism, put together a game plan for the provision of homeless services at the Community Assistance Center, and come back before the jurisdictions within 90 days.

08-405  AGENDA ITEM 9

Agenda Subject: “Update presentation, discussion and possible direction to staff on the potential shared services opportunities. (All Entities)”

Charles McNeely, Reno City Manager, explained the joint bodies directed staff to look at opportunities for shared services and potential cost savings to the taxpayers. He said staff would be asking for comments and feedback following the report, as well as some support from the joint bodies for moving forward. He pointed out the recommendation in the staff report that suggested an update in six months for the six areas identified in the staff report. He clarified there were a number of items that would not take the full six months, and said staff was asking for the flexibility to implement such items more quickly when possible.

10:44 a.m.  Councilmember Mayer temporarily left the meeting.

Katy Singlaub, Washoe County Manager, complimented the staff from the respective entities for their hard work. Although it was not reflected in the staff report, she pointed out the team had also engaged the Washoe County School District (WCSD) in the process. She said staff looked at several criteria, including:

- how could more units of service be provided using the same or fewer resources;
- what was feasible to be done right now with the greatest opportunity for success;
- how the quality and value of service to the citizens could be improved;
- what unique opportunities existed right now, such as retirements among key personnel; and
- how the game plan could include measurable performance results for the taxpayers.

Ms. Singlaub indicated the Team wanted to build on the many existing examples of successfully shared services, such as the 800 MHz system, the Regional Public Safety Training Center and consolidated animal services.

10:46 a.m.  Councilmember Smith temporarily left the meeting.

10:46 a.m.  Councilmember Mayer returned to the meeting.

Shaun Carey, Sparks City Manager, said he welcomed the collaboration that was occurring. He explained the Assistant Managers brought their staff experts to the table for each area identified, and the Team was seeing some real opportunities for increased efficiency through collaboration. He expected the process of working through a manageable set of objectives to yield a better government for everyone in the region.

10:50 a.m.  Councilmember Mayer left the meeting.

Mary Hill, Reno Assistant City Manager, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the County Clerk. She recognized the other members of the Regional Shared Services Team (RSST): Sparks Assistant City Managers Steve Driscoll and Randy Mellinger, Assistant County Manager John Sherman, County Finance Director John Sherman, and Reno Legislative Manager Nick Anthony. She referred to the Team’s mission statement. She apologized for not recognizing the participation of the WCSD in the staff report, and pointed out the effort could include other additional entities in the future. She said the Team identified six possible areas of opportunity and involved the operational staff managers to further analyze each area, including: Parks and Recreation, Fleet Services, Human Resources, Information Technology, Purchasing and Risk Management.

10:53 a.m.  Commissioner Jung temporarily left the meeting.

10:53 a.m.  Councilmember Smith returned to the meeting.

10:53 a.m.  Commissioner Galloway left the meeting.

10:55 a.m.  Councilmember Smith left the meeting.

10:56 a.m.  Commissioner Jung returned to the meeting.
Ms. Hill reviewed a list of possible shared opportunities identified within each of the six areas. She indicated the RSST Management Team would continue to meet to identify the resources needed to go forward, establish a timeline, set priorities, identify potential outcomes and results, and report back to the jurisdictions within six months.

Commissioner Jung suggested the addition of Senior Services and Regional Green Initiatives to the six areas of opportunity that were already identified. She said she was recently made aware it would cost about $150,000, (which would probably be reclaimed fairly rapidly), to hire staff to pursue reimbursement from agencies such as the Veterans Administration. She hoped the Team would look at the relative strengths of each of the entities under each area of opportunity. She wondered if Information Technology was looking at the use of common software.

Trustee Pullman said, although the WCSD did not fully overlap with the other entities, they appreciated being invited to participate and had a lot to contribute. She pointed out there was a WCSD staff member dedicated to conservation issues throughout the WCSD buildings, and the WCSD actually pioneered the use of geothermal heat exchange in some of its newer schools.

Chairman Larkin asked why roads were not included on the Team’s list of opportunities. Ms. Hill said she was not sure why roads were not on the list, but explained the Team unanimously selected the six areas because they offered the greatest opportunity for success in the near future. She said the Team would be happy to add roads to the list.

Mayor Cashell expressed concern about a six-month timeline and suggested 90 days was more appropriate. He stated it was possible the 2009 Legislature would make shared services a mandate. Mr. McNeely observed that, although there was a six-month plan, the Team anticipated that a number of things could be accomplished much sooner. He emphasized the Team was trying to focus on items that could be brought back to the entities in a comprehensive manner, rather than biting off everything at once. Mayor Cashell hoped the Team would come back with specifics for each item. Mr. McNeely agreed, but cautioned there were fewer staff people to do the work being undertaken due to economic constraints.

Councilmember Sferrazza suggested the members from each jurisdiction select one project and work with staff and legal counsel to make recommendations to their respective agencies. She offered to put an item on the Reno City Council agenda to have a subcommittee focus on one issue.

Ms. Singlaub indicated the Team wanted specific and direct guidance from the elected officials, and the intent today was to have the bodies adopt and give direction for a work plan to be implemented over the next six months. She said appointing representatives from the elected bodies would result in Open Meeting Law requirements to prepare agendas, notices and minutes. She suggested staff could
accomplish more work in a more expedient manner if the bodies were to adopt a work plan and hold staff accountable to get it done and report back. Mayor Cashell agreed.

Commissioner Weber suggested the Team put together a list of when meetings were to be held on certain topics, so officials could stop by if there was something of interest to them. She pointed out she did not have a copy of the written staff report in front of her and suggested it would have been helpful to have one.

No further action was taken on this item.

08-406 AGENDA ITEM 11

Agenda Subject: “Briefing relative to the roles of the various entities in the provision of Senior Services, discussion and potential direction to staff. (All Entities)”

11:15 a.m. Councilmember Sferrazza temporarily left the meeting.

11:16 a.m. Councilmember Gustin temporarily left the meeting.

Grady Tarbutton, Director of Washoe County Senior Services, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, which was placed on file with the County Clerk. He said there was a strategic planning goal to engage the entire community in discussing how to deal with the aging population. He indicated he would present some strategies that allowed collaboration and pointed out there was already ongoing collaboration between the three jurisdictions. For example, he stated the Reno Parks and Recreation Department, Sparks Parks and Recreation Department and Washoe County Senior Services put together 70 events for seniors in the community to be held over the course of a single month.

11:17 a.m. Councilmember Gustin returned to the meeting.

Mr. Tarbutton reviewed the goals of the Washoe County Senior Services strategic plan. He talked about the County services and programs already in place for seniors. He pointed out the senior population was expected to grow from 67,000 today to 75,000 in 2011 and 100,000 by the year 2020, which represented 20 percent of the entire population. He indicated partnerships would be required in order to prevent institutionalization, create opportunities for volunteers, and generate cost savings among the agencies. He stated there was an average cost of $211 per day for long-term care in Nevada during 2008 and community-based care for seniors received a reduction in services during the last legislative session. He referred to a model developed by the National Association of Area Agencies on Aging, entitled “A Blueprint for an Aging Society.” He also referred to “Aging in Place: A Toolkit for Local Governments,” which was developed by the Atlanta Regional Commission. He discussed the issues and needs of aging seniors and what was meant by “aging in place.”

11:24 a.m. Councilmember Sferrazza returned to the meeting.
Mr. Tarbutton displayed a chart showing the anticipated growth of the senior population from 2008 to 2025. He noted at least 50 percent of those aged 85 or older would need some form of assistance with their activities of daily living. He commented that senior issues were not always considered in all forms of community planning. He outlined a list summarizing the direction given to staff by the Board of County Commissioners at their April 2008 Retreat.

11:26 a.m. Councilmember Zadra left the meeting.

Mr. Tarbutton reviewed several best practices and policies that supported the County’s emerging vision for lifelong communities and aging in place. He talked about the New Columbia planned community in Portland, Oregon as an example of best practices in planning. He said staff put together a grid of the numerous places seniors had to go when applying for food stamps, Medicaid and County services, which demonstrated the need to link organizations. He emphasized the importance of civic engagement among volunteers, advocates and all segments of the community. Mr. Tarbutton provided a copy of the Strategic Plan for Washoe County Senior Citizens from 2006-2016, which was placed on file with the County Clerk.

Commissioner Jung asked what it would cost for the County to hire a veteran’s services officer. Mr. Tarbutton said he did not have an exact figure, but estimated $150,000 for two staff members and a clerk. Commissioner Jung wondered if staff would look at the business case and come back with an estimate of how much money could be reclaimed by pursuing such a program. Mr. Tarbutton cautioned that a veteran’s services officer had to be certified by the federal Veteran’s Administration, which could take up to two years. Commissioner Jung asked if it was possible to recruit certified individuals. Mr. Tarbutton said he spoke with Tim Tetz, Executive Director of the Nevada Office of Veteran Services, who was willing to work with the agencies and help in any way he could.

Councilmember Sferrazza stated Councilmember Aiazzi was interested in a partnership and would advocate for partial funding at the City of Reno if Washoe County and the City of Sparks could also agree.

No action was taken on this item.
There being no further business to come before the joint bodies, on motion by Commissioner Jung, seconded by Chairman Larkin, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Galloway, Councilmember Aiazzi, Councilmember Dortch, Councilmember Zadra, Councilmember Carrigan, Councilmember Mayer, Councilmember Salerno, Councilmember Smith, Trustee Clark, Trustee Ruggiero and Trustee Porter absent, the meeting was adjourned.
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Pending Board Approval
The Commission, Board, and Councils convened at 8:33 a.m. in joint session in the Commission Chambers of the Washoe County Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada, with Sparks Mayor Geno Martini presiding. Also present were Washoe County Manager Katy Simon, Washoe County Special Assistant District Attorney Melanie Foster, Washoe County Clerk Amy Harvey, Reno Chief of Staff Donna
Dreska, Reno Chief Deputy City Attorney Tracy Chase, Reno City Clerk Lynnette Jones, Sparks City Manager Shaun Carey, Sparks City Attorney Chet Adams, Sparks City Clerk Linda Patterson, Washoe County School District Superintendent Paul Dugan, and Washoe County School District Lead General Counsel Randy Drake. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerks called the roll for their respective entities, and the following business was conducted:

08-845 AGENDA ITEM 4

Agenda Subject: “Approval of the agenda for the Reno and Sparks City Councils, the Washoe County School District and the Washoe County Commission Joint Meeting of August 18, 2008.”

On motion by Councilmember Gustin, seconded by Councilmember Zadra, which motion duly carried with Councilmembers Aiazzi, Sferrazza, Carrigan, and Schmitt absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 4 be approved.

The Washoe County Commission and the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees did not approve the Agenda Item 4 due to the lack of a quorum.

08-846 AGENDA ITEM 5

Agenda Subject: “Public Comment (three-minute time limit per person) – (Additional Public Comment on specific agenda items will be limited to three-minute time limit per person after each agenda item and must be related to the specific agenda item.) Comments to be addressed to the Chair of the meeting and to the Reno and Sparks City Councils, Washoe County School District, and the Washoe County Commission as a whole.”

Shirley Bertschinger stated Charter Communications was planning on moving the local government channels to the digital tier. She said that would mean they would no longer be available to basic cable subscribers, which would especially impact senior citizens. She pleaded with the elected officials to take the steps necessary to right this wrong being perpetrated on their constituents by Charter Communications.

*8:36 a.m.* Councilmembers Aiazzi and Schmitt arrived at the meeting.

08-847 AGENDA ITEM 6

Agenda Subject: “Approval of the minutes for the Joint Meeting of February 11, 2008, between the Washoe County Commission, Reno City Council, Sparks City Council and Washoe County School District Board of Trustees.”

For the City of Reno, on motion by Councilmember Dortch, seconded by Councilmember Zadra, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Sferrazza absent, Mayor Cashell ordered that Agenda Item 6 be approved.
For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Salerno, seconded by Councilmember Smith, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Carrigan absent, Mayor Martini ordered that Agenda Item 6 be approved.

The Washoe County Commission and the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees did not approve Agenda Item 6 due to the lack of a quorum.

08-848 AGENDA ITEM 7

**Agenda Subject:** “Update and possible discussion on Washoe County School District Financing/Bond Issues. (Washoe County School District)”

Perry DiLoreto said the Legislature appointed a commission to study the Washoe County School District’s funding issues, which included four elected officials and eleven citizens, after deciding that the citizens of Washoe County should find their own solutions to those funding issues. He noted the citizens appointed represented teachers, parents, businesses, labor, development, the power company and the Reno Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority (RSCVA).

Mr. DiLoreto stated he was skeptical in the beginning about the funding problems, because there never seemed to be enough money available for schools. He explained as a developer, he made sure schools were provided to handle the future demand due to an increasing population. He said it became clear early on in the process that the issue was not about new schools but about existing schools, which were not in good shape. He said the issue for the students was to be warm, dry, safe, and connected with respect to technology. He stated he was offended by the disparity that existed, and he discussed some of the problems that older schools were experiencing.

Mr. DiLoreto explained that private enterprise was required by law to set up reserves to take care of maintenance if a developer established a common area community. He noted the school system did not have such a requirement nor did they have the money to address it if they did. He said hard choices had to be made when there were not adequate funds to go around, which usually meant postponing maintenance.

Mr. DiLoreto felt the Commission did a very thorough job of examining the need and the cost. He said they also challenged the School District and its technical and construction people to validate their processes and to convince the Commission that they were up to the task of spending large sums of money on renovations, and he noted the Commission was satisfied with their response.

Mr. DiLoreto stated the Commission next addressed determining where the money would come from in this troubled economy. He felt waiting was not an option because children were suffering due to the disparity in conditions that existed among the schools. He advised it was determined a Question needed to be passed in November that would raise the sales tax by .25 percent and the government services tax by .50 percent to
do something about the issue. He noted the Commission voted unanimously to move this forward on all three aspects: the need, the cost, and where the money should come from. He said this Question was well thought out and deserved the support of every leader present in this room.

*8:44 a.m.* Commissioner Weber arrived at the meeting.

Ken Buhrman, Washoe Education Association (WEA) President, said he was speaking on behalf of the over 3,000 members of the WEA and other non-member faculty. He noted out of the 92 schools in the County, over 20 were over 50 years old and over half of the remaining schools were over 40 years old. He read several examples provided by teachers regarding classrooms that were wearing out. He said students deserved to have a clean, safe, dry, and warm environment in which to learn. He stated the support of Washoe County School District Question 1 was very important to bring every student’s classroom up to par with every other student’s classroom. He said it was unfair some students had comfort and technology while others did not.

*8:47 a.m.* Commissioner Galloway arrived.

Mr. Buhrman noted every other county in Nevada, besides Washoe County, had the ability to tax to help bring their schools up to par.

Mr. Buhrman advised interested citizens to go to the Question’s web site at www.yesonwcsd1.com for additional information. He said there would be a campaign kickoff on August 25, 2008 at 10:00 a.m. at Glen Duncan Elementary School and everyone was invited.

**AGENDA ITEM 8**

*Agenda Subject: “Presentation and discussion on the impact of State Budget Cuts on Washoe County School District Educational Programs and Operations. (Washoe County School District)”*

Paul Dugan, Washoe County School District Superintendent, conducted a PowerPoint presentation regarding the District’s budget reductions, which was placed on file with the County Clerk.

Mr. Dugan advised that the School District initially had to make a 4.5 percent reduction in its 2007-09 biennial budget and it was felt it was better to lose $63.5 million in State Program funding that was not yet awarded. He advised that amount would be deducted from the total amount statewide K-12 schools would have to return, which would lower how much each district would have take from their General Fund budget. He said by eliminating the $63.5 million in new funding, it would leave just over $29 million that the districts would have to cut statewide and $4 million that Washoe County would have to return to the State. He discussed the recommendations made to the Washoe County School District’s Board of Trustees on the proposed cuts. He stated the
districts were asked to make an additional 3.3 percent reduction in June. He said when that amount was added to the previous cut, it totaled a 7.8 percent cut to the General Fund budgets.

Mr. Dugan advised that State textbook funding was cut in half as a compromise to taking back the cost of living adjustment (COLA). He said because most of the districts, including Washoe County, had already negotiated the contracts, the districts would have been legally required to fund the COLA’s anyway. He advised that would have been a serious challenge.

Mr. Dugan said the continuing challenge was to prepare for the projected 14.5 percent budget reductions in the 2009-2011 biennium. He stated the Potential Budget Cuts slide showed what was being proposed to go before the Board of Trustees and the public with the goal of keeping an ending fund balance of between 2 and 4 percent. He felt wise planning by the Board and the hard work by the Business Department allowed the District to deal with this type of cut better than in years past. He acknowledged being fiscally prudent was paying off.

Mr. Dugan explained the 2009-2010 reductions were very tentative because the District did not know what its obligation was until the State determined what it would cut.

Mr. Dugan summarized that to date the District had returned the 4.5 percent and the half of the textbook funding as required by the State. He said the 3.3 percent cuts would be taken to the community for discussion in time for the District to take its recommendations to the Board prior to the State’s December deadline. He said it was hoped the economy would improve and there would be no need for the 14.5 percent budget reductions for 2009-2011. He said if the 14.5 percent cuts were required, it would have dire consequences for the District.

Commissioner Galloway asked what would be the baseline from which the 14.5 percent cut would be measured. Mr. Dugan replied he believed it was based on the 2007/08 original funding level, but he was finding it frustrating trying to get accurate and reliable responses to questions. He advised the 4.5 percent and 3.3 percent cuts would not count towards the 14.5 percent because they were in different bienniums.

Commissioner Galloway said he noted donations to the Administration Building Replacement Fund were deferred, and he asked if there was already some money in the fund. Mr. Dugan replied that approximately $3 million was set aside and that money would be taken out of the fund bringing the balance to zero.

In response to the call for public comment, Earl Ammerman suggested getting funding from items not tied to the market and which were not susceptible to changes in the economy. He offered several suggestions for alternate sources of funding.
Jonnie Pullman commented that the School District received funding from the State, which was being cut, to pay for the operation of the School District. She explained the money used to maintain the District’s buildings came from a different source. She said the assistance the public was being asked to provide would be directed towards the buildings, not to replenish the operating funds being cut by the State.

**AGENDA ITEM 4 AND AGENDA ITEM 6 – CONTINUED**

Commissioner Galloway said page 8 of the February 11, 2008 minutes did not state his question to which Chairman Larkin replied. He stated the question was, “was this motion for a unilateral contribution only from Washoe County without requirement of contributions from Reno and Sparks?” He noted the answer was correctly stated. He requested the question be added to the minutes because otherwise the response did not make any sense.

Due to having a quorum, on motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Humke absent, Chairman Larkin ordered that Agenda Items 4 and 6 be approved with the clarification to page 8 of the minutes.

08-850 **AGENDA ITEM 9**

**Agenda Subject:** “Presentation and report on progress and legislative matters by the Chairman and members of the Fairness in Reno Sparks Taxes (FIRST) Committee, (City of Sparks)”

Mike Sprinkle, Fairness in Reno-Sparks Taxes (FIRST) Blue Ribbon Task Force Chairman, discussed the composition of the Task Force that was created in December 2007 by the Reno and Sparks City Councils. He said the Task Force came up with three preliminary options after listening to the local governmental entities regarding their perspectives on the issues and to experts on the subject. He said the options were brought forward to meet the timeline for bill draft requests (BDR’s) for the 2009 Legislative Session.

Mr. Sprinkle read the FIRST Blue Ribbon Task Force’s preliminary recommendations for Legislative action that were attached to the staff report. He indicated it was anticipated there would be two more meetings prior to the Task Force having its formal proposals ready to present to the two City Councils. He said the proposals would include possible legislative actions and some things the Task Force believed might be outside of the Legislature’s scope.

Mr. Sprinkle noted the public could go to firstrenosparks.com for additional information.

Commissioner Galloway discussed the proposals and asked if the proposals would just take money from one entity and shift it to other entities in various
proportions. Mr. Sprinkle acknowledged there were certain aspects where that was true, but he did not believe that all of the proposals amounted to that.

Commissioner Galloway asked if Mr. Sprinkle agreed that there were only two significant services, street maintenance and the Sheriff’s patrol, that the unincorporated area received that it did not pay for separately. Mr. Sprinkle said he did not necessarily agree with that because there were other shared services. Commissioner Galloway asked why there would be a need to do anything else if they were somehow funded separately. Mr. Sprinkle said he did not believe the Task Force was suggesting to the County or the City Councils how to go about spending their money.

Commissioner Galloway felt the source collection of sales tax was a step backwards in time because it led to sales tax wars all over California where one redevelopment agency subsidized projects to steal sales tax from another local entity. He said it happened mostly between cities and, if this was done, it would create a sales tax war between the cities of Reno and Sparks.

08-851 AGENDA ITEM 10

Agenda Subject: “Update on the status of staff efforts, discussion and possible direction on efforts to pursue Regional Shared Services by the Regional Shared Services Team. (Regional Shared Services Team)”

Steve Driscoll, City of Sparks Assistant City Manager, said the Regional Shared Services Team presented its initial report at the May 12, 2008 joint meeting. He stated there were six functions that were identified for an initial survey, and the charter on May 12th was to look at collaborating on the increased demand for services without having the funds. He explained the staff report included a list of all the things being done collaboratively between the County and the two Cities with some being consolidated from the standpoint of one entity working on behalf of the others. He stated based on the meeting of May 12th, the discussion was expanded to include the Washoe County School District and those discussions were just getting started. He noted there was no underpinning obligation that any entity would be forced to do anything they did not voluntarily want to deal with even though the four entities were working together.

Mr. Driscoll highlighted what was being worked on within Fleet Services, Human Resources, Information Technology, Parks and Recreation, Purchasing, and Risk Management as documented in Pages 2-9 of the staff report.

Chairman Larkin said the Sheriff’s Office suggested the Board of County Commissioners look at leasing vehicles, and he asked if the Managers had considered doing that and was it being factored into the Fleet Management portion. Mr. Driscoll replied the entities acquired their rolling stock in different ways. The City of Sparks had been leasing its fire apparatus for almost a decade. He said a recent newspaper report indicated it was more cost effective for the City of Reno to acquire the rolling stock rather than lease because of the current financial situation. He said Fleet staff continued
to work with Finance when making major or periodic purchases and leasing versus acquisition was being factored in based on what the financing market looked like at the time.

Chairman Larkin noted lease/purchase options were available particularly for large equipment. He asked if the group could come back with some generalized standards that would provide some guidance to the four entities on those options and what role a centralized general services administration could play.

Chairman Larkin advised the County had not yet filled the Human Resources position, so he did not know what the recommendation would be. He said he was very supportive of moving forward with consolidating the Human Resources Departments in some capacity. He stated he would appreciate the subcommittee taking that to either each entity individually or to bring it back to the next joint meeting.

Chairman Larkin thanked the Managers and Assistant Managers for all of the work they put into this effort.

Mayor Cashell noted the Parks study was not a complete study of the whole Parks Department structure. He felt there should be a greater focus on Interlocal Agreements for Purchasing, Parks, Information Technology, and so on to eliminate duplication because, for example, one Purchasing Department should be able to handle the whole system. Mr. Driscoll said it was found, using Human Resources as an example, that the managers were working managers and collaborative efforts were being done to maximize and extend the capacities available today, which was why centralizing the management function was being examined. He acknowledged the Parks study was not comprehensive and the Team would decide what still needed to be looked at.

Mayor Cashell said he was not criticizing anyone because a great job was being done, but he felt in this economy the entities should consider not replacing someone who left, and bring the Department under one organization. He stated it had already been done and he felt Interlocal Agreements, merging or consolidation, would save a lot of money if everyone started doing things together. Mayor Martini commented the term being used was shared services.

Commissioner Weber asked if the Parks Departments had considered working with the School District regarding operation of their sports fields because there were people in many communities who would like to utilize those fields. She noted the County had a maintenance yard at the North Valleys Regional Park, and she felt the County should work with the School District and the City of Reno on park maintenance. She also asked if it had been considered using the Roads Department to remove snow on all of the roads in the area.

Commissioner Weber agreed with Mayor Cashell that it was a matter of urgency that every tax dollar needed to be used efficiently during these economic times.
She indicated everyone was doing a great job, but some things needed to move forward quickly.

Mr. Driscoll said there was a current Interlocal Agreement regarding snow removal. He stated during the October-November timeframe, the equipment would be examined and the maps would be updated so everything would be ready to be deployed. He noted there was a predetermined set of routes that had been in place for several years and which worked during the last big snow event in 2004/2005. He said the plan had been revamped twice since then and would be revamped each time there was a snow situation.

Mr. Driscoll stated regarding Commissioner Weber’s question on parks, he said there was an agreement between the City of Sparks and the Washoe County School District for the City of Sparks to provide the majority of the maintenance for the playing fields at the schools. He noted the Sparks Youth Sports Foundation was responsible for the scheduling of all playable fields, regardless of whether they were in the City, State or County facilities. He noted the City of Reno had a similar situation with the City having a centralized source for scheduling.

Mr. Driscoll advised that having single maintenance yards in the outlying areas was something that was being studied. He said he would bring that issue to the Public Works staff for a formal response.

Councilmember Hascheff noted the tasks in the staff report contained information regarding the status and the next step, but no timelines. He asked if staff was looking for direction regarding an Interlocal Agreement so the timelines and the critical paths could be brought back regarding the shared services that could be done in 2008, those that could be done in 2009, and so on. Mr. Driscoll responded the next step for staff would be to develop the action plans and to attach smart goals. He confirmed some areas might require Interlocal Agreements, and as those came up they would be worked as quickly as possible. He acknowledged that because of budget constraints, solutions need to be found now as to what would be sustainable and doable. He said it had been suggested that some type of narrative could be brought to the Commission, Councils, and Board individually without having to bring it to the joint meeting so everyone would be aware of what was being done in a timelier manner.

After further discussion, Mr. Driscoll confirmed there would be a shared services update at the next joint meeting.

Mayor Cashell said he hoped any Interlocal Agreements that could be done for shared services would be done before the next Legislative session because he felt there would be a mandate out of the Legislature that the local entities share services immediately or the Legislature would do it for the entities.
AGENDA ITEM 11

Agenda Subject: “Update, discussion and possible direction from staff on Regional Homeless Services issues and opportunities. (City of Reno)”

Jodi Royal-Goodwin, City of Reno Community Reinvestment Manager, conducted a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Homeless Summit held on July 22, 2008. A copy of the presentation was placed on file with the County Clerk.

Trustee Pullman said she assumed that no Interlocal Agreement was needed for the School District to provide educational services to the children located in the Community Assistance Center (CAC) or referred to the CAC because of the Children in Transition program. Ms. Royal-Goodwin said it would not be necessary and the focus of the proposed Interlocal Agreement was the funding and the management of the contracts for operating the facilities.

Mayor Martini asked if staff needed any further direction. Ms. Royal-Goodwin replied not at this time.

Mayor Cashell asked about the status of the Interlocal Agreements for the Health Access Washoe County (HAWC) Outreach Clinic, the Clothes Closet, and so on so they could be moved into the CAC. Ms. Royal-Goodwin replied the Interlocal Agreements were on schedule. She said the Interlocal that authorized executing the leases for the tenants would be brought before the Reno City Council the week of September 10th and the subsequent week for the City of Sparks and the County.

Mayor Cashell commented why it took so long to establish a nonprofit. He said the HAWC clinic, the Clothes Closet, and ReStart services would be moved in and available by the shelter’s opening. He said it was hoped the Women’s and Family Shelter would be open, even partially, by October. He explained Charles McNeely, City of Reno Manager, introduced him to a gentleman who contributed $200,000 to go along with the $100,000 already available, which came close to making up the shortfall.

In response to the call for public comment, Michael Ford, Catholic Community Services of Northern Nevada Executive Director, said Catholic Community Services supported the recommendations presented today, and he urged action be taken today to adopt them.

Patrick O’Brien said as a Reno Police Officer he worked the streets and his office was at 315 Record Street. He stated a few years ago he got his name in the New Yorker Magazine because he figured out when the homeless population was not dealt with it cost a great deal of money, which was happening right now. He felt if there was not strong leadership and someone taking point, then everyone would have to continue to adapt and law enforcement would continue to be put into situations it should not be. He said law enforcement personnel being social workers was not a good situation for them or
the community. He asked the recommendations presented by Ms. Royal-Goodwin be backed.

Pam Becker agreed management of the CAC could be provided by a nonprofit agency, but there should be continuous involvement by the County and by the Cities of Reno and Sparks. She said she saw the CAC as being similar to other groups, such as the Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitor’s Authority (RSCVA) and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), which affect the whole community. She noted all of these groups had other entities that ran them on a day-to-day basis, but they also had elected officials sitting on their Boards to provide oversight. She stated it was recognized during the Homeless Summit there was a need for a non-profit to run the CAC because it would be difficult, if not impossible, for local governments to write grants and accept donations. She noted two funds were set up with the Community Foundation that were dedicated to accepting funds for the homeless population and the activities of the CAC and she felt a better job should be done of telling the public about those funds being available.

Mayor Martini asked if action needed to be taken on this item. Melanie Foster, Legal Council for Washoe County, said the three entities needed to vote to take action on the recommended action in the staff report.

For the City of Reno, on motion by Councilmember Aiazzi, seconded by Councilmember Dortch, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Sferrazza absent, Mayor Cashell ordered that the areas of consensus be accepted and the City of Reno serve as the lead for the CAC operation and oversight through an Interlocal Agreement that would expire on June 30, 2009.

For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Salerno, seconded by Councilmember Mayer, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Carrigan absent, Mayor Martini ordered that the areas of consensus be accepted and the City of Reno serve as the lead for the CAC operation and oversight through an Interlocal Agreement that would expire on June 30, 2009.

For the Washoe County Commission, on motion by Commissioner Weber, seconded by Commissioner Jung, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Humke absent, Chairman Larkin ordered that the areas of consensus be accepted and the City of Reno serve as the lead for the CAC operation and oversight through an Interlocal Agreement that would expire on June 30, 2009.

08-853 AGENDA ITEM 12

Agenda Subject: “Consideration and possible approval by each agency of the Bi-Annual Legislative Cooperation Memorandum and update of each Agency’s Legislative Program (Washoe County)”
Patricia Rogers, Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency Government Relations-Community Outreach Representative, said the staff report included the Memorandum of Legislative Cooperation that was approved by the Regional Planning Governing Board on July 24, 2008. She noted the Memorandum had been in place for several years, but there was one text change requested by the Washoe County Health District, which was to change its name from Washoe County Health Department to the Washoe County Health District.

Ms. Rogers said the intent of the Memorandum was to provide cooperation and unity where possible and disclosure of opposing platforms and differences as soon as possible. She advised that staff and contract lobbyists meet frequently in informal meetings to do this.

For the City of Reno, on motion by Councilmember Hascheff, seconded by Councilmember Zadra, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Sferrazza absent, Mayor Cashell ordered that Agenda Item 12 be approved.

For the City of Sparks, on motion by Councilmember Schmitt, seconded by Councilmember Salerno, which motion duly carried with Councilmember Carrigan absent, Mayor Martini ordered that Agenda Item 12 be approved.

For the Washoe County Commission, on motion by Commissioner Galloway, seconded by Commissioner Weber, which motion duly carried with Commissioner Humke absent, Chairman Larkin ordered that Agenda Item 12 be approved.

Trustee Price advised this Memorandum would be brought forward at the Washoe County School District's Board of Trustees meeting on August 26, 2008.

Commissioner Weber noted the May 12th joint meeting minutes were not part of today’s meeting packet and it would be helpful to have the most current minutes available. Amy Harvey, County Clerk, said her staff did get behind due to the Board of Equalization meetings and the 1,700 appeals. She apologized and said she would try to make them available in a timelier fashion.
10:15 a.m. On motion by Councilmember Aiazzi, seconded by Councilmember Gustin, the meeting was adjourned.
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STAFF REPORT
May 11, 2009

To: Reno City Council, Sparks City Council and Washoe County Commission
Thru: Charles McNeely, Reno City Manager
From: Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Community Reinvestment Manager
Re: Update, Discussion and Possible Direction to Staff Regarding Community Assistance Center Operations and Oversight

Summary: Since opening in October, operations of the Community Assistance Center (CAC) have become calmer. In addition, we have created a day area and campus perimeter, completed tenant improvements for the Children’s Cabinet, and continued to deal with the issues of service resistant clients and the interface with the surrounding neighborhood. Staff has also investigated the feasibility of a new non-profit assuming CAC management and oversight responsibilities.

We are now in the final quarter of Fiscal Year (FY) 2008-2009 and staff requires direction on the following issues:

A. Long-term oversight and managements;
B. Renewal of the Cooperative Agreement for Services Related to the Operation of the Homeless Community Assistance Center Between the City of Reno, Washoe County and the City of Sparks; and
C. The FY 2009-2010 Budget.

It is recommended that the elected bodies:
A. Approve staff continuing to work with Volunteers of America (VoA) to determine feasibility of transferring operations and management;
B. Direct the renewal of the Cooperative Agreement with the City of Reno continuing as the lead entity through FY 2009-2010 or until such time as oversight and management can be transferred to a non-profit, whichever occurs first; and
C. Support the current estimated funding by each jurisdiction.

Previous Actions at Joint Meetings:
March 2005 3 jurisdictions endorsed the formation of the 10-Year Plan Development Committee
February 5, 2007 Adoption of Housing for All: A Plan to End Homelessness
May 12, 2008 3 jurisdictions directed the Mayors, Commission Chair and managers to determine how the CAC would be operated
August 11, 2008

3 jurisdictions confirmed that the City of Reno would serve as the lead entity in an interlocal for the remainder of FY 08-09, opening the shelters and awarding contracts by October 2008, while the long-term operation model would be through a non-profit with on-going governmental oversight.

**Discussion:** In early September 2008 all three jurisdictions adopted the *Cooperative Agreement for operations of the Community Assistance Center* (CAC); the Agreement identified the City of Reno as the lead entity through June 30, 2009, funding commitments from each jurisdiction, and that staff would work together to transfer operations to a new non-profit.

Staff researched the requirements for developing a new non-profit that would assume management and oversight responsibility of the CAC. It would take at least a full year to establish and receive Internal Revenue Service approval in addition to requiring a minimum of $200,000 for minimal staff, a full-time director and an administrative assistant. It was recommended by knowledgeable professionals that, if possible, an existing non-profit with capacity, an appropriate structure, and mission assume this role.

During the first six months of operations the focus has been on resolving start-up and transition issues, while exploring the feasibility of models for long-term operations and management. Given that the VoA has substantial operations experience and organizational capacity and that they operate all three shelters it appeared a logical option to assume this management role while additional oversight is provided through an oversight committee and funding provided through a foundation or endowment. Staff has initiated discussions with VoA regarding this possibility and they are considering the request.

VoA was outstanding in staffing up and opening all three shelters within one month of the contract award. Adapting the model of services used in Sacramento, the organization has transitioned the men’s facility from a drop-in-center providing only sleeping accommodations to a program-based shelter that facilitates recovery from homelessness and requires client participation, as well as investing a substantial amount of their own agency resources to provide equipment and services to improve operations. Case management was also introduced in all the shelters, by VoA and Washoe County case workers, requiring all clients to participate. Staff from VoA has also been supportive of the City’s efforts to address service resistant clients and the neighborhood interface.

Reno staff continue to operate the Resource Center. Clients can receive mail; access phones, restrooms and internet services; obtain referrals to services; and attend scheduled classes and events. The day area also opened in late March providing a place for clients to “hang out” during the day that has shaded sitting areas, a drinking fountain, and restroom facilities. An alternative overflow has also been implemented on the campus to provide safe sleeping areas for the services resistant “campers” and individuals who cannot or will not access other shelters. Staff has continued to solicit assistance from service providers to meet the basic needs of these individuals with limited success.

The *Cooperative Agreement* executed by the three jurisdictions to open the CAC, and which identified Reno as the lead agency for oversight and management, will expire June 30, 2009.
unless it is renewed by each entity. In addition, the document identifies the funding commitments of each jurisdiction to the project. This Agreement enables the execution of operating and service contracts, without which the shelters will close. Without the renewal of the Agreement the City will be unable to execute FY 09-10 operating contracts or ensure adequate funding is secured.

The nine months of FY 2008-2009 CAC operations budget is approximately $1.57 million, funded by the cities of Reno and Sparks, Washoe County, and more than $500,000 in private donations. For FY 2009-2010 operations the budget is approaching $2.3 million. All three jurisdictions have indicated they will be continuing to support the CAC and some funding commitments have been made. The City of Reno has committed $337,690 and is considering allocating an additional $500,000. The Sparks City Council has allocated $25,000 to Resource Center operations, plus any carry over funds available at the end of FY 08-09.

County staff has said the anticipated County contribution is approximately $709,000, which will be acted upon during budget hearings. In addition, it is expected the dedication of three case workers will continue. Reno staff commitments for the Resource Center and maintenance will also continue.

The table below illustrates the CAC operating budget for FY 09-10 compared to the committed and estimated funding. At this time there is approximately a $710,000 funding gap.

### Estimated CAC Expenses & Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY09-10 full year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's, Women's &amp; Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Weather Overflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reno</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA 2 Housing Set-Aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washoe County</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigent Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protective Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sparks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Donations/Other Grants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Year Balance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City will be submitting an application for Emergency Food and Shelter Program funds available under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

**Fiscal Impact:** Shelter operations will continue to require funding in FY 09-10 and future years, even as responsibility is shifted to a non-profit entity.

**Areas of Consensus:** Staff from the three entities are in consensus on the following elements:
- the shelters provide necessary services that must continue to operate;
- the Cooperative Agreement should be renewed; and
- the City of Reno will continue to serve as the lead agency in operating the CAC through FY 09-10 or while efforts to transfer management and oversight to a non-profit continue.

Staff requests the three entities confirm these areas of consensus to solidify direction to staff.

**Areas to be Resolved:** Staff requests direction from the three entities on funding commitments and approval to proceed with transferring management and oversight to a capable and willing existing non-profit rather than creating a new entity.

Staff recommends the cooperative agreement be executed through June 30, 2010, with the City of Reno continuing to serve as the lead agency during this period or until such time as management and oversight is transferred to a non-profit, whichever is earlier.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends confirmation of the areas of consensus and direction on funding commitments for FY 09-10 CAC operations and renewing the Cooperative Agreement through June 30, 2010 with the City acting as lead entity until such time as management and oversight can be transferred to a non-profit.

**Proposed Motion:** I move the areas of consensus be accepted and the Cooperative Agreement be renewed with the City of Reno serving as the lead through June 30, 2010 or transfer to a non-profit is completed.
STAFF REPORT
Joint Meeting Date: May 11, 2009

To: Washoe County Commission, Reno City Council, Sparks City Council, and Washoe County School District (WCSD)
Through: Shaun Carey, Sparks City Manager
From: Steven Hull, Assistant Superintendent Public Affairs, WCSD
Presenter: Barbara Clark, President, WCSD Board of Trustees
Re: Update on the selection of the new WCSD Superintendent
Date: April 27, 2009

Summary: On August 1, 2009, Superintendent Paul Dugan will retire after serving five years as Superintendent and 31 years as a Nevada educator, including 26 years in the WCSD. Since Mr. Dugan’s announcement that he would retire, the Board of Trustees has conducted a comprehensive search for a new Superintendent. This report will update the Joint Meeting members on the status of this search.

Previous Actions at Joint Meetings: None

Background: Immediately following Superintendent Dugan’s announcement that he would retire, the Board of Trustees initiated the process for recruiting and selecting a new Superintendent. This process was comprehensive and initially included seven Town Hall Meetings to solicit community and staff input regarding the skills and attributes they wanted in a new Superintendent. This input was solicited through written feedback collected at the Town Halls and through an online survey, and was used by the Board when they reviewed the initial applications that led to the selection position finalists.

The finalists were interviewed in Reno the week of April 20th. Each interview with the Board was public and made available later online. In addition, a five minute recording of the candidate was posted on the District’s website for viewing by those who could not attend the public events.

While in Reno, the finalists met with WCSD’s staff and the public. Additional input was solicited from all stakeholders and this input was used to help determine what candidates would receive site visits. This is the status of the process as of this date (April 27, 2009). President Clark will provide additional background information and update the Joint Meeting participants on the latest news regarding the search.
**Fiscal Impact:** None for the Joint Meeting participants.

**Areas of Consensus:** N/A

**Areas to be Resolved:** N/A

**Recommendation:** None. This is an information item.

**Proposed Motion:** None. This is an information item.
To: Washoe County Commission, Reno City Council, Sparks City Council, and Washoe County School District (WCSD)

Through: Shaun Carey, Sparks City Manager

From: Steven Hull, Assistant Superintendent Public Affairs, WCSD

Presenter: Mark Stanton, Assistant Superintendent Capital Projects and Facilities, WCSD

Re: The WCSD continues to revitalize and renew existing facilities using funding provided by the 2002 Rollover Bond. This presentation will provide information to the Joint Meeting participants about projects that will be initiated in the near future.

Date: April 27, 2009

Summary: Since the voters passed the 2002 Rollover Bond over $308,000,000 have been spent on constructing new schools, adding on to existing schools, updating and expanding the District’s technology infrastructure and renewing and revitalizing existing buildings. This report provides information on the latest renewal and revitalization projects being undertaken throughout the District.

Previous Actions at Joint Meetings: None

Background: Over $98,788,000 dollars from the 2002 Rollover Bond have been invested in older school improvements since 2003. Several projects have been in the planning stages and will be initiated this summer. Another bond sale of approximately $50,000,000 will occur in the near future and it will be focused on capital renewal and revitalization projects and technology upgrades.

Capital “renewal” is defined as the replacement of existing building systems, furnishings and site improvements to restore or maintain their original functionality. Examples include the replacement of roofs, asphalt and concrete and HVAC equipment. “Revitalization” involves the enhancement or a building or site and includes additions, alterations, restorations or other improvements that ensure all buildings meet specific standards that are consistent throughout the District. Both of these initiatives are essential to maintain and preserve the significant public investment in building infrastructure; to provide all student equivalent learning environments and facilities with respect to these facilities being warm, technologically
connected, safe and dry; and to ensure these environments give our children every learning advantage so that they will successfully compete in a globally competitive world.

**Fiscal Impact:** No fiscal impact on the Joint Meeting participants as a group. The WCSD will invest $86,000,000 over the next 18 months in the community’s/County’s educational infrastructure improving these facilities. In addition, significant job creating will occur as a consequence.

**Areas of Consensus:** N/A

**Areas to be Resolved:** N/A

**Recommendation:** None. This is an information item.

**Proposed Motion:** None. This is an information item.
DATE:        April 29, 2009
TO:          Board of County Commissioners
FROM:        Kimberly H. Robinson, Planning Manager
            Ph: 775.328.3602
            e-mail: krobinson@washoecounty.us
            Lisa Brosnan, Planner
            Ph: 775.328.3668
            e-mail: lbrosnan@washoecounty.us
            Kelly Mullin, Planner
            Ph: 775.328.6187
            e-mail: kmullin@washoecounty.us

THROUGH:     Adrian P. Freund, FAICP, Director

SUBJECT:     LDC09-00037 (Echeverria Silver Lake Property) - This is a request for a Comprehensive/Master Plan Amendment within the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP) from: GR (General Rural)-RSCJP on ±289.6 acres to: OS (Open Space)-RSCJP on ±219.09 acres, I (Industrial)-RSCJP on ±66.47 acres and HDR (High Density Rural) - RSCJP on ±4 acres. The ±289.6 acre site is located on the east side of Red Rock Road, ±1,450 feet north of the Red Rock Road/Moya Boulevard intersection. This project is located in a Joint Planning Area and Cooperative Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the Reno City Council and the Washoe County Commission. The property is identified as having a designation of SP (Specific Plan) in Washoe County's North Valleys Land Use Plan Map (Map 3 of the RSCJP). It is identified as having a designation of SPA (Special Planning Area) in the City of Reno's Land Use Plan, a portion of the City of Reno's Master Plan. The current land use is listed as GR (General Rural) in the RSCJP Planned Land Use Map (Map 4). The hearing may also include an appeal of the decisions made by the Joint Planning Commissions of Washoe County and the City of Reno regarding this project, per the Washoe County Development Code. APN: 090-030-02; 090-040-02 & 03
            (Commission District 5)

AGENDA ITEM # ______
SUMMARY

This is a request for the Board of County Commissioners, in conjunction with the Reno City Council, to review the above request. The properties are located within the city limits of Reno. However, since they are also located within the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan boundaries (a joint planning area), any amendments require approval by both the City of Reno and Washoe County.

**County Priority/Goal supported by this item:** Responsible growth management

**Commission District Affected:** Commission District 5

PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION

*Board of County Commissioners:* None

*Planning Commission:* This item will be heard by the Planning Commissions of Washoe County and the City of Reno during a joint meeting on Wednesday, May 6, 2009. A verbal update regarding the outcome of that meeting will be provided to you at the hearing on May 11, 2009.

BACKGROUND

The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan is located wholly within the North Valleys planning area and has been designated by the 1996 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan as an area to be jointly planned by both Washoe County and the City of Reno. Any proposed amendments to the plan must be approved by the Planning Commissions of both Reno and Washoe County, as well as the Board of County Commissioners and the Reno City Council.

As the project is located within Reno’s city limits, the City of Reno is responsible for sponsoring the application and conducting a full analysis of potential impacts. A copy of their staff report has been attached for your review. Washoe County’s comments regarding the proposal are attached to Reno’s staff report.

Staff recommends that the Commission review the City of Reno’s staff report and the other attachments regarding this project and determine whether to approve or deny the project based upon the findings listed below.

The findings listed in the City of Reno’s staff report are findings required by their code, and are to be considered by the Reno City Council. The findings listed in the Washoe County staff report are required by the Washoe County Development Code, and are to be considered by the Washoe County Commission. In order to approve or deny the project, each governing body must make its own respective set of findings.

There is some possibility that the decision of the Planning Commissions during their joint meeting on May 6, 2009 will be appealed. If this is the case, the hearing on May 11, 2009 will be an appeal regarding the project. If an appeal is submitted, additional information, including possible motions, will be provided to you at or before the hearing.
CAB Comments

The proposed project was initially reviewed by the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board at their December 8, 2008 meeting. Questions were addressed regarding traffic and flood issues. The applicant was asked to return to the CAB to address any changes in the application and to provide updates on negotiations with the Nature Conservancy regarding the property. The CAB did not take any action.

The project was heard again at the North Valley CAB’s April 6, 2009 meeting. A brief discussion took place regarding the community value of the proposed open space. The CAB voted to recommend approval of the project.

Copies of the minutes from both meetings are attached for your reference.

FISCAL IMPACT

No projected fiscal impact for the County.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Washoe County Commission review the City of Reno’s staff report and the other attachments regarding this project and determine whether to approve or deny the project based upon the findings listed below.

POSSIBLE MOTIONS

APPROVAL

“I move that the Board of County Commissioners approves LDC09-00037 for the Echeverria Group, amendments to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan, having made at least one of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.820.15:

1. Consistency with Comprehensive Plan. That the proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the North Valleys Area Plan and Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan;

2. Compatible Land Uses. That the proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare;

3. Response to Changed Conditions. That the proposed amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land;
4. **No Adverse Effects.** That the proposed amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan; and

5. **Desired Pattern of Growth.** That the proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.”

AND

“I move that the Board of County Commissioners authorizes the Chair to sign the Resolution for the updated joint plan after a determination of conformance with the Regional Plan by the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency.”

DENIAL

I move that the Board of County Commissioners denies LDC09-00037 for the Echeverria Group, amendments to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan, having made at least one of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.820.15:

1. **Consistency with Comprehensive Plan.** That the proposed amendment is not in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the North Valleys Area Plan and Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan;

2. **Compatible Land Uses.** That the proposed amendment would result in land uses which are incompatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and would adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare;

3. **Response to Changed Conditions.** That the proposed amendment does not identify and respond to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment does not represent a more desirable utilization of land;

4. **No Adverse Effects.** That the proposed amendment will adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan; and

5. **Desired Pattern of Growth.** That the proposed amendment does not promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County. The proposed amendment does not guide development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.

KR/KM
Attachments:  
A. Planning Commission Staff Report, Dated April 24, 2009  
B. City of Reno Staff Report for LDC09-00037, Dated May 6, 2009  
C. Minutes from North Valleys CAB Meeting, Dated April 15, 2009  
D. Minutes from North Valleys CAB Meeting, Dated December 8, 2008  
E. Proposed Resolution for LDC09-00037  

c:  
David Childs, Assistant County Manager  
Adrian P. Freund, Director  
Nathan J. Edwards, Deputy District Attorney  
Kimberly H. Robinson, Planning Manager
STAFF REPORT
May 11, 2009

To: Reno City Council and Washoe County Commission
Thru: Charles McNeely, City Manager
From: John Hester, AICP, Community Development Director
       Claudia C. Hanson, AICP, Deputy Community Development Director
Re: LDC09-00037 (Echeverria Silver Lake Property)
Date: May 1, 2009

Summary: This is a request for a Master Plan Amendment (within the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan) from: General Rural - Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan (GR-RSCJP) on ±289.6 acres to: OS (Open Space)-RSCJP on ±219.09 acres, I (Industrial)-RSCJP on ±66.47 acres and HDR (High density Rural) - RSCJP on ±4 acres. The City of Reno base Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same. The ±289.6 acre site is located on the east side of Red Rock Road, ±1,450 feet north of the Red Rock Road/Moya Boulevard intersection. The property is currently zoned GR (General Rural) per the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan. This project is located in a Joint Planning Area and Cooperative Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions.

Proposed Motion: I move to uphold the recommendation of the Reno City Planning Commission and the Washoe County Planning Commission.

Please see attached staff report.
CITY OF RENO
Planning Commission
May 6, 2009
Staff Report

CASE NO.: LDC09-00037 (Echeverria Silver Lake Property)

APPLICANT: Echeverria Group

APN NUMBER: 090-030-02; 090-040-02 & 03

REQUEST: This is a request for a Master Plan Amendment (within the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan) from: General Rural - Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan (GR-RSCJP) on ±289.6 acres to: OS (Open Space)-RSCJP on ±219.09 acres, I (Industrial)-RSCJP on ±66.47 acres and HDR (High density Rural) - RSCJP on ±4 acres. The City of Reno base Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same.

LOCATION: The ±289.6 acre site is located on the east side of Red Rock Road, ±1,450 feet north of the Red Rock Road/Moya Boulevard intersection. The property is currently zoned GR (General Rural) per the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan. This project is located in a Joint Planning Area and Cooperative Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions.

PROPOSED MOTION: Based upon compliance with the applicable findings, I move to recommend that City Council approve the amendment to the Master Plan by resolution, subject to conformance review by the Regional Planning Agency.

BACKGROUND:

The site is located in the Reno-Stead Joint Corridor Plan (RSJCP) which has a general Master Plan land use designation of Special Planning Area (SPA). The Planned Land Use designation for the site is General Rural (GR).

Because the property is located within the RSJCP a joint review and hearing by the Reno/Washoe County Community Development staffs and the Reno/Washoe County Planning Commissions is conducted. Comments received from Washoe County staff are attached with City staff responses (Exhibit A).
With the exception of one single family residence located on the southeast corner, the site is vacant. The site is relatively flat and slopes from southwest to north/northeast into the Silver Lake Playa. According to the Technical Survey provided with the application, the site contains four regionally significant hydrologic resources (SHR). The first consists of the Silver Lake Playa which comprises approximately 73% of the site (±212 acres) and includes the area within 50 feet of the ordinary high water mark of the Silver Lake Playa. This area is proposed to be maintained as Open Space. The second SHR consists of an existing stock watering pond located on the southwest side of the site, which is also proposed to be maintained as Open Space (±6.78 acres). The third area consists of a major drainageway which enters the site from the south approximately 1,400 feet east of Red Rock Road. The drainageway runs north for ±550 feet where the channel terminates into an alluvial fan then sheet flows towards Silver Lake. Because this drainageway is located in an area proposed for Industrial, a special use permit to grade within or reroute this drainageway would be required to be approved prior to developing this area. The fourth area is classified as a non-404 wetland and is located to the east and northeast of the proposed east boundary of the requested Industrial designation. According to the applicant’s Technical Survey, a portion of this area may be impacted if the major drainageway discussed above is rerouted and/or to provide volume mitigation for any development requiring fill in the designated FEMA flood plain. These impacts would be addressed via the special use permit and/or the Wetlands and Stream Environment Protection Standards contained in code. NOTE: A copy of the Technical Survey is included in each Planning Commissioners packet. Figure 1 contained in the Technical Survey shows the existing/proposed flood plain in relation to the proposed I designation.

This property is located within the City’s Sphere of Influence and was annexed into the City on December 3, 2008.

**ANALYSIS:**

**Land Use Compatibility:** Land use surrounding the site consists of vacant property to the north and east within the Silver Lake Playa, zoned OS (Open Space) and SF6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 square feet parcel size); warehousing, industrial and vacant property to the south zoned PUD (Planned Unit Development); and one single family residence on a ±28 acre parcel adjacent to the west zoned General Rural in Washoe County.

The proposed Industrial (I) designation is an extension of the industrial/warehousing uses to the south. The environmentally sensitive areas surrounding the proposed I designation are appropriately protected by the proposed Open Space (OS) designations. The proposed High Density Residential designation is consistent with its existing use (single family residential) and provides a proper transition between the OS to the west and north and the Mixed Residential (MR) in the City to the east (Exhibit A).
Urban/Environmental Design: These issues will be analyzed at such time as a project is proposed.

Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan: It should be noted that only the policies in the RSCJP that are applicable to this Master Plan Amendment request have been analyzed. All policies in the RSCJP that relate to development of the site will be analyzed when a specific project is proposed.

Map 2 (Development Suitability) of the RSCJP indicates that approximately 73% of the site is designated as: (1) a water body; (2) potential flood hazard/potential wetlands; or (3) 100 year flood hazard. The areas constrained by these 3 designations are proposed as OS. In general, only the unconstrained areas of the site are proposed for the I designation. The proposed HDR designation is consistent with the current residential use on ±4 acres. Maps 3, 4, and 5 (RSCJP) identify the North Valleys Land Use Plan, the Planned Land Use and Reno Sphere of Influence, respectively. Map 3 indicates this property is suitable for a Specific Plan District (SPD) handbook. While the City of Reno no longer utilizes the SPD zoning designation, a PUD (Planned Unit Development) can be utilized as an equivalent. The applicant has indicated that PUD zoning will be requested on the ±66.47 acres proposed for the I designation to provide appropriate standards for architecture, landscaping, pedestrian circulation/connectivity, etc., to ensure the aesthetics and buffering provided with future development are consistent with the area. A PUD on this site would also be consistent with the existing industrial PUD located to the south. OS (Open Space) and LLR2.5 (Large Lot Residential – 2.5 acres) zoning will be requested on the proposed OS and HDR designations, respectively, which would be consistent with their existing environmental constraints and use. Map 4 designates this property as General Rural, and Map 5 indicates the southern portion of site is in the City’s Sphere of Influence (SOI). However, more recent mapping information provided by Regional Planning indicates that the entire site is located within the City’s SOI. Map 7 (Water Service Area Boundaries) shows that the proposed I and HDR designations are in the Washoe County service area. Map 8 (Adopted Streets and Highways Plan) identifies Red Rock Road as a Rural Highway, which provides direct access to US 395 making the Master Plan amendment request appropriate regarding intensity.

There are several policies in the RSCJP that apply to this Master Plan request:

Conservation Policies:

C.2.1 Natural or improved open drainageways shall be preserved; alteration of major drainageways is prohibited unless improvements result in an enhancement to the existing condition with respect to: opportunities for recreation, filtration, impoundment of stormwaters or diversity of plant species to be introduced to filter stormwater and create food and cover for wildlife.
The Technical Survey provided by the applicant indicates that the existing drainageway, which has been rerouted in the past, may be rerouted with future development. This will require approval of a special use permit in accordance to the City’s Drainageway Protection Standards (RMC 18.12.1901 – 1907). The PUD could also provide more specific standards as to how the drainageway would be treated to be consistent with this policy.

The special use permit will also address the recreation, infiltration, stormwater, impoundment, diversity of plant species and wildlife issues as applicable.

C.2.2 The use of major drainageways as undeveloped buffers between areas of development is required. Undeveloped drainageways may also be used for pedestrian, equestrian or bicycle access into the Peavine Mountain area and other open space areas. Access routes along major drainageways shall include sufficient width for a trail easement.

During review of the PUD for the industrial site and the special use permit as discussed for Policy C.2.1, pedestrian and bicycle access would be considered in relation to the affected drainageway and how they would be tied into the path system identified for Silver Lake in the City’s Open Space and Greenways Plan. The rerouted drainageway would provide a buffer between the properties to the south while providing enhanced pedestrian access.

C.2.3 New development proposals shall identify the location of all potential wetlands areas, playas, stream environment zones and other hydrologic resources within or adjacent to the proposed project boundaries.

The applicants Technical Survey has identified the location of potential wetlands, playas, stream environmental and other hydrologic resources within the project boundary. With minor exceptions these areas will be preserved as open space.

C.2.4 Development proposals that incorporate wetlands or other stream environments shall comply with the requirements of the City’s Major Drainageways Plan and Wetlands and Stream Environment Policy.

The City’s Drainageway Protection Standards and Wetland and Stream Environment Protection Standards will be utilized as applicable when a specific development is proposed.

Land Use Policies:

LU.6.3 Development procedures for properties within the joint plan area shall provide opportunities for public review of non-residential uses proposed adjacent to residential uses. Such procedures may include special use
permit requirements or administrative site plan review with notification to adjoining property owners.

The industrial PUD will require review via the public hearing process, which includes notifying property owners within 750 feet of the project boundary.

Policies LU.7.1 thru LU.7.9 are related to the type of industrial development allowed/prohibited, how outdoor storage should be screened and placed; the extent and area of landscaping required, building height limitations (40 feet), minimum building separation adjacent to residential areas (2:1 setback to height ratio); and building façade design including articulation.

All of these issues would be addressed via the PUD zoning process, many of which are already contained in City code.

Public Services and Facilities Policies:

Water and Wastewater Service: Policies PSF.1.1 and PSF.2.1 are addressed as this property is located within both the Washoe County Service area for water and is adjacent to the Truckee Meadows Water Authority Retail Area to the south. Sewer service is provided by the Reno Stead Wastewater Treatment Facility. There is currently a City of Reno sewer main located ±2,000 feet to the south of this site. All necessary water rights and service extensions for water and sewer would be required prior to or concurrent with any development of the property.

Public Safety: Policy PSF.3.1 relates to ensuring that plans for police and fire service are in place to address the adequacy of these services. This site is adjacent to existing City development, which is served by the Reno Police and Fire Departments. Comments received from both departments indicated no concerns with this request. When a specific development is proposed (e.g. PUD), specific comments and requirements would be provided to ensure adequacy of police and fire service.

Parks and Open Space: Policies PSF.4.4 and PSF.6.2 encourage industrial development to integrate open space within the development and provide connections to adjoining public lands; and to pursue acquisition of parcels deemed to be desirable open spaces. The applicant intends to dedicate the proposed Silver Lake OS area to the Nevada Land Conservancy and incorporate standards for trail connections to this area as part of the PUD.

Transportation Policies:

T.4.2 During the development review process, Washoe County and the City of Reno shall require, whenever practicable, that new developments minimize their direct access to all arterial roadways;
T.6.1 Ensure that all development proposals that generate 750 average daily trips include a description of existing or proposed public transportation demand management programs or policies; and

T.6.2 Encourage nonresidential developments to use transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, including providing such employee incentives as car pooling, van pooling, bus vouchers, shuttle service, telecommuting, shower facilities and bicycle racks.

Policies T.4.2, T.6.1, and T.6.2 will be analyzed at the time a development application is submitted. The property will have indirect access to a rural highway (Red Rock Road). Public transportation and TDM strategies will also be reviewed with the PUD when the uses and employee base are known.

City of Reno Master Plan Amendment and Findings: There are five findings that must be made in order to approve a Master Plan Amendment. A change in the area must have occurred (1); the density and intensity must be appropriate to surrounding land use patterns (2); the change provides for orderly physical growth of the City (3); there must be adequate transportation, recreation, and utilities to accommodate the proposed uses and densities (4); and the change must be in substantial conformance with the Master Plan and policies (5).

This site was designated as General Rural in 1999 with adoption of the RSCJP. In 2002, as part of the Regional Plan Settlement Agreement this property was placed in the City of Reno’s Sphere of Influence (SOI) and the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA). When property is placed in the SOI/TMSA it is considered appropriate for urban development, as all necessary services such as sewer, water, police and fire service are readily available or are planned to be provided to the area. With this Master Plan amendment, a technical survey to more specifically identify environmental constraints was provided. This survey demonstrates that the areas with significant hydrological resources, as discussed previously in this report, are present on ±73% of the site and are thus proposed for Open Space (OS). The remainder of the site proposed for Industrial is generally located outside of these environmentally constrained areas (Exhibit B).

There have been several changes in this area that warrant the Master Plan amendments as requested. The area has been incorporated into the City’s SOI and the TMSA, as discussed above. The site has been more specifically analyzed to determine what is appropriate for development and what areas should be left as OS. Industrial development consistent with this request has been built on the adjacent properties to the south and to the northeast along the north side of the Silver Lake Playa (MPA finding 1).

The amendment would allow densities and intensities which are compatible with surrounding uses and existing adjacent Master Plan land use designations. The
properties to the north and east are designated Park/Recreation/Open space which is consistent with OS designation requested adjacent to these properties. The OS designation will protect the Silver Lake Playa and provide a significant buffer between any existing residential development to the north (±4,000 feet) and east (±1,700 feet). The properties to the south are designated as Special Planning Area and are zoned for an Industrial PUD. The east side of the requested Industrial designation matches up with the developed industrial uses to the south and is separated from the existing house proposed for HDR by a ±1,700 foot wide OS buffer. The existing house to the west is ±150 from the west side of the proposed Industrial designation. Buffering and screening policies within the RSCJP in conjunction with the PUD will provide adequate protection for this single family residence (MPA finding 2).

The property is located within the TMSA and in a joint plan administered by the City of Reno and Washoe County. Properties located within the TMSA are planned to accommodate regional growth including the associated public services and infrastructure to support this growth. The constrained areas are proposed for OS. The developable portions are proposed for Industrial. The project will set the stage for a future Industrial PUD which will provide employment opportunities in close proximity to existing and planned residential areas. This addition to the employment base will provide an incremental step to providing jobs to housing balance, while reducing vehicle trips and trip lengths for residents living and working in the area. These factors when considered together promote orderly physical growth (MPA finding 3).

The proposed Industrial portion of the site is located adjacent to a rural highway (Red Rock Road) which has the capacity to serve this project. Red Rock Road connects to US 395 ±3,400 feet (.64 miles) to the south. The proposed Industrial designation would be an extension of an existing industrial area which utilizes Moya Boulevard and Red Rock Road for truck traffic. Traffic generated by this ±66.47 acre site is anticipated to be less than 6,200 trips/day. Pedestrian and bicycle access can be incorporated into the future PUD to connect the Industrial portions of the site with the OS as discussed in the City’s Open Space and Greenways Plan. As previously discussed, sewer and water service are available to the site. Other services such as telephone, natural gas, electricity and cable TV can be extended to the site from existing nearby facilities. Protective services such as Police and Fire will be provided by the City of Reno. The Stead police substation has a 4-5 minute response time to the site. Reno Fire Station #13 located on Silver Lake Boulevard is ±2.5 miles from this site. This request will not add residential units and therefore has no impact on area schools (MPA finding 4).

The request is in compliance with the City of Reno Master Plan because it meets the definitions of the land use designations proposed for Industrial, Open Space and High Density Rural as specified in the Land Use Plan section. Concurrency has been demonstrated as discussed throughout this report. Concurrency will ultimately be enforced at the building permit stage. Applicable City Master Plan policies are addressed in the “Master Plan Policies” section of this report (MPA finding 5).
Public Safety and Improvements: Reno Police and Fire staff had no specific comments related to this Master Plan amendment. No public improvements are associated with this request. Public improvements will be determined at such time as the PUD is submitted and/or during review of project building permits.

Circulation: Conceptual plans provided with the application indicate a primary access to Red Rock Road, located ±1,200 feet north of Moya Boulevard; and a secondary access to Red Rock Road located ±2,300 feet north of Moya Boulevard.

Engineering Comments:

Hydrology and Grading:

The project is located within the Silver Lake Playa area. As such, volume mitigation for development proposing to place any fill within the FEMA designated flood plain and volume mitigation for any increased runoff from development will be required. Changing the master plan designation for a portion of the development to Industrial does not constitute entitlement to develop within the FEMA designated flood plain without proper mitigation.

The preliminary Significant Hydrological Resources (SHR) technical survey identified four SHR’s encumbering the 66.47 acres proposed for an industrial master plan designation. Two of these SHR’s are identified as being avoided by development while two others will be impacted. The major drainageway which enters the south portion of the site is identified as disturbed. Any modification or relocation of this drainageway will require approval of a SUP. An existing non 404 wetland could also be impacted by future development of the site. Sufficient area is available adjacent to the wetland to mitigate potential development impacts. Review of the preliminary technical report suggests potential impacts to SHR’s with future development of the property can be adequately mitigated.

Traffic:

Per RMC Section 18.12.903a.1.a applications for a master plan amendment generating 200 or more peak-hour trips (PHT) may require a traffic report. The applicant must provide a traffic generation letter for review prior to recommendation of approval by the Engineering Division. If the calculated PHT exceed 200, a traffic study will be required.

A traffic report was prepared for a representative regional warehousing/industrial development project. Since no specific project is considered with a Master Plan amendment, the traffic study conclusions and recommendations may be different at the time of project development as the project specifications may change. The development proposes to access a City of Reno Minor Arterial Roadway (Red Rock Road) that is scheduled for widening to 4 lanes by 2030 in the RTC 2040 RTP. When Red Rock Road is widened to the north of the proposed site accesses, all roadways will meet
accepted LOS standards through 2040. The existing intersection of Red Rock Road and Silver Lake Road will not meet LOS standards without intersection improvements. The study proposes the construction of a roundabout or traffic signal at the intersection to mitigate the developments impact. The traffic study adequately demonstrates that the proposed widening of Red Rock Road and improvements at the Red Rock Road/Silver Lake Road intersection are sufficient to support the master plan amendment and future development. Required roadway improvements will be determined at the time of development review and approval.

Master Plan Policies: As proposed the project appears to be consistent with the following applicable Master Plan policies: E-4 there should be no net loss of wetlands, playas and non-404 wetlands in the City in terms of both acreage and value. This may be achieved by designating these areas as open space, avoidance of these areas or mitigation both on and off-site; E-6 the City should protect significant hydrologic resources and major drainageways within its jurisdiction; E-8 protect hydrologic resources through public acquisition, application of land use and/or zoning controls; OS-4 trails/bikeways designed to connect with the broader regional system; OS-10 new industrial development should accommodate pedestrian and bicycle access to the local and regional non-motorized transportation network; FM-3 fill should not be approved in flood plains unless: (a) flood elevations will not be increased; (2) hazards to other properties will not result; and (3) fill or associated modifications to drainage patterns will not negatively impact wetlands; CD-7 encourage expansion of existing industries to help diversity of the economy; and SD-16 new development designed to allow through public access to adjoining public open space (MPA finding 5).

Other Reviewing Bodies:

Cooperative Planning: Please see Exhibit C, for the applicant’s Cooperative Planning analysis. Staff is in agreement with the responses.

Neighborhood Advisory Board: This project was reviewed by the North Valleys Neighborhood Advisory Board on November 17, 2008 and the North Valleys Citizens Advisory Board on December 8, 2008 and April 6, 2009. A copy of their comments is attached to this report (Exhibits D & E).

Neighborhood Meeting: As required by NRS 278.210, the applicant noticed and held a neighborhood meeting on December 2, 2008. The Neighborhood meeting was attended by 3 persons. One of the attendees asked questions relative to developing her property for residential. Most of her property is located adjacent to proposed OS (Exhibit F).
AREA DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>MASTER PLAN DESIGNATION</th>
<th>ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>Parks, Recreation, Open Space</td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH Industrial, Vacant</td>
<td>Special Planning Area</td>
<td>PUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST Vacant, Single Family Residence</td>
<td>Parks, Recreation, Open Space; Mixed Residential</td>
<td>OS, SF6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST Single Family Residence</td>
<td>General Rural (Washoe County)</td>
<td>GR (Washoe County)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:

RMC 18.06.301 Master Plan Amendments

FINDINGS:

Master Plan Amendment: Master Plan amendment findings. In order to adopt an amendment to the master plan, the planning commission and city council shall find all of the following:

1. There has been a change in the area or in the conditions on which the current designation was based which warrants the amendment;

2. The density and intensity of the proposed master plan amendment is sensitive to the existing land uses and is compatible with the existing adjacent land use designations;

3. The amendment will provide for orderly physical growth of the city, enhance the urban core and foster safe, convenient and walkable neighborhoods and shopping districts;

4. There are or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed master plan designation; and

5. The proposed change is in substantial conformance with the goals and policies of the master plan and other adopted plans and policies.

Staff: Vern Kloos, Senior Planner
LDC09-00037
Echeverria Silver Lake Property
Subject Site - Master Plan Amendment from General Rural to Open Space on ±219.09 ac, Industrial on ±66.47 ac and High Density Rural on ±4 ac.

City Limits
Zoning

Community Development Department
450 E Street Street, Reno, NV 89509
800-477-0002 Fax: 334-2043
www.cityofreno.com
Echeverria Silver Lake Property

PROPOSED RENO STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN MAP
February 19, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Vern Kloos, Senior Planner
Reno Community Development Department

FROM: Lisa Brosnan, Planner
Ph: 775-328-3668   Fax: 775-328-6133
E-mail: lbrosnan@washoeCounty.us

SUBJECT: LDC09-00037 (Echeverria Silver Lake Properties) – Request for an Amendment to the existing City of Reno master plan designation of SPA (Special Planning Area) ±289.6 AC of GR (General Rural) in the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP) to SPA/ ±216.3 AC of OS (Open Space) and ±73.3 AC of I (Industrial) in the City of Reno Master Plan for APN 090-030-02; 090-040-02, 03. Annexation of the subject parcels is currently in process with the City of Reno under ANX09-00004.

Dear Vern,

Below are Washoe County Community Development staff’s comments regarding the above project, which falls under Joint Planning Area review.

1. The High Density Rural zoning at the Southeast corner of the property recognizes an existing land use, but the proposed zoning is incompatible with adjacent land uses.
2. The location of proposed Open Space and Industrial land uses are not supported by FEMA maps.
3. Proposed Industrial zoning does not reflect natural contours of the land and may displace flood water and limit riparian habitat.
4. Industrial zoning should be limited to areas outside the FEMA flood boundary.
5. The exhibits provided do not provide views of the natural shoreline in relation to the proposed Industrial zoning.
6. The application indicates on page 2 of 10 that there is a natural spring located on the subject property that will not be preserved.
7. The spring and watershed should be required to be preserved as Open Space with an appropriate buffer area on all sides.
8. The Master Plan should not be amended prior to approval of a FEMA Letter of Map Revision.
9. The plans are not clear, but appear to indicate manufactured fill slopes adjacent to Industrial uses within the flood zone and within the proposed Open Space. Fill within these areas is inappropriate.

Washoe County Community Development believes that the application as presented to both the City of Reno Planning Commission and the Washoe County Planning Commission is not supportable given the concerns expressed in this memorandum. Washoe County Community Development staff would recommend that both planning commissions remand the application to the City of Reno Community Development Department with direction to the applicant to provide a revised application and site plan that addresses the enumerated concerns in this memorandum. Further, Washoe County Community Development staff recommends that a revised application and site plan be presented to the relevant city and county citizen advisory organizations for their review and comment before any further action by the City of Reno and the Washoe County Planning Commissions occurs.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please let me know if there is anything else you need from staff on this item.

Sincerely,

Lisa Brosnan, Planner
Washoe County Department of Community Development
City Staff Responses to Washoe County Staff comments provided in the order in which they appear in the County Memo (Exhibit A)

1. The HDR (1 du/2.5 acres to 5 acres) proposed is consistent with the existing single family residential use of the property and is more consistent for these ±4 acres than the existing General Rural (1 du/40 acres) designation.

The properties to the west and north are proposed for OS, the property to the east is Master Planned and zoned for single family residential. The properties to the south are vacant and located within an Industrial PUD. The existing house is a minimum of 150 feet from the PUD boundary. Setbacks and buffering standards contained in code and the PUD would address the compatibility of adjacent industrial development when the vacant PUD lands are developed.

2. The master plan maps correspond fairly closely to the FEMA flood zone areas. In some areas the industrial designation does encroach on the flood zone. This is not unique to this request or to the Silver Lake playa in general. Any future development within the Industrial designation will have to comply with City of Reno and FEMA development standards.

3. The request is for an Industrial designation only. No project is proposed at this time. Any development will have to address flood storage and riparian habitat.

4. See response to comment 2 above.

5. No comment.

6. The preliminary technical survey submitted in January 2009 indicates that this natural spring and the area surrounding will be preserved as open space (±6.78 acres).

7. So noted. See response to comment 6 above.

8. This statement proposes an impossible order of events. A FEMA Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) is processed and approved to modify a FEMA flood map as a result of construction activities being completed that have created a change in the flood map. A Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) could be pursued once a project is approved for the site if the project modifies the FEMA flood map. At this time, no specific project has been proposed or approved for the site.

9. Any specific project would have to comply with City of Reno and FEMA development standards and would be addressed at a future time. Grading in the OS is allowed subject to meeting these standards.

City of Reno staff believes that all relevant issues associated with this Master Plan amendment request have been adequately addressed in the City of Reno Planning Commission staff report and the above responses. The revisions made to the project after the presentations to the County CAB and City NAB are minor and serve to reduce the overall impact of the project (e.g. decrease in the I designation, increase in the OS designation, and the addition of the HDR designation). The project impacts will be specifically addressed when the PUD zoning and associated special use permits are reviewed for the I portion of this request. This process will involve review by both the CAB and NAB, as well as, noticed public hearings before the Reno City Planning Commission and City Council.
Cooperative Planning Findings

18.08.404 (e) (4) Master plan policies and goals and zoning amendments criteria.

a. Regional form and pattern, including open space.

1. Findings for Policy 1.1.6 – Rural Development Area

Response: The subject property is not located within a Rural Development Area.

2. Findings for Policies 1.1.8 and 2.1.1 – Development Constraints Area

Response: The northern portion of the subject property predominantly made up by Silver Lake is located within a Development Constraints Area, and is labeled as a Playa. This portion of the property will be preserved in an Open Space designation with the proposed Master Plan Amendment.

3. Findings for policies 1.1.9 and 2.2.1 – Slope Management (15 percent – 30 percent)

Response: The subject property contains moderate slopes averaging between 1 percent and 2 percent. Therefore, the findings for this section are not applicable to the subject property.


Response: The subject property is not located within a designated employment center, although the addition of Industrial designated property will increase employment opportunities in the area.
5. Findings for Policy 1.2.1 – Desired population and employment distribution and jobs/housing balance.

Response: The proposed Master Plan Amendment will support a much needed employment demand for the area. The Stead area is known for its popularity in Industrial developments, which the proposed amendment will continue that trend. There are neighboring residential developments within a half mile of the subject property. Therefore, the proposed amendment will provide a good balance of jobs for the existing housing creating a live work opportunity for the surrounding area.

6. Findings for Policy 1.2.12 – Regional Centers

Response: The subject property is not located within a designated Regional Center.

7. Findings for Policies 1.2.8, 1.2.9 and 1.2.12 – Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Corridors.

Response: The subject property is not located within a designated TOD Corridor.

8. Findings for properties identified as potential Open Space within adopted Regional Open Plan.

Response: Silver Lake is labeled as a potential Open Space Corridor within the City of Reno Open Space and Greenways Plan. The proposed Master Plan Amendment will preserve the portion of the property that contains Silver Lake in an Open Space designation.

9. Findings for Policies 1.3.2 and 1.3.3 – Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA) – development standards (for an amendment in the TMSA outside the SOI).

Response: The subject property is located within the TMSA and is also located in the City of Reno Sphere of Influence (SOI). Therefore the above findings are not applicable to the proposed Master Plan Amendment.

b. Housing.

1. Findings.

Response: The proposed Master Plan Amendment would change the land use designations on the property to Open Space and Industrial. Therefore, the housing section is not applicable.
c. Concurrency, timing and phasing of infrastructure.

1. Findings.

Response: The Vidler water importation project has been approved and is currently under construction to bring additional water to the North Valleys. There are currently existing utilities either adjacent to or within a half mile of the subject property. Existing utilities would be extended to the site at the time of final design of a project. All other off-site improvements would be determined at time of final design of a project. There is an existing industrial development south of and adjacent to the subject property, which makes the location of the subject property ideal for industrial development.

d. Public service levels and fiscal effect.

1. Findings.

Response: The subject property is located adjacent to existing Industrial and residential developments and is within the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan. Therefore, the proposed Master Plan Amendment will not have any impacts on the adopted level of service for police, fire, or other public services. The proposed Master Plan Amendment will provide additional Open Space creating the opportunity for future recreational uses for the surrounding community.

e. Natural resources constraints not elsewhere addressed.

1. Findings.

Response: The portion of the property containing Silver Lake will be preserved in an Open Space designation in order to protect future recreational opportunities for the surrounding community, and also to protect natural habitats adjacent to Silver Lake.
PROJECT REVIEW FORM
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No.  LDC09-00037       Date: 11-24-08
Case Name:  Echevarria Silver Lake Property
Case Planner:  Vern Kloos
NAB Member Name:  Edward Hawkins
Community Liaison:  Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:

1. There is a 2-story residence on property to be zoned Industrial/Commercial.
2. Ecological sensitive area on extreme east side of project.
3. Displacement of water where proposed development to go. 55 acre feet in 100-year flood.

Issues/Concerns: The "sample issues" box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

1. Remove residence before zone change.
2. Complete wetlands study through acceptable organization.
3. Remove enough volume of deep lake to accommodate 275 acre feet of water for wet years.

[NAB Member Signature]
PROJECT REVIEW FORM
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No.: LOC09-00037
Date: 11-17-09

Case Name: Silver Lake Property
Case Planner: Vern Kuo

NAB Member Name: Byron Davis
Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:

- Building on Flood Plain
- Silver Lake Flood Plain
- Additional Traffic on Red Rock

Issues/Concerns: The "sample issues" box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

NAB Member Signature
PROJECT REVIEW FORM
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No.: 709-00087
Case Name: Silver Lake
Case Planner: 
NAB Member Name: 
Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:
Clean industrial?
Open space area?
Runoff contaminating Silver Lake?

Issues/Concerns: The "sample issues" box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

- Auto & Pedestrian Access
- Public/Fire Safety
- Architecture
- Neighborhood Compatibility
- Traffic
- Building Height
- School Impact
- Intensity/Density
- Signage
- Landscaping
- Pollution
- Good Location
- Lighting
- Environmental Concerns
- Privacy

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

Trap and clean runoff. Protect Silver Lake.

NAB Member Signature
PROJECT REVIEW FORM
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No. 1DC09-20037 Date: 11/7/08
Case Name: Echeverria Silver Ledge Prop
Case Planner: Vern Kloos
NAB Member Name: Janet Pirozzii
Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:

4.6 Acres Undeveloped, the rest open space - working w/ NV Land Conservancy

Issues/Concerns: The "sample issues" box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

Assure water is trapped so as not to get into environment.

I like the idea of using this space as open space w/ minimal amount of building. I prefer this to residential.

I also like the fact that conservancy might have control of open space.

Assure traffic from Diesel away from homes.

NAB Member Signature
PROJECT REVIEW FORM
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No. LDC09-00237          Date: 17 NOV '08
Case Name: ECHEVERRIA SILVER LAKE PROPERTY
Case Planner: YERN €OOS
NAB Member Name: GARRET JOLE
Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:
WILL THIS PROJECT BE FILLING IN SILVER LAKE WITH LANDFILL? YES SLIGHTLY, BUT THEY WILL BE OFFSETTING THIS IN ANOTHER AREA.

Issues/Concerns: The “sample issues” box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

__________________________________________
NAB Member Signature
Case No. LDC09-00037
Date: 11/17/08
Case Name: Echeverria Silverlake Properties
Case Planner: Vern Kloos
NAB Member Name: Jennifer Oliver
Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:

Notes:

Warehouse/Distribution Sites (Anticipated)
No Homes
Discussed w/ NLC: Possibility of getting open space to NLC trust
Comments:
Compatible use

Issues/Concerns: The “sample issues” box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

__________________________
NAB Member Signature
PROJECT REVIEW FORM
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No.: DC-09-00037    Date: 11-17-08
Case Name: Echeverria Silver Line Property
Case Planner: Vero Skos
NAB Member Name: Katherine M. Graff
Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:

I have no real issue with this project. I do have concerns regarding water flow. I also have concerns regarding traffic flow and more empty industrial lots.

____________________________________________________________

Issues/Concerns: The “sample issues” box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________

NAB Member Signature: ___________________________
PROJECT REVIEW FORM
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No. LD09-00037  Date: 11/17/08
Case Name: E. Everraj Silver Lake Property
Case Planner: Vern Kloos
NAB Member Name: Lisa Kaper
Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Issues/Concerns: The "sample issues" box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Lisa Kaper
NAB Member Signature
MEMORANDUM

TO: Bob Webb, Planning Manager
FROM: Allayne Everett, Recording Secretary
DATE: December 31, 2008
RE: LDC09-00037 (Echeverria Silver Lake Property)

The following is a portion of the draft minutes of the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board held December 8, 2008.

LDC09-00037 (Echeverria Silver Lake Property) – Andy Durling, Wood Rodgers presented the request for a Master Plan Amendment from: General Rural – Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan (GR-RSCJP) on +289.6 acres to OS (Open Space)- RSCJP on +216.3 acres and I (Industrial)-RSCJP on +73.3 acres. The +289.6 acre site is located on the east side of Red Rock Road, +1,450 feet north of the Red Rock Road/Moya Boulevard intersection. The property is currently zoned GR (General Rural) per the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan. This project is located in an area which is subject to Cooperative Planning. Vern Kloos, Senior Planner APN: 090-030-02; 090-040-02 & 03. MEETING DATE: Reno Planning Commission – January 7, 2009 The CAB did not take any action on this item, but agreed to forward the comments to Washoe County.

Comments and Concerns

• In response to questions raised, Mr. Durling discussed truck traffic issues on Red Rock Road and how the applicant would protect wildlife particularly at the spring fed pond. Mr. Durling stated that the there would be access from Red Rock Road to the natural resources and the City of Reno would identify the haul route. Mr. Durling also stated that the spring fed pond and wildlife would not be negatively impacted.
• Mr. Durling stated that they are having a traffic study that should be completed soon and they are considering a right turn lane into the property.
• Mr. Durling addressed questions pertaining to flood potential and stated that all stormwater would be collected on the property and that the City of Reno requires that all water has to be treated.
• In response to questions raised regarding potential tenants for the property, Mr. Durling stated that the zoning that is being requested does not allow outdoor manufacturing or storage. They anticipate warehousing and logistics.
• Mr. Durling stated that any proposed change to the open space would have to be brought back to the CAB for recommendations.
• Scott Sarratt advised the audience that the CAB is an advisory board that has the same voice that any other citizen has.
• Concerns were raised that there are individuals “Sage Brush Rangers” that trespass on private property to take valuables that are left in trash containers and the applicant was asked to address how security will be handled on the subject property. Mr. Durling stated that it is in the business owner’s best interest to secure their property. Concerns were also raised regarding how the proposed development would mitigate negative impacts to local wildlife.
• Mr. Durling was asked to come back to the CAB to address any changes to the current application and also to address negotiations with the Nature Conservancy and protections for wildlife in the Swan Lake area.

c: Bonnie Weber, Commissioner
Kitty Jung, Commissioner
Scott Sarratt, Chair.
Lorrie Adams, Community Outreach Coordinator
From: Michelle Fournier
To: Cheryl Ryan; Vern Kloos
Date: 4/16/2009 7:47 AM
Subject: Fwd: From the North Valleys CAB: Echeverria Silver Lake Property and RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property

Please see comments below.

>>> "Adams, Lorrie M" <ladams@washoe county.us> 4/14/2009 12:16 PM >>>
Hello, Lisa
Here is what the North Valleys CAB had to say about the above applications:

Echeverria Silver Lake Property:

No concerns were raised during the discussion.

CAB Action: The CAB recommends approval.

RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property:

The CAB heard the following comments/concerns: (1) "the removal does not allow County citizens to have a 'voice' in planning, nor do County citizens have an elected official to speak on their behalf;" (2) citizens prefer the property stay within RSCIP and (3) traffic on US 395 and Lemmon Drive will be "dramatically" impacted.

CAB Action: The CAB decided to forward comments and take no action.

Thank you,
Lorrie Adams
Community Outreach Coordinator
Washoe County
Phone: 328.2720
Cell: 813.6786
Email: ladams@washoe county.us
November 14, 2008

To: Adjacent Property Owners  
From: Andrew D. Durling, Associate, Wood Rodgers, Inc.

Re: Echeverria Silver Lake Property  
    Master Plan Amendment  
    Open House Neighborhood Meeting

Dear Neighbor:

We would like to invite you to an open house neighborhood meeting to discuss the proposed Echeverria Silver Lake Property Master Plan Amendment. The property is approximately ±289.6 acres located adjacent to Red Rock Rd. approximately 1,300 feet north of the intersection of Red Rock Rd. and Moya Blvd. (Refer to enclosed Vicinity Map).

The applicant is requesting a Master Plan Amendment from: General Rural – Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan (GR-RSCJP) on ±289.6 acres to: OS (Open Space)-RSCJP on ±216.3 acres and I (Industrial)-RSCJP on ±73.3 acres. The proposed designations would allow the property to be consistent with adjacent existing uses. The ±216.3 acres of Open Space are proposed in the northern portion of the subject property, which contains Silver Lake. The ±73.3 acres of Industrial are proposed on the southern portion of the property adjacent to existing Industrial buildings.

The applicant is currently proposing to build an Industrial development on the ±73.3 acres proposed as Industrial. A Special Use Permit will be submitted to the City of Reno for a future project upon completion of the Master Plan Amendment and future Zone Change. As part of the Special Use Permit process, you will be notified and have an opportunity to provide input on the project. We believe that the proposed Master Plan Amendment would be a benefit to the surrounding neighborhood as it would preserve ±216.3 acres (75%) of the subject property as Open Space, which would create future recreational opportunities for the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed Industrial designation would also create additional employment opportunities for the North Valleys.

A Vicinity Map identifying the subject property has been included with this packet. Additionally, we have provided you with graphics that show both the existing and proposed master plan designations for your reference.

To address comments or concerns you might have about these changes, we are having a neighborhood meeting. Representatives from the project will be available to answer questions and address concerns. The neighborhood meeting will be as follows:

Applicant Hosted Neighborhood Meeting  
Date: Tuesday, December 2, 2008  
Time: 6:00 – 7:00 pm  
Location: Wood Rodgers, Inc.  
575 Double Eagle Ct.  
Reno, NV 89521
In addition to the neighborhood meeting, the regularly scheduled City of Reno Ward 4 North Valleys Neighborhood Advisory Board Meeting, and the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board Meeting will give you another opportunity to see the requested changes and to express any comments or concerns about the proposed changes prior to the City of Reno Planning Commission review. The meeting dates and times are as follows:

City of Reno Ward 4 North Valleys Neighborhood Advisory Board
Date: Monday, November 17, 2008
Time: 6:30 pm
Location: North Valleys Regional Sports Complex
          8085 Silver Lake Dr.
          Reno, NV 89506

Washoe County North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board
Date: Monday, December 8, 2008
Time: 7:00 pm
Location: North Valleys Regional Sports Complex
          8085 Silver Lake Dr.
          Reno, NV 89506

Should you have any questions or comments regarding these proposed changes, we encourage you to attend and participate in at least one of these meetings. If you are unable to attend any of the meetings and would like to discuss the changes further, please feel free to contact me at 823-5211 or via email at adurling@woodrodgers.com with any questions, comments or concerns regarding the provided information prior to the meetings.

Sincerely,

Wood Rodgers, Inc.

Andrew D. Durling, AICP
Associate
Attached is the Description Verification, as well as the sign-in sheet from the December 2, 2008 Neighborhood Meeting. As you can see, the attendance was minimal. One adjacent property owner that owns the property to the northwest was asking questions relative to the future development of her parcel as a residential subdivision. As the majority of our project that is adjacent to her property is being proposed as Open Space, I do not believe our project will detrimentally affect her property.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks!

Andy

Andrew D. Durling, AICP - Associate
planning & urban design
WOOD RODGERS
575 double eagle court
reno, nevada 89521
775.823.4068 - main
775.823.5211 - direct
775.745.0913 - mobile
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Haefele</td>
<td>2530 McCutieus Dr</td>
<td>323-692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Boren</td>
<td>7605 Devonshire</td>
<td>840-1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Rector</td>
<td>1200 Financial Blvd, Reno</td>
<td>958-4080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: April 29, 2009

TO: Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Kimberly H. Robinson, Planning Manager
Ph: 775.328.3602
e-mail: krobinson@washoecounty.us

Lisa Brosnan, Planner
Ph: 775.328.3668
e-mail: lbrosnan@washoecounty.us

Kelly Mullin, Planner
Ph: 775.328.6187
e-mail: kmullin@washoecounty.us

THROUGH: Adrian P. Freund, FAICP, Director

SUBJECT: LDC08-00205 (RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property) - This is a request for a Comprehensive/Master Plan amendment to remove ±98.06 acres of property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP). The site is located ±294 feet to the northwest of the intersection of Lemmon Drive and Sky Vista Parkway with a portion of the northern end of the property fronting on Lemmon Drive. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the Reno City Council and the Washoe County Commission. The property is identified as having a designation of SP (Specific Plan) in Washoe County's North Valleys Land Use Plan Map (Map 3 of the RSCJP). It is identified as having a designation of SPA (Special Planning Area) in the City of Reno's Land Use Plan, a portion of the City of Reno's Master Plan. As identified by the RSCJP Planned Land Use Map (Map 4), the underlying land use/zoning designations for the property are GC (General Commercial); LDS/RR (Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential - 2.5 to 1 acre lots); and OS (Open Space) in Washoe County. The underlying zoning designations in the City of Reno are AC (Arterial Commercial); CC (Community Commercial); LLR1 (Large Lot Residential - 1 acre); SF6 (Single Family - 6,000 square foot lots); and OS (Open Space). The hearing may also include an appeal of the decisions made by the Joint Planning
Commissions of Washoe County and the City of Reno regarding this project, per the Washoe County Development Code. APN: 086-380-02 and 086-390-16

(Commission District 5)

SUMMARY

This is a request for the Board of County Commissioners, in conjunction with the Reno City Council, to review the above request. The properties are located within the city limits of Reno. However, since they are also located within the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan boundaries (a joint planning area), any amendments require approval by both the City of Reno and Washoe County.

County Priority/Goal supported by this item: Responsible growth management

Commission District Affected: Commission District 5

PREVIOUS BOARD ACTION

Board of County Commissioners: None

Planning Commission: This item will be heard by the Planning Commissions of Washoe County and the City of Reno during a joint meeting on Wednesday, May 6, 2009. A verbal update regarding the outcome of that meeting will be provided to you at the hearing on May 11, 2009.

BACKGROUND

The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan is located wholly within the North Valleys planning area and has been designated by the 1996 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan as an area to be jointly planned by both Washoe County and the City of Reno. Any proposed amendments to the plan must be approved by the Planning Commissions of both Reno and Washoe County, as well as the Board of County Commissioners and the Reno City Council.

As the request is located within Reno’s city limits, the City of Reno is responsible for sponsoring the application and conducting a full analysis of potential impacts. A copy of their staff report has been attached for your review. Washoe County’s comments regarding the proposal are attached to Reno’s staff report.

Staff recommends that the Commission review the City of Reno’s staff report and the other attachments regarding this request and determine whether to approve or deny the request based upon the findings listed below.

The findings listed in the City of Reno’s staff report are findings required by their code, and are to be considered by the Reno City Council. The findings listed in the Washoe County staff report are required by the Washoe County Development Code, and are to be considered by the Washoe County Commission. In order to approve or deny the request, each governing body must make its own respective set of findings.
There is some possibility that the decision of the Planning Commissions during their joint meeting on May 6, 2009 will be appealed. If this is the case, the hearing on May 11, 2009 will be an appeal regarding the request. If an appeal is submitted, additional information, including possible motions, will be provided to you at or before the hearing.

CAB Comments

The proposed request was initially reviewed by the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board in May 2008. At that meeting, County residents voiced concern over maintaining a voice in the planning process as well as potential water flows across the property. At that meeting, the CAB voted to recommend approval of the project. The request was heard again at the North Valleys CAB’s April 6, 2009 meeting. The CAB agreed to take no action regarding the request. Concerns again included the potential for County residents potentially losing their voice in the planning process if this property was removed from the joint planning area. Concerns over traffic issues were also raised.

Copies of the minutes from both meetings are attached for your reference.

FISCAL IMPACT

No projected fiscal impact for the County.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Washoe County Commission review the City of Reno’s staff report and the other attachments regarding this request and determine whether to approve or deny the request based upon the findings listed below.

POSSIBLE MOTIONS

APPROVAL

“I move that the Board of County Commissioners approves LDC08-00205 for RTM Sky Vista, LLC and ERGS, Inc., amendments to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan, having made at least one of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.820.15:

1. **Consistency with Comprehensive Plan.** That the proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the North Valleys Area Plan and Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan;

2. **Compatible Land Uses.** That the proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare;

3. **Response to Changed Conditions.** That the proposed amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted.
by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land;

4. **No Adverse Effects.** That the proposed amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan; and

5. **Desired Pattern of Growth.** That the proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.”

AND

“I move that the Board of County Commissioners authorizes the Chair to sign the Resolution for the updated joint plan after a determination of conformance with the Regional Plan by the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency.”

DENIAL

I move that the Board of County Commissioners denies LDC08-00205 for RTM Sky Vista, LLC and ERGS, Inc., amendments to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan, having made at least one of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.820.15:

1. **Consistency with Comprehensive Plan.** That the proposed amendment is not in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the North Valleys Area Plan and Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan;

2. **Compatible Land Uses.** That the proposed amendment would result in land uses which are incompatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and would adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare;

3. **Response to Changed Conditions.** That the proposed amendment does not identify and respond to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment does not represent a more desirable utilization of land;

4. **No Adverse Effects.** That the proposed amendment will adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan; and

5. **Desired Pattern of Growth.** That the proposed amendment does not promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County. The proposed amendment does not guide development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.
KR/KM

Attachments:  
A.  Planning Commission Staff Report, Dated April 24, 2009  
B.  City of Reno Staff Report for LDC08-00205, Dated May 6, 2009  
C.  Minutes from North Valleys CAB Meeting, Dated April 20, 2009  
D.  Minutes from North Valleys CAB Meeting, Dated May 12, 2008  
E.  Proposed Resolution for LDC08-00205

xc:  
David Childs, Assistant County Manager  
Adrian P. Freund, Director  
Nathan J. Edwards, Deputy District Attorney  
Kimberly H. Robinson, Planning Manager
ATTACHMENT A

Planning Commission Staff Report,
Dated April 24, 2009
WASHOE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
MEMO

To: Washoe County Planning Commission
Re: LDC08-00205 (RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property)
Date: April 24, 2009
Prepared By: Kimberly H. Robinson, Planning Manager, Lisa Brosnan, Planner and Kelly Mullin, Planner

GENERAL INFORMATION SUMMARY

Applicant: RTM Sky Vista, LLC and ERGS, Inc.

Requested Action: This is a request for a Comprehensive/Master Plan amendment to remove ±98.06 acres of property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP). The site is located ±294 feet to the northwest of the intersection of Lemmon Drive and Sky Vista Parkway with a portion of the northern end of the property fronting on Lemmon Drive. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions. The property is identified as having a designation of SP (Specific Plan) in Washoe County's North Valleys Land Use Plan Map (Map 3 of the RSCJP). It is identified as having a designation of SPA (Special Planning Area) in the City of Reno's Land Use Plan, a portion of the City of Reno's Master Plan. As identified by the RSCJP Planned Land Use Map (Map 4), the underlying land use/zoning designations for the property are GC (General Commercial); LDS/RR (Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential - 2.5 to 1 acre lots); and OS (Open Space) in Washoe County. The underlying zoning designations in the City of Reno are AC (Arterial Commercial); CC (Community Commercial); LLR1 (Large Lot Residential - 1 acre); SF6 (Single Family - 6,000 square foot lots); and OS (Open Space). APN: 086-380-02 and 086-390-16

FINDINGS

Staff presents the request and offers the following motions for your consideration:

APPROVAL

I move that the Washoe County Planning Commission adopts LDC08-00205 for RTM Sky Vista, LLC and ERGS, Inc., amendments to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan, having made at least one of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.820.15; and further adopt a resolution required by NRS 278.210(3):
1. Consistency with Comprehensive Plan. That the proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the North Valleys Area Plan and Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan;

2. Compatible Land Uses. That the proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare;

3. Response to Changed Conditions. That the proposed amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land;

4. No Adverse Effects. That the proposed amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan; and

5. Desired Pattern of Growth. That the proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.

DENIAL

I move that the Washoe County Planning Commission denies LDC08-00205 for RTM Sky Vista, LLC and ERGS, Inc., amendments to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan, having made at least one of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.820.15:

1. Consistency with Comprehensive Plan. That the proposed amendment is not in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the North Valleys Area Plan and Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan;

2. Compatible Land Uses. That the proposed amendment would result in land uses which are incompatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and would adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare;

3. Response to Changed Conditions. That the proposed amendment does not identify and respond to changed conditions or further studies
that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment does not represent a more desirable utilization of land;

4. **No Adverse Effects.** That the proposed amendment will adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan; and

5. **Desired Pattern of Growth.** That the proposed amendment does not promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County. The proposed amendment does not guide development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.

## ANALYSIS

The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan is located wholly within the North Valleys planning area and has been designated by the 1996 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan as an area to be jointly planned by both Washoe County and the City of Reno. Any proposed amendments to the plan must be approved by the Planning Commissions of both Reno and Washoe County, as well as the Board of County Commissioners and the Reno City Council.

As the project is located within Reno’s city limits, the City of Reno is responsible for sponsoring the application and conducting a full analysis of potential impacts. A copy of their staff report has been attached for your review. Washoe County’s comments regarding the proposal are attached to Reno’s staff report.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the City of Reno’s staff report regarding this project and determine whether to approve or deny the project based upon the findings listed above.

The findings listed in the City of Reno’s staff report are findings required by their code, and are to be considered by the City of Reno Planning Commission. The findings listed in the Washoe County staff report are required by the Washoe County Development Code, and are to be considered by the Washoe County Planning Commission. In order to approve or deny the project, each Planning Commission must make its own respective set of findings.

## CITIZEN ADVISORY BOARD COMMENTS

The proposed project was initially reviewed by the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board in May 2008. At that meeting, County residents voiced concern over maintaining a voice in the planning process as well as potential water flows across the property. At that meeting, the CAB voted to recommend approval of the project.
The project was heard again at the North Valleys CAB’s April 6, 2009 meeting. The CAB agreed to take no action regarding the project. Concerns again included the potential for County residents potentially losing their voice in the planning process if this property was removed from the joint planning area. Concerns over traffic issues were also raised.

Copies of the minutes from both meetings are attached for your reference.

**APPLICABLE REGULATIONS**

Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 278; Washoe County Code Chapter 110.

Attachments: City of Reno Staff Report for LDC08-00205, Dated May 6, 2009
Minutes from North Valleys CAB Meeting, Dated April 20, 2009
Minutes from North Valleys CAB Meeting, Dated May 12, 2008
Proposed Resolution for LDC08-00205

xc: Agencies: North Valleys CAB; City of Reno Planning
RESOLUTION NO. 09-__
RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF AN AMENDMENT
TO THE WASHOE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
JOINT WITH THE CITY OF RENO
RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN
CITY OF RENO CASE NUMBER LDC08-00205
(RTM SKY VISTA AND ERGS PROPERTY)

ADOPTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE WASHOE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN (RSCJP) TO REMOVE ±98.06 ACRES OF
PROPERTY FROM THE RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN (RSCJP). THE SITE IS
LOCATED ±294 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST OF THE INTERSECTION OF LEMMON
DRIVE AND SKY VISTA PARKWAY WITH A PORTION OF THE NORTHERN END OF
THE PROPERTY FRONTING ON LEMMON DRIVE. THE AMENDMENT IS IN A JOINT
PLANNING AREA AND IS BEING NOTICED FOR REVIEW BY THE CITY OF RENO
AND WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONS. THE PROPERTY IS IDENTIFIED
AS HAVING A DESIGNATION OF SP (SPECIFIC PLAN) IN WASHOE COUNTY’S
NORTH VALLEYS LAND USE PLAN MAP (MAP 3 OF THE RSCJP). IT IS IDENTIFIED
AS HAVING A DESIGNATION OF SPA (SPECIAL PLANNING AREA) IN THE CITY OF
RENO’S LAND USE PLAN, A PORTION OF THE CITY OF RENO’S MASTER PLAN. AS
IDENTIFIED BY THE RSCJP PLANNED LAND USE MAP (MAP 4), THE UNDERLYING
LAND USE/ZONING DESIGNATIONS FOR THE PROPERTY ARE GC (GENERAL
COMMERCIAL); LDS/RR (LOW DENSITY SUBURBAN/RURAL RESIDENTIAL - 2.5 TO
1 ACRE LOTS); AND OS (OPEN SPACE) IN WASHOE COUNTY. THE UNDERLYING
ZONING DESIGNATIONS IN THE CITY OF RENO ARE AC (ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL);
CC (COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL); LLR1 (LARGE LOT RESIDENTIAL - 1 ACRE); SF6
(SINGLE FAMILY - 6,000 SQUARE FOOT LOTS); AND OS (OPEN SPACE). (APN:
086-380-02 AND 086-390-16)

WHEREAS, Joint Planning Area Case Number LDC08-00205 came before the
Washoe County Planning Commission and the City of Reno Planning
Commission for a duly noticed public hearing on May 6, 2009;

WHEREAS, the Washoe County Planning Commission heard public comment and
input from both staff and applicant representatives regarding the
proposed comprehensive plan amendment;

WHEREAS, the Washoe County Planning Commission has given reasoned
consideration to the information it has received regarding the proposed
comprehensive plan amendment;

WHEREAS, the Washoe County Planning Commission has made the findings
necessary to support approval of this proposed comprehensive plan
amendment as set forth in NRS chapter 278 and Washoe County
Development Code Article 820;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED pursuant to NRS 278.210(3) that (1) the
Washoe County Planning Commission does hereby approve the
proposed joint planning area comprehensive plan amendment in City of
Reno Case Number LDC08-00205, comprised of the maps, descriptive
matter and other matter intended to constitute the amendment as
submitted at public hearing noted above; and (2) this approval is subject
to the conditions adopted by the Washoe Planning Commission at the public hearing noted above.

ADOPTED this 6th day of May, 2009.

WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Christy Magers, Chairman

ATTEST:

Adrian P. Freund, FAICP,
Secretary to the Planning Commission
ATTACHMENT B

City of Reno Staff Report for LDC08-00205,
Dated May 6, 2009
STAFF REPORT
May 11, 2009

To: Reno City Council and Washoe County Commission
Thru: Charles McNeely, City Manager
From: John Hester, AICP, Community Development Director
Claudia C. Hanson, AICP, Deputy Community Development Director-Planning
Re: LDC08-00205 (RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property)
Date: May 1, 2009

Summary: This is a request for a Master Plan amendment to remove ±98.06 acres of property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. The Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same. The site is located ±294 feet to the northwest of the intersection of Lemmon Drive and Sky Vista Parkway with a portion of the northern end of the property fronting on Lemmon Drive. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions. The zoning designations for the property are GC (General Commercial); LDS/RR (Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential – 2.5 to 1 acre lots); HDS/LDR (High Density Suburban/Low Density Residential – 3 to 7 du/acre); and OS (Open Space) in Washoe County, and are AC (Arterial Commercial); CC (Community Commercial); LLR1 (Large Lot Residential – 1 acre); SF6 (Single Family – 6,000 square foot lots) and OS (Open Space) in the City.

Proposed Motion: I move to uphold the recommendation of the Reno City Planning Commission and the Washoe County Planning Commission.

Please see attached staff report.
CITY OF RENO
Planning Commission
May 6, 2009
Staff Report

CASE NO.: LDC08-00205 (RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property)

APPLICANT: RTM Sky Vista, LLC
ERGS, Inc.

APN NUMBER: 086-380-02 and 036-390-16

REQUEST: This is a request for a Master Plan amendment to remove ±98.06 acres of property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. The Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same.

LOCATION: The site is located ±294 feet to the northwest of the intersection of Lemmon Drive and Sky Vista Parkway with a portion of the northern end of the property fronting on Lemmon Drive. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions. The zoning designations for the property are GC (General Commercial); LDS/RR (Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential – 2.5 to 1 acre lots); HDS/LDR (High Density Suburban/Low Density Residential – 3 to 7 du/acre); and OS (Open Space) in Washoe County, and are AC (Arterial Commercial); CC (Community Commercial); LLR1 (Large Lot Residential – 1 acre); SF6 (Single Family – 6,000 square foot lots) and OS (Open Space) in the City.

PROPOSED MOTION: Based upon compliance with the applicable findings, I move to recommend that City Council approve the amendment to the Master Plan by resolution, subject to conformance review by the Regional Planning Agency.

BACKGROUND:

On March 5, 2008, the City Council approved the annexation of the overall ±118.3 acre parcel into the City of Reno (see Exhibit A). On January 14, 2009, the Sky Vista Wal Mart (SVWM) was approved by the City Council upon appeal, and on February 11, 2009, the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission found the SVWM in conformance with the Regional Plan regarding the thresholds that were triggered for a
Project of Regional Significance (see Exhibits B and C for the approval letters). If this Master Plan amendment is approved for a boundary change to eliminate the site from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP), it is the applicant’s intent to subsequently apply for a zoning map amendment to PUD (Planned Unit Development) on the property. Originally, the SVWM acreage (+24.3) was a part of this Master Plan amendment application, but was taken out of the request because the existing zoning allowed the SVWM to move forward independent of the anticipated PUD and adhere to their entitlement and construction schedule. This results in ±98.3 acres on the remaining portion (Exhibit D).

Because the property is located in the RSJCP, a joint review and hearing with the Washoe County staff and Planning Commission is usually conducted. When the request was originally submitted on April 1, 2008, staff provided the application to Washoe County staff for their review. However, the application was put on hold in order to process the SVWM project. Upon resuming the review of this Master Plan amendment, the project was noticed for a joint Planning Commission meeting. The joint meeting satisfies NRS Section 278.02784 which requires that the City proceed with projects in a joint planning area in a joint fashion. Washoe County Planning staff provided comments that are attached in Exhibit E.

**Analysis:**

**Key Issues:** Removal of the property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan

**Land Use Compatibility:** The request is for removal of the property from the RSCJP only. The Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area will remain the same and was applied to the site since it is in the RSCJP. As the City of Reno Master Plan states, the Special Planning Area (SPA) designation is specifically designed for the following:

- Allows any individual land use, or land uses in combination which are compatible and complementary within the project boundaries and with adjoining properties

- Appropriate for large holdings which could be developed with a mix of land uses (e.g. planned unit developments, regional centers and transit corridors). Also appropriate for areas undergoing a transition in land use to more intense development, areas that would become more stable with development of mixed uses that complement each other, or areas where the City wants to encourage investment.

While this application is not a request for a zoning map amendment or to change the existing SPA Master Plan designation, taking the property out of the RSCJP will provide for the ability to request a PUD without conflicting policies between the RSCJP, the City of Reno Master Plan and the Reno Land Development Code. While the RSCJP is a
Master Plan document, it contains development standards, some of which conflict with City code.

Amendment to the RSCJP Boundaries: The RSCJP policies and standards have not been updated in any significant manner since its inception in 1999; however the Reno Land Development Code has undergone many changes over the last 10 years. It is reasonable to assume that Washoe County’s Development Code has changed as well, although staff has not verified this. There are also conflicts between the RSCJP and the Regional Plan concerning boundaries as well as conflicts with the RTC 2040 plan concerning street classifications (please see the “Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan Review” and “Updating the RSCJP” sections of this report for specific details). Removing the property from the plan in preparation for a PUD will eliminate any inconsistencies between these documents, particularly between the RSCJP and the City of Reno Land Development Code, and will allow the applicant to move forward in a more expedient manner.

Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan Review: It should be noted that only the policies in the RSCJP that are applicable to the proposed request have been analyzed.

While the City of Reno and Washoe County work together in a joint manner to administer the plan, Washoe County originally published the RSCJP and has traditionally conducted the revisions when amendments have been approved through the joint planning process. However, the most recent amendment was conducted in 2006 making the plan’s maps outdated.

Map Data:

Map 1 in the RSCJP shows the boundary of the plan area and identifies the parcel as within the plan area, but located in Washoe County. The site was annexed into the City of Reno on March 5, 2008, making Map 1 incorrect. Map 2 of the Plan is the “Development Suitability Map” and indicates that while the property has slopes over 15 percent on the overall site, about half of the property is unconstrained. Maps 3, 4, and 5 identify the North Valleys Land Use Plan, the Planned Land Use and the Reno Sphere of Influence respectively. Map 3 indicates that this site is suitable for an SPD Handbook. While the City of Reno no longer utilizes the SPD zoning designation, a PUD can be utilized. Page 8 of the RSCJP states that “If an SPD is not adopted..., then properties will develop according to the underlying zoning” (Exhibit F). Map 4 does not reflect the recent annexation. Map 5 indicates that the property was put in the Reno Sphere of Influence in 2004. As with Map 1, it does not show that the subject property has been annexed and is incorrect. Map 6 is specific to the “Wild Stallion Estates” project and is not applicable. Map 7 shows the parcel in the Washoe County Service Area for public services. Map 8 identifies the street classification system and shows Lemmon Drive and Military Road as an arterial, and Sky Vista Parkway as a collector. It is noteworthy to add that the City of Reno’s Public Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Plan (PSFI) in the City’s Master Plan departs from the RSCJP street classification for
Sky Vista Parkway. It is identified as a collector in the RSCJP, but as a minor arterial in the PSFI. North Virginia also serves the area and is identified as a Rural Highway in the RSCJP, but as a minor arterial for the segment between Golden Valley Road and Red Rock Road in the PSFI. Given these inconsistencies, Map 8 is also in need of updating.

Conservation Policies:

C.1.1: New development shall preserve significant topographic features, i.e. rock outcroppings, vistas.

At the time an application is submitted for a Zoning Map amendment to PUD, City staff will review the entire site and make the appropriate recommendations to preserve the areas of significant relief and any other environmentally sensitive areas. Specifically for this case, there are slopes of 15% or greater and there is a significant ridgeline in the northern 1/3 portion of the site.

C.2.1: Natural or improved open drainageways shall be preserved; alteration of major drainageways is prohibited unless it results in the improvement of the drainageway.

While the drainageway is off the applicant’s site, the City’s Major Drainageway Plan requires that all disturbance, including grading, be setback 15 feet from the grade break.

C.2.2: The use of major drainageways as undeveloped buffers is required.

When the neighboring property owner to the west proposes development, the drainageway on the site will be required to comply with this policy. Any future development on the subject parcel or the neighboring parcel must demonstrate compliance with the City of Reno’s new Open Space and Greenways Plan.

C.3.1: Each development proposal shall be evaluated with the intent to preserve visually prominent ridges and rock outcroppings; and

C.3.2: Building envelopes on ridgetops that are not set aside for open space shall be subject to a minimum 100-foot setback from the horizontal plane of the ridgeline and 50 feet from the vertical plane of the ridgeline, whichever is more restrictive.

The City’s “Significant Ridgeline Map” shows a significant ridgeline in the northern one third of the property. The City’s hillside ordinance protects ridgelines via development standards which will be enforced at the time of development. The City’s Hillside Ordinance also protects rock outcroppings and regulates the location and design of roadways.

Land Use Policies:
LU.3.4: Major drainageways shall be used as buffers between residential development and non-residential development.

The site has no existing adjacent residential development, other than the vacant residentially zoned property on the subject site and to the east off the site.

LU.5.3: New development shall be proportionate to and integrated with the surrounding terrain.

The future PUD Handbook will have standards enforcing compatibility.

Public Services and Facilities Policies:

PSF.2.1: All planned urban and suburban development shall be included in the service area of a centralized community sewage treatment facility: and

PSF.2.2 The City of Reno and Washoe County should collectively evaluate the sanitary sewer needs for future development in the joint plan area.

Water will be provided by TMWA or the County via the Vidler Line, and sewer will be provided by the City’s facility nearby on Norton Street, or the County’s Facility accessed from Lemmon Drive.

PSF.4.4 Encourage developers of industrial and commercial properties to integrate open spaces within development and provide connections to adjoining public lands and hillsides; and

PSF.6.1 Restrict development on steep slopes, rock outcroppings, playas, drainageways, and wetlands on lands.

The development area has both “most suitable” areas and constrained areas with slopes of 15% or greater. When the property comes in for a zoning map amendment to PUD, the land uses proposed will be reviewed for their appropriateness as they relate to the topography and environmental conditions on the site.

Transportation Policies:

T.4.2 During the development review process, Washoe County and the City of Reno shall require, whenever practicable, that new developments minimize their direct access to all arterial roadways;

T.6.1 Ensure that all development proposals that generate 750 average daily trips include a description of existing or proposed public transportation demand management programs or policies; and
7.6.2 Encourage nonresidential developments to use transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, including providing such employee incentives as car pooling, van pooling, bus vouchers, shuttle service, telecommuting, shower facilities and bicycle racks.

The site takes its primary access off of Sky Vista Parkway which is identified in the RSCJP as a collector and a minor arterial in the City’s Master Plan. When an application is submitted for the rest of the site, access will be reviewed again. Ultimately, the property must have two different access points for emergency access and general safety. This second access will be Lemmon Drive, a major arterial.

Master Plan Amendment Findings: Finding 1 requires that a change in the area has occurred that warrants the amendment. In the past few years, the properties to the north and south have been approved for Arterial Commercial and Community Commercial zoning, and in some cases entitlements for development projects such as the SVWM and the “Silver Peak Apartments” complex. More importantly, construction of the Vidler water importation project will provide needed water to service the general area. This in combination with the recent realignment of Military Road to accommodate additional traffic and the addition of signalized access to the subject property from Sky Vista Parkway will ensure adequate services.

Finding 2 requires that the intensity of the amendment be sensitive and compatible to the existing land uses in the surrounding area. This amendment request ultimately does not have any immediate impacts to the surrounding properties since the Master Plan designation of SPA does not change. Only the boundaries in the plan area will change if approved. The public hearing process for a PUD will still provide for review by all commenting agencies, including Washoe County, the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board (CAB), and the North Valleys Neighborhood Advisory Board (NAB).

Finding 3 requires that the amendment provide for orderly physical growth of the City, enhance the urban core and foster walkable neighborhoods. With the Vidler waterline under way, the recent realignment of Military Drive, and a signalized intersection at Sky Vista Parkway at the entrance to the site that was required with the SVWM, orderly growth is occurring. The SVWM and the subject acreage will have sidewalk throughout the site, including a connection to the adjacent park to the northwest. Additionally, if the request is approved, this area of the City will have the commercial services that many residents have expressed to staff they want during the review of the SVWM. A possible residential component in the future PUD could also provide the City an opportunity to meet the goals of the recently adopted Housing Plan. Most importantly, existing residents who live in Red Rock and the North Valley areas will no longer have to commute as far for the same services, reducing overall traffic on the U.S 395 and I-80.
Finding 4 requires that there be adequate transportation, recreation, utility and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed Master Plan amendment. As stated above, there will be adequate vehicular and pedestrian transportation to the site. An RTC Ride bus stop serving Route 7 is currently located on Sky Vista Parkway adjacent to the subject parcels. US 395 freeway and Lemmon Valley on and off ramps are just over 1,000 feet away making the site appropriate for future intensity. As with the SVWM, water will be provided by TMWA or the County via the Vidler Line. At this time discussions have been ongoing with Washoe County Utilities and TMWA and a “Discovery Report” has been requested to address water service to the site and is forthcoming. Sewer will be provided by the City’s facility nearby on Norton Street, or the County’s facility accessed from Lemmon Drive. A sewage Discovery Report has also been requested. At this time, the site is located within Police Beat 24 and is serviced by the Stead Substation located at 10555 Stead Boulevard. Fire service is provided by Station 13 at 10575 Silver Lake Road and is within Fire District 1304. The nearest Police Station is ±2.7 miles away, and the nearest Fire Station is ±2.19 miles away.

Finding 5 requires that the proposed change be in substantial conformance with the Master Plan. The SPA designation is designed specifically for large holdings of property that can accommodate mixed uses which are governed by Regional Centers or PUD’s, and for properties that are undergoing a transition to more intense development. Because the Master Plan designation is not being changed, the property still conforms to these criteria. The only change is to the boundary of RSCJP which will allow the applicant to move forward in a more expedient manner. Please see the Master Plan section of this report for a more detailed analysis of the Master Plan policies.

Updating of the RSCJP: The last amendment to the RSCJP was on October 17, 2006 and consisted of the addition of standards for the Wild Stallion Estates property, and the incorporation of Industrial Outdoor Storage standards within Policy LU.7. As far as staff can identify, no other updates to any other component of the plan, including the policies and standards have occurred. Since 2006, there have been amendments to the plan that include, but are not limited to: the ERGS property (LDC07-00218); the Peavine Peak property (LCD08-00206, and LDC09-00042); and Arroyo Crossing (LDC07-00102). Amendments to the City’s Land Development Code have also occurred. The RSCJP plan needs to be amended to reflect the previous actions after the 2006 amendment. During review of the above requests it became apparent that because the Master Plan and zoning designations have not been updated as each amendment occurs, applications have been submitted by consultants that include errors and omissions. Complicating this is that past practice for amendments for properties in the plan that are in the City of Reno have included assigning the County’s land use designations for some requests (as shown in the plan), as well as assigning City designations on others. With the Peavine Peak submittal, the Zoning Administrator has determined that the City will only assign City designations from this point forward on parcels that are in the City of Reno to avoid confusion.
The maps in the plan also need to be revised. While processing ERGS Crossing shown in Exhibit G, staff discovered that the RSCJP identifies the parcels for this land in the plan area on Land Use Plan Map 3, but there is no assignment of the property with any underlying zoning designations shown on Planned Land Use Map 4. Ultimately, it was determined that the larger parcel of the ERGS holdings was not within the plans boundaries, however staff still offered a review of the request subject to the policies contained in the RSCJP and held joint meetings as a courtesy. In recent discussions with Regional Planning staff, it was indicated that during their review of Master Plan amendments from the City and Comprehensive Plan amendments from the County, that portions of the boundaries were incorrect and needed updating.

In addition, the Draft 2040 Regional Transportation Plan has new standards and polices for regional road infrastructure and classification of streets. These policies have been in use for some time and many are in conflict with the RSCJP transportation policies and road classifications that were written many years ago. Staff has used the Land Development Code and the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan since the City is required to do so by the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. For additional clarity, the RSCJP states that the City’s Land Use Development Code and the standards therein apply for properties in the City and the sphere. The Regional Plan also requires that a master plan for a joint plan be consistent with the Regional Plan (page 5 of the RSCJP).

Finally, initial attempts at reviewing the SVWM request were complex since it is subject to the City of Reno’s relatively new Large Retail Establishment (LRE) ordinance. The RSCJP has been in place since 1999, and while it has had minor amendments to the land use maps, it has not been amended to update the policies and standards. As a result, the most recent amendments to the major drainageway plan and hillside development standards in the City’s code have some conflicting goals and/or policies with the RSCJP. Additionally, the policies, standards and maps in the plan need to be updated to reflect current City and County codes, the RTC 2040 plan, and the Regional Plan.

Public Safety and Improvements: When a PUD Handbook is submitted, public safety and improvements will be reviewed and any necessary infrastructure will be required at that time.

Circulation: With the approval of the SVWM, the road alignment was set for the site, with the primary accesses from Sky Vista Parkway (a minor arterial) and Lemmon Drive (a major arterial).

Master Plan: As proposed and with recommended conditions, the project appears to be consistent with the following applicable Master Plan policies and objectives: CD-1: Encourage new developments with intense activities to locate in existing planned urban centers and areas served by public transit; CD-3: Encourage clustering and protect sensitive environmental resources; CD-20: The City encourages the clustering of services in locations convenient to neighboring residential areas in order to promote
fewer vehicle trips; CD-50: Mix and multiple uses are encouraged. These developments whether large or small, should promote walkable neighborhoods with services, housing, employment and transit in close proximity to one another; and E-24: The City should promote the protection, conservation, and acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands such as prominent ridgelines.

Other Reviewing Bodies:

Washoe County: See Exhibit F
Regional Transportation Commission: No comments
Washoe County Health Department: No comments

Neighborhood Advisory Board: This project was reviewed by the Ward 4 North Valley’s Neighborhood Advisory Board on June 16, 2008. A copy of their comments is attached to this report (Exhibit H).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:

RMC 18.06.301 Master Plan Amendments

FINDINGS:

Master Plan Amendment: Master Plan amendment findings. In order to adopt an amendment to the master plan, the planning commission and city council shall find all of the following:

1. There has been a change in the area or in the conditions on which the current designation was based which warrants the amendment;
(2) The density and intensity of the proposed master plan amendment is sensitive to the existing land uses and is compatible with the existing adjacent land use designations;

(3) The amendment will provide for orderly physical growth of the city, enhance the urban core and foster safe, convenient and walkable neighborhoods and shopping districts;

(4) There are or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed master plan designation; and

(5) The proposed change is in substantial conformance with the goals and policies of the master plan and other adopted plans and policies.

Staff: Cheryl Ryan, Senior Planner
LDC08-00205
RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property

Subject Site for a Master Plan Amendment to remove ±125.8 acres from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan and remain as a Special Planning Area.

City Limits
Master Plan
LDC08-00205
RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property
Subject Site for a Master Plan Amendment to remove ±125.8 acres from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan and remain as a Special Planning Area.

City Limits
April 14, 2008

Real Trust Management Capital Corp.
Attn: Joe Camarda
8230 Boone Road, Ste. 350
Vienna, VA 22181

RE: Case No. LDC07-00331 (Alta Vista Crossing) - NOTICE OF FINAL ACTION, DECISION OR ORDER

Dear Applicant:

At a regular meeting held March 26, 2008, the City Council passed and adopted Ordinance No. 6012, approving the above referenced annexation.

Sincerely,

Lynnette R. Jones
City Clerk

xc: Community Development
Traffic Design Engineer
Terry Zeller, Parks, Recreation & Community Services
Patrice Echola, Regional Transportation Commission
Marchon Miller, Regional Transportation Commission
Nathan Hastings, DR Land Company, Inc.

One East First Street, Second Floor*P.O. Box 7, Reno, NV 89504
CityofReno.com

LDC08-00205
RTM/SKY VISTA & ERGS
EXHIBIT A
February 10, 2009

RTM-HRCF Sky Vista, LLC
c/o Steve Etzel
250 Park Avenue South, 3rd floor
New York, NY 10003

RE: Case No. LDC09-00029 (Sky Vista Walmart) – THIRD AMENDED LETTER

Dear Applicant:

At a regular meeting held January 14, 2009, and following a public hearing thereon, the City Council upheld the Planning Commission recommendation, subject to a finding of conformance for a Project of Regional Significance, and approved the request for the following:

(1) Special use permits for: (a) hillside development; (b) cuts of 20 feet or greater in height and fills of 10 feet or greater in depth; (c) residential adjacency; (d) 24 hour operations; and (e) a freestanding sign in excess of 25 feet in the CC zone, subject to the following conditions; and

(2) Variances to the Large Retail Establishment ordinance for: (a) the number of exterior entrances for all tenants occupying space in a primary commercial building; (b) orienting the primary entrance away from the primary street(s) that provide access to the site; (c) modifying the parking lot quadrants; and (d) modifying the 8 foot planter along public streets adjacent to the site on a ±118.3 acre parcel located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Sky Vista Parkway and Lemmon Drive in the CC (Community Commercial), LLRI (Large Lot Residential - 1 acre), SF6 (Single Family - 6,000 square foot lots) and OS (Open Space) zones, subject to the following conditions. The ±24.3 acre site proposed for development with this project is zoned CC and is a Project of Regional Significance.
All conditions shall be met to the satisfaction of Community Development Department staff, unless otherwise noted.

1. The project shall comply with all applicable City codes, plans, reports, materials, etc., as submitted. In the event of a conflict between said plans, reports, materials and City codes, City codes in effect at the time the building permit is applied for, shall prevail.

2. The applicant shall apply for all building permits necessary for the Walmart within eighteen (18) months from the date of final approval, and continuously maintain the validity of those permits, or this approval shall be null and void. The phasing of the stand alone buildings shall be in accordance with Condition No. 25.

3. Parking of Recreation Vehicles or trucks with campers for more that 3 hours is prohibited. Signs shall be posted to this effect, and on-site security shall enforce the requirement.

4. No seasonal sales, special event sales, or other sales of merchandise may be conducted in the parking lot area. All seasonal sales, special event sales, or other sales of merchandise must be contained within the building or along the front of the building in a manner that does not block access and circulation within the site. Such events must meet applicable special event and temporary use applications and operation procedures. No parking spaces may be blocked at any time with the sale or storage of any items or cordoned off in any manner. This applies to all tenant spaces on the site.

5. Prior to the issuance of each building permit, including a site improvement permit, a plan for a shopping cart retrieval system for all uses on the site must be submitted, approved, installed and enforced for the site in perpetuity. The final system selection shall be approved by the Community Development Department.

6. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the “stand alone” pads, it shall be demonstrated that the architecture for each of the stand alone pads shall be consistent with the overall design of the Walmart building in color, materials, and articulation and shall have four sided architecture.

7. Prior to issuance of each building permit, including a site improvement permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan that demonstrates compliance with the additional landscaping requirements for parking areas with over 600 spaces. The City’s Landscape Architect shall review and approve the plans and make modifications as necessary.
8. The special use permit for 24 hour operations is specific to the WalMart LRE only. All future tenants in the stand alone buildings must apply individually for a special use permit.

9. Prior to issuance of each building permit, including a site improvement permit, the applicant shall identify a location where large discarded cardboard boxes and other large trash items will be stored. This area shall be enclosed with an opaque screening method that is in keeping with the materials used for the building. At no time may discarded or stored items be placed outside of the enclosed area, nor may items be stacked such that they are higher than the enclosure.

10. Prior to the issuance of each building permit, a roof top mechanical plan shall be submitted. The plans must show the height of the mechanical equipment and the parapet.

11. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, including site improvements, it shall be demonstrated on the final landscaping plan that all disturbed areas are landscaped with ornamental materials. The detention basin slopes shall be revegetated with a seed mix that includes shrubs, grasses and wildflowers on the embankments and bottom, and shall be planted with trees on the embankments. Trees on the detention basin slopes shall be planted in clusters and installed at a rate of 1 tree for every 600 square feet of the area contained on the slopes. The City's Landscape Architect shall review the plans and require modifications as appropriate.

12. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall have plans approved demonstrating that all retaining walls shall be dry stacked rockery walls or constructed with the "reddie-wall" or "country manor" systems. The color of the walls shall be consistent with the colors of the topography, or consistent with the materials of the building materials, whichever is applicable. Additional walls shall be used, or the height of the walls shall be increased, in order to reduce the length of mechanized slopes along the east side of the site around the knoll. Double or triple walls or an increase in the length of the walls shall be required as determined by staff. Tiered walls must have benches of 8 feet or greater and be ornamentally landscaped for erosion control to the satisfaction of the City's Landscape Architect.

13. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the final grading plan submitted for the project shall demonstrate that the area of disturbance for the detention pond paralleling the major drainageway to the west off the site is 15 feet back from the grade break of the drainageway.
14. Prior to issuance of a building permit, including a site improvement permit for the Walmart structure, the applicant shall submit a detail of the loading dock area that includes a cross section of the docks, the screen walls and landscaping. The City’s Landscape Architect shall review the plans and require modifications as appropriate.

15. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, including a site improvement permit, the applicant shall demonstrate that the final landscaping plan shows the trees on the slopes along Sky Vista Boulevard and the access road that parallels the truck dock are oversized. Trees on permanent slopes west of the access road must be of the same density as shown on the preliminary landscape plan north of Sky Vista Parkway. For the oversized trees along Sky Vista Parkway. Deciduous trees shall be a 50/50 mix of 3 and 4 inch caliper, and the evergreen trees shall be a 50/50 mix of 8 and 10 feet tall. The trees used to screen the loading docks shall also comply with this condition. The City’s Landscape Architect shall review the plans and require modifications as appropriate.

16. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, a reciprocal parking agreement shall be submitted for review, and upon approval, the agreement shall be recorded. It shall also be demonstrated that the CC&R’s include a landscape and property maintenance plan that stipulates how the property will be maintained, including the replacement of dead or dying plant material.

17. Truck deliveries to the site shall be prohibited between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. No idling of trucks or operation of chilling units shall be permitted. All truck docks shall be sealed during loading/unloading of items. Parking lot sweeping and/or cleaning shall be prohibited between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. This condition shall become null and void should the zoning on the adjacent LLR-1 property be approved for a zoning map amendment to a non-residential zone.

18. Prior to the issuance of any permit, including a site improvement permit, it shall be demonstrated that a dark skies lighting system will be installed. Site lighting shall be 3.3 footcandle on average, with a minimum of 1.0 footcandle between the hours of 11:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. It shall also be demonstrated that in the event that the LLR1 zoning is not changed to a non-residential use, that light poles are restricted to 12 feet within 100 feet of the residential zone. Poles not within 100 feet of residentially zoned property shall be 30 feet in height or less.

19. Prior to the issuance of any permit, including a site improvement permit, it shall be demonstrated that the pedestrian patios in front of the building shown on the civil landscaping plan with stamped colorized concrete will be installed. The final landscaping plans shall indicate the color, stamping pattern and area.
20. Prior to issuance of any permit, the elevations for each building shall show that all 
CMU used for the WalMart and the stand alone pads be split face. Smooth CMU 
shall be permitted on a limited basis to provide for changes in texture. Anti 
graffiti paint or coating shall be required on all buildings.

21. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, or a site improvement permit, it shall be 
demonstrated on the final plans that the landscaping on both sides of the 
pedestrian walkways that lead from the parking area to the WalMart building have 
an overall width of 15 feet (this includes the walkway), and that the sidewalks 
along perimeter streets are 6 feet in width in accordance with the Large Retail 
Establishment ordinance.

22. Prior to issuance of any permit, it shall be demonstrated that Building A as 
identified on Exhibit H, shall be not higher than 14 feet as required in 
Conservation Policy C.1.4 in the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

23. Prior to issuance of any permit, it shall be demonstrated that lighting for signs 
meet Land Use Policies LU.9.3 and LU.9.4 in the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

24. The applicant agrees to retroactively pay a Police Concurrency impact fee on a 
square foot basis for each building permit issued prior to a Council approved fee, 
if an impact fee is adopted prior to December 31, 2009. After Council adoption, 
the fee shall be paid at the time of building permit. If a Fire Station is built, credit 
will be given for the cost of a 600 square foot office space and 4 parking spaces 
provided in the Fire Station.

25. The stand alone pads and future buildings to the northwest (Buildings A, B and C 
as shown on Exhibit C) of this report shall be constructed and receive a Certificate 
of Occupancy 5 years after the Certificate of Occupancy is granted for the 
WalMart by the City of Reno. If after 5 years the buildings are not completed, the 
pads shall be planted with a meadow seed mix that includes wildflowers subject 
to the review and approval of the City’s Landscape Architect.

26. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, including a site improvement permit, 
the final landscaping plan shall demonstrate that the access road from Sky Vista 
Parkway to the northern most driveway to the site shall be ornamentally 
landscaped on both sides for its entire length, prior to the issuance of a Certificate 
of Occupancy for the WalMart structure. The City’s Landscape Architect shall 
review and approve the final road plan for the location and amount of landscaping 
and revegetation. A bond to cover the cost of revegetation of all slopes and areas 
disturbed by grading shall be submitted prior to issuance of a grading permit.
Landscaping on the entire site shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a site improvement permit.

Prior to approval of each permit, the applicant shall demonstrate all necessary on-site and off-site easement(s), vacations, relocations, and grants are complete or prepared, approved, and ready for recordation. These easements include, but are not limited to; project construction, site access and cross access, utility access, emergency access, maintenance access, sewer lines, surface drainage, storm drains, irrigation ditches, and utility improvements. All required access, sewer, storm drainage, and utility improvements shall be constructed and associated on-site and off-site easement vacations, relocations, and grants shall be recorded prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy.

27. Prior to approval of any permit, the applicant shall provide a hydrology report, identifying required mitigation, if any, to maintain the controlled elevation of Swan Lake. Prior to the issuance of any permit, the applicant shall have approved plans for the disposition of storm waters generated on site up to and including a 100 year frequency storm, including any necessary easements. Volumetric analysis is to be based on the 100-year, 10-day storm event, while routing of peak flows shall be based on the 100-year, 24-hour storm event. Final hydrology must account for both the peak and volume of storm flows generated by the 100-year storm event, and final design shall incorporate measures to assure that there is no net increase in the regulatory 100-year water surface elevation at Swan Lake.

28. Prior to the approval of any site improvement permit, excluding grading, the applicant shall have an approved Sewerage Report in accordance with the Public Works Design Manual. On-site sanitary sewer mains and manholes will be publicly owned and maintained. Adequate maintenance access shall be provided for all sanitary sewer improvements per the Public Works Design Manual.

29. Prior to the approval of any site improvement permit, excluding grading, the applicant shall have plans for all required public sanitary sewer improvements approved by the Community Development Department in accordance with the Sewer Report. All required off-site sanitary sewer infrastructure shall be constructed by the applicant and deemed complete and functional by the City prior to the issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

30. Site circulation design, traffic control devices, and operational characteristics of the site accesses, common use driveways, on-site drive aisles, emergency accesses, fire access lanes, pedestrian routes, sidewalks, and parking areas shall be in accordance with the Public Works Design Manual and shall meet with the approval of the City Fire and Community Development Departments.
31. The applicant shall provide sidewalks and demonstrate accessible and ADA compliant pedestrian routes from all adjacent public rights-of-way to the on-site buildings.

32. Prior to the approval of a building permit, the applicant shall have a City of Reno and RTC approved CCFEA traffic study for the project. This study shall evaluate background and project traffic patterns, site accesses, and pedestrian routes and review of the roadway capacities, intersection levels of service for the roadway network included in the project. Prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy for this permit, the applicant shall have all recommended improvements at the intersection of Sky Vista Parkway and the Project Access (including signalization) and the widening of Sky Vista Parkway from Lemmon Drive to the Project Access to four lanes completed.

33. Prior to approval of a site improvement permit, the applicant shall provide a written response from RTC defining transit requirements for this project and shall dedicate rights-of-way or grant appropriate easements and construct transit improvement in accordance with RTC’s requirements prior to the approval of any certificate of occupancy to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department staff.

34. Prior to a certificate of occupancy for the first building permit, the applicant shall develop an Employee Trip Reduction Program (TRP), including an implementation schedule, for the project in accordance with the requirements of RTC to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department staff. Said TRP shall be updated to incorporate each non-residential final map and be continuously operated and maintained throughout the life of the project.

35. Prior to the approval of each permit, the applicant shall have plans and appropriate easements for the relocating or undergrounding of all overhead utilities proposed with this project in accordance with City standards and RMC Section 18.12.603 “Underground Utility Services.”

36. Prior to approval of each permit, the applicant shall demonstrate all necessary on-site and off-site easements, vacations, relocations, and grants are complete or prepared, approved, and ready for recordation. These easements include, but are not limited to; project construction, site access and cross access, utility access, emergency access, maintenance access, sewer lines, surface drainage, storm drains, irrigation ditches, and utility improvements. All required access, sewer, storm drainage, and utility improvements shall be constructed and associated on-site and off-site easement vacations, relocations, and grants shall be recorded prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy.
37. Prior to the approval of each permit, the applicant shall have a preconstruction meeting and an approved Construction Management Plan. This plan shall include provisions for on-site and off-site construction material storage, employee parking and shuttle services (as appropriate), and construction activity phasing and staging. The plan shall also depict the proposed construction transportation and delivery routes within the project vicinity. Access to adjacent businesses and properties shall be maintained during construction.

38. Prior to the approval of each permit, the applicant shall comply with the Quality Assurance Program as set forth in the Public Works Design Manual, Chapter VI, titles "Inspection, Testing and Verification" and "Quality Assurance Program."

39. Prior to the approval of a grading permit, the applicant shall have final grading plans approved demonstrating compliance with the hillside development standards. Where not retained with rockery or reddie walls as shown on the plans or required by Community Development staff, the grading plan shall show feathering and undulation of slopes (using 2:1, 3:1, 4:1 and 5:1) into the natural topography. A note shall be added to each grading sheet as follows:


40. The Renewal Plan for reuse of the WalMart building shall be submitted to Community Development staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

A copy of this letter must be attached to your building plans when making application for a building permit with the Community Development Department.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lynnette R. Jones
City Clerk

LRJ:edg
xc:  Community Development
    Traffic Design Engineer
    Terry Zeller, Parks, Recreation & Community Services
    Donald Naquin, City Landscape Architect
    Reno Fire Department
    Patrice Echola, Regional Transportation Commission
    Marchon Miller, Regional Transportation Commission
    Dave Snelgrove, Wood Rodgers, Inc.
    Kenny Brown, DR Land Company
February 12, 2009

Rosanna Coombes  
Clerk of the Regional Planning Commission  
One East First Street, Suite 1100  
Reno, Nevada 89501

Dear Ms. Coombes:

On February 11, 2008, the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) held a public hearing and determined that the following matter conforms with the comprehensive Regional Plan:

Regional Plan Conformance Review – project of regional significance, Sky Vista Wal Mart (CR08-038) – a project of regional significance for traffic generation in excess of 6,250 average daily trips and sewage generation in excess of 187,500 gallons per day. The ±118.3 acre project site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Sky vista Parkway and Lemmon Drive in the Community Commercial of Highway 395, west of White Lake Parkway and southeast of White Lake.

This letter has been filed with the Clerk of the Regional Planning Commission on this date and constitutes notice of final action under NRS 278.0235, “Actions against Agency: Commencement,” unless a petition for review is timely filed by a person seeking review of the RPC action or determination pursuant to section 1.3 of the Regional Planning Governing Board’s Regulations on Procedure.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 775/321-8392 if you have any questions on this matter.

Sincerely,

Sienna Reid  
Regional Planner

cc:  File CR08-038  
John Hester, City of Reno  
Carmi Gunderson, City of Reno  
Armando Ornelas, City of Sparks  
Adrian Freund, Washoe County  
Debra Goodwin, RTC  

One East First Street, Suite 1100, Reno, NV 89511  
775-321-8385; Fax 775-321-8386  
http://www.tmrpa.org

LDC08-00205  
RTM/SKY VISTA & ERGS  
EXHIBIT C
EXHIBIT TO ACCOMPANY LEGAL DESCRIPTION

WASHOE COUNTY   NEVADA
PORTION OF THE SE 1/4 OF SECTION 4, T. 20 N., R. 19 E.

TOTAL ACRES = 7.50 ±
MEMORANDUM

TO: Cheryl Ryan, Senior Planner  
Reno Community Development Department

FROM: Lisa Brosnan, Planner  
Ph: 775-328-3668  Fax: 775-328-6133  
E-mail: lbrosnan@washoeCounty.us

SUBJECT: LDC08-00205 (Lemmon Drive/Sky Vista Parkway Properties) – Request for an Amendment to the existing City of Reno master plan designations for APN 086-390-16 from OS and of SPA (Special Planning Area) to Parks/Recreation/Open Space and Urban Residential Commercial on 7.5± acres (APN 086-390-16) and removal of a portion of 086-380-02 and all of 086-390-16 from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

Dear Cheryl,

Below are Washoe County Community Development staff’s comments regarding the above project, which falls under Joint Planning Area review.

1. This project has changed since last reviewed in May, 2008. The area proposed for a Wal-Mart has been cut from the plan, reducing the total acreage from 125.8 acres to 98.06 acres.
2. The Master Plan designation (SPA) is to remain the same.
3. At their regular meeting held on May 12, 2008, the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board heard a presentation on the proposed Lemmon Drive/Sky Vista Parkway Properties project including the possibility of its removal from the Reno-Stead corridor Joint Plan. The North Valleys CAB voted 4-3 in favor of the proposal with the following considerations.
   a. The proposed project would increase negative traffic impacts.
   b. Improvement to adjacent roads would be necessary to handle the additional density.
   c. The CAB fears a loss of voice in the process if taken out of the joint plan.
   d. Concern was expressed over slope and resultant water run off.
   e. The CAB would like assurance that the significant ridgeline will be protected.
4. The subject properties are included in Reno’s Sphere of Influence and are therefore not subject to cooperative planning review by Washoe County. According to the Guiding Principles listed in Appendix A of the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan: The City shall process all development permits and exercise...
any power conferred pursuant to NRS 278.010 through 278.630, inclusive, within
the sphere of influence during and after the joint planning process.”

5. At future opportunities for review of this project, County staff will carefully review:
   a. Grading
   b. Buffering between commercial and residential uses
   c. Circulation and traffic impacts
   d. Preservation of ridgelines and steep slopes
   e. Compatibility with uses in the County’s jurisdiction

6. A representative of the applicant has made a commitment to return to the North Valleys CAB as this project moves forward. County staff encourages City staff to ensure that the applicant and the CAB to follow through on this commitment.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please let me know if there is anything else you need from staff on this item.

Sincerely,

Lisa Brosnan, Planner
Washoe County Department of Community Development
C. Land Use

The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan is a document that establishes master plan designations in the joint plan area. For the City of Reno, land use designations are effectuated by adoption of zoning. The City of Reno administers all development regulations for parcels within its sphere. In the case of Washoe County, the master plan designations are also the zoning/land use districts. Washoe County administers development regulations for parcels outside of Reno’s sphere.

In 1999, existing development in the joint plan area consisted of four established communities, three mobile home parks, and scattered commercial and industrial uses. The residential communities were: Anderson Acres, Horizon Hills subdivision, Grandview Terrace subdivision, and properties along Tholl and Cassillis Roads. The densities were generally one-third acre homesites and one- to five-acre homesites, many with livestock.

The dominant land use within the joint plan area was private vacant land with a pre-1993 zoning classification of A-1 (1 dwelling unit/acre [du/ac]). With the adoption of the North Valleys Area Plan in 1991, most of these parcels were designated Low Density Suburban (1 du/ac) or General Rural (1 du/40 acres). The General Rural land use was applied on parcels that either exhibited an environmental constraint (e.g. slopes in excess of 15 percent) or were far removed from public infrastructure. Growth in the North Valleys planning area has brought infrastructure to areas that were until recently far removed from public services. The General Rural land use designation does, however, reflect a rural lifestyle enjoyed by many North Valleys residents.

A number of parcels along Old U.S. 395 were designated Specific Plan. Specific Plan, as a designation, defines areas for mixed uses but requires more detailed planning to identify the appropriate mix of land uses within the area. The 1999 plan retained the recommendation of the North Valleys Area Plan that those properties develop as a Specific Plan Zoning District. This ensures a homogeneous development pattern between uses, building types, and architectural elements. If a Specific Plan District is not adopted pursuant to the City’s Zoning Ordinance, properties will develop according to the underlying land uses assigned by this joint plan.

Vacant lands within the plan area also include public property owned by Washoe County (e.g. the North Valleys Regional Sports Complex and water tanks), Washoe County School District (e.g. the North Valleys Transportation Center) and the federal government (e.g. steep slopes and ridgelines). The U.S. Forest Service may acquire private parcels in this area in an effort to consolidate its holdings in the Peavine Mountain area and protect a valued scenic and natural resource.

In 1999, the most concentrated area of commercial activity was located in the North Valleys Shopping Center located at the intersection of Lemmon Road and U.S. 395. Additional commercial uses included stand-alone commercial businesses on Red Rock Road and the North Virginia Street corridor. Industrial activity was scattered throughout the plan area, particularly on lands bounded by U.S. 395 and North Virginia Street. These uses included open storage, warehousing, and vehicle and machinery repair shops.

The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan area is surrounded to the north and east by the Reno City limits. In 1966, upon disposal by the United States Government, the Stead Air Force Base and surrounding properties were annexed to the City. Over time, the City annexed lands contiguous to the former military base. During the same period, the City’s main northern limits were expanded. One objective of this joint plan effort is a first step toward establishing a contiguous municipal jurisdiction for the City of Reno, connecting the Truckee Meadows sector with the Stead-Lemmon Valley community.
**PROJECT REVIEW FORM**
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No. **LDC08-00205**  Date: **6-16-08**
Case Name: **RTM/SKY VISTA & ERGS PROPERTY**
Case Planner: **CHERYL RYAN**
NAB Member Name: **GARRET JENSEN**
Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

**NAB COMMENTS:**

_is this the proposed file site of intent?_

_not at liberty to say!_

---

Issues/Concerns: The “sample issues” box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

**SAMPLE ISSUES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

---

NAB Member Signature: 

**LDC08-00205**
RTM/SKY VISTA & ERGS
EXHIBIT H
PROJECT REVIEW FORM
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No. 1908-0205
Case Name: 125 M Sky Villa & EL65 Project
Case Planner: Cheryl Lynn
NAB Member Name: Bypow Davis
Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:

__________________________

Issues/Concerns: The “sample issues” box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

__________________________

NAB Member Signature
NAB Comments - Janet L Pirozzi

I am not opposed to changing this property from a Joint Planning area to the City of Reno. However, I am opposed to the project itself.

The proposed project will create more traffic in this already somewhat congested area.

Here are already storefronts vacant and we keep on building. There are storefronts vacant in the Smith strip mall, Scolaries strip mall and Starbucks adjacent storefronts. In addition, there are vacant storefronts in Stead strip mall and the new Red Rock strip. I don’t see how building new buildings will bring new services if the current storefronts have not attracted new services that last.
ATTACHMENT C

Minutes from North Valleys CAB Meeting,
Dated April 20, 2009
TO: Bonnie Weber, Commissioner  
Kitty Jung, Commissioner  
FROM: Allayne Everett, Recording Secretary  
DATE: April 20, 2009  
RE: LDC08-00205 RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property  

The following is a portion of the draft minutes of the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board held April 6, 2009.

LDC08-00205 (RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property) – Sarah Chvilicek opened this agenda item and stated that this application falls within the joint planning corridor. Dave Snelgrove, Wood Rodgers presented the request for a Comprehensive/Master Plan amendment to remove ±98.06 acres of property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP). The site is located ±294 feet to the northwest of the intersection of Lemmon Drive and Sky Vista Parkway with a portion of the northern end of the property fronting on Lemmon Drive. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions. The property is identified as having a designation of SP (Specific Plan) in Washoe County's North Valleys Land Use Plan Map (Map 3 of the RSCJP). It is identified as having a designation of SPA (Special Planning Area) in the City of Reno's Land Use Plan, a portion of the City of Reno's Master Plan. As identified by the RSCJP Planned Land Use Map (Map 4), the underlying land use/zoning designations for the property are GC (General Commercial); LDS/RR (Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential - 2.5 to 1 acre lots); and OS (Open Space) in Washoe County. The underlying zoning designations in the City of Reno are AC (Arterial Commercial); CC (Community Commercial); LLR1 (Large Lot Residential - 1 acre); SF6 (Single Family - 6,000 square foot lots); and OS (Open Space). APN: 086-380-02 and 086-390-16. MOTION: Francine Donshick moved to recommend that LDC08-00205 RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property not be taken out of the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. The motion was seconded. Francine Donshick withdrew her motion. The second was withdrawn. With no vote to support the motion, the NVCAB agreed to take no action and to forward the comments forward to Washoe County. Sarah Chvilicek stated for the record that the concerns stated regarding the traffic flow issues and particularly at US 395, that per the traffic study that a signal be installed at Sky Vista and Military and also consider a signal at Sky Vista and the access at the new Walmart property. Ms. Chvilicek reminded the community that the NVCAB had previously recommended approval of this project and considering the current budget concerns, it is important that communications be kept open. Ms. Chvilicek stated concern that the City of Reno is being irresponsible by trying to include the Spring Mountain project within the City Limits and chipping away at opportunities for joint planning. In overarching districts, Washoe County comes first. The City of Reno residents have representation by both City and County. Unincorporated county residents do not have that representation.

Comments and Concerns

- Sarah Chvilicek reported that she told Wood Rodgers that she would discuss holding joint meetings with the North Valleys Neighborhood Advisory Board (NVNAB) when the planned unit developments (PUD) were brought forward.
- In response to questions raised, Mr. Snelgrove stated that they to pull this property out of the Joint Corridor Planning Area. Mr. Snelgrove also confirmed that Wood Rodgers would bring any proposed plans before the NVCAB.
- In response to questions raised, Mr. Snelgrove stated that the Master Plan designation would remain Special (Specific) Plan Area. (Both specific and special were stated.)
- Commissioner Bonnie Weber stressed the importance of Wood Rodgers and the City of Reno to honor their cooperative planning commitments to the NVCAB and North Valleys residents.
- Mr. Snelgrove stated that they anticipate substantial residential and more non-residential on the east side of the site. Mr. Snelgrove also stated that they would have to address sewer capacity needs.
- Mr. Snelgrove stated that they are looking at density issues addressing suburban to urban level core with some multi-family units which would be subject to the PUD handbook.
- In response to questions raised, Mr. Snelgrove stated that the advantage to the developers by going through the City rather than Washoe County development is that the City of Reno takes less time to process and Washoe County also has more code restrictions.
Concerns were raised that Washoe County citizens are subject to development impacts by the City of Reno but have no voice in the planning process. Mr. Snelgrove stated that they feel that this specific project is beneficial to city and county residents and they are honoring cooperative planning.

Concerns were raised that removing this project from the joint planning area for the sake of expediency is not in the best interest of Washoe County residents as they would not have the voice and representation as if the development were in Washoe County.

Commissioner Weber stated that for residents in the north valleys, it is difficult to deal with the negative impacts from city development projects particularly when benefits that were promised during the planning process have not been honored by the developers or the City of Reno.

c: Sarah Chvilicek, Chair.
    Bob Webb, Planning Manager
    Lorrie Adams, Community Outreach Coordinator
Minutes of the regular meeting of the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board held May 12, 2008
at the North Valleys Regional Sports Complex Community Building 8085 Silver Lake Drive, Reno, Nevada

1. CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by, Glen Pedersen, V. Chair. Glen Pedersen led
   the salute to the flag.

2. MEMBERS PRESENT – Francine Donshick, At-Large Secondary Alternate, District 3, Debra Richied, John Mumme,
   Secretary/Treasurer, Glen Pedersen, Vice Chair., Debra Richied, John (Jack) Selin, Earl Walling and John White,
   arrived at 7:03 p.m. Glen Pedersen announced that Pat McAlinden, Chair, has resigned from the board.

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – Francine Donshick moved to approve the May 12, 2008 agenda as posted. Jack
   Selin seconded the motion. The motion carried.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – Debra Richied moved to approve the minutes of the April 14, 2008 meeting as
   submitted. John Mumme seconded the motion. The motion carried.

5. REPORTS AND UPDATES – The following reports and updates was informational only and no action was taken.
   The reports will be limited to five minutes each.

A. UPDATES/ANNOUNCEMENTS/CORRESPONDENCE – CAB files and correspondence which are part of the
   public record are on file in the Washoe County Department of Community Development and are available for
   public review. Written correspondence and testimony will be included in the public record when a request is
   made to make the document a part of the public record and when a copy is provided to the CAB Chair, who
   forwards the document to the County.
   • Glen Pedersen stated that public comments will be limited to 3 minutes per person and 5 minutes per group.
   • Glen Pedersen reported on the approved CAB Bylaws.
   • Pat McAlinden submitted a report on the recent Chairs meeting which Mr. Pedersen read into the record.

B. WASHOE COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE ITEMS – Washoe County Sheriff’s Department was not available to
   present a report on public safety issues.

C. RENO FIRE DEPARTMENT REPORT – A representative from the Reno Fire Dept. was not available to present a
   report of fire safety issues. Glen Pedersen reported that the both the Sheriff's Department and Fire Department
   has had limited staff available to attend the public meetings.

D. STEAD AIRPORT UPDATE – Skip Polak, Stead Airport Manager reported on activities and projects at the Stead
   Airport. Mr. Polak reported that the tanker that was brought in to fight the wildfire in Dayton is now stationed at
   the airport. Other wildfire aircraft is expected to be brought in within the next few weeks. Mr. Polak discussed
   the flight plan signage adjacent to the airport and stated that he would review the study and bring updated information
   back to the CAB in June. Truck driving competition will be held at the airport in June. Greyhound bus drivers will
   also be qualifying at the airport this month. Increased jet traffic is expected in June. Flight training for the air
   races is planned for the 18th to the 20th of June. Mr. Polak reported that Governor Gibbons has a task force that is
   looking for staging locations throughout Nevada to for use should there be a significant earthquake event.

E. SIERRA NEVADA JOB CORPS UPDATE – John Lee, Liaison, Sierra Nevada Job Corps reported on student
   activities and events. A community service clean-up project was just completed in the Montello area and they
   have just completed a landscape project at the school.

F. REGIONAL PARKS AND OPEN SPACE DEPARTMENT UPDATE – PEAVINE DISTRICT – Bryan Harrower,
   Park Ranger provide a report and highlighted events and activities at the North Valleys Regional Sports Complex
   (NVRSC). Mr. Harrower reported on the Exploring Nevada program at the May Museum. Swan Lake Nature
   Study Program will have the grand opening in June. Time and date will be published in the Reno-Gazette Journal
   and at the Parks Department.

G. WASHOE COUNTY UPDATE: Lorrie Adams, Community Outreach Coordinator provided an update on County
   issues and events. Ms. Adams reported on emergency preparedness community forum is scheduled on May 21,
   2008 at the Verdi VFW Hall.

Commissioner Kitty Jung, District 3 urged citizens to submit their suggestions and comments on the budget by e-
mail or by calling 219-5472. Commissioner Jung reported on recent activities and issues. Commissioner Jung
stated her support for not cutting the budgets for public safety, public parks and public libraries and also stated
her opposition to cutting the number of CAB meetings due to budget cuts. Francine Donshick stated concern that
some residents in the Golden Valley area did not get the Waste Management free dump vouchers that were
mailed to other residents. Ms. Donshick also stated that there needs to be a signal on West Golden Valley
southbound onto US 395. Commissioner Jung provided vouchers for discounts for adopting puppies or kittens.
and for spaying or neutering. Following her report, Commissioner Jung was available to address questions and concerns. In response to questions raised, Commissioner Jung stated that Washoe County is reviewing the interlocal agreement between Reno and Washoe County regarding incarceration of violators arrested by Reno Police.

Commissioner Bonnie Weber was available to present a report on County issues and events. Commissioner Weber thanked Pat McAlinden for all of her work and efforts for the community and the CAB. Commissioner Weber thanked everyone for the good job with the Keep Truckee Meadows Beautiful community clean-up. Commissioner Weber thanked Bill Thomas and Bob Lissner for their cooperation with local residents with the Evan Ranch development project. Commissioner Weber invited everyone to attend the last Coffee with Commissioner Weber in May and after the summer break, coffees will resume in September. Commissioner Weber reported that construction of the Lemmon Valley Fire Station is moving forward. Commissioner Weber thanked the CAB members for their service to the community. Commissioner Weber stated her support for funding public safety as the first priority.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Comment heard under this item will be limited to items not on the agenda. Any time limits for this public comment item and for public testimony during an agenda item will be set by the Chair at the beginning of the meeting, but the time limit per person shall be no less than three minutes. The Chair may also grant additional time for persons representing a group at the beginning of the meeting. Testimony during an agenda item shall be limited to the subject of the agenda item. Comments are to be made to the CAB as a whole.

- Gary Schmidt introduced himself and announced his candidacy for County Commissioner, District 4. Mr. Schmidt stated information on his platform and also provided brochures with his contact information.
- Marvin Neal, Nevada Teen Ranch reported that the Teen Ranch application has been approved conditioned upon their obtaining an emergency alternate route to the facility. Mr. Neal offered to bring updated information back to the NVCAB with available. Mr. Neal stated that the alternate route will be through the Moon Rocks to Winnemucca Ranch Road.
- Jeanne Fow reported that the RTC 2040 Steering Committee final draft plan should be available in June.
- Glen Pederson asked for further public comment and hearing none, closed this item.

** Following public comment, Glen Pedersen was advised that the representative from the Sheriff's Department may have arrived to make his presentation at 8:02 but the Deputy was not available so Chairman Pedersen moved forward with item 7. A.

7. **NEW BUSINESS** - (The staff contact listed on items for Community Development may not be in attendance but can be contacted with code and policy questions.)

A. LDC08-00206 – Peavine Peak – Greg Evangelatos, Tectonics, representing the applicant presented the request for a Master Plan amendment in the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan to change the land use designation from General Rural in the County and from Unincorporated Transition in the City to Industrial and Open Space. The master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and therefore requires review by the City of Reno and Washoe County. The site is located ±1,257 feet south of the intersection of Peavine Peak Road and North Virginia, and is accessed by Peavine Peak Road. Mr. Evangelatos stated that this application is within the City of Reno Sphere of Influence and not yet annexed into the City. **MOTION:** Francine Donshick moved to recommend approval of LDC08-00206, Peavine Peak as presented. John Mumme seconded the motion. The motion carried with Debra Richied opposed and Glen Pedersen abstained.

**Comments and Concerns**

- In response to questions raised, Mr. Evangelatos stated that should the applicant not get a Master Plan Amendment, the property would probably remain vacant.
- In response to questions raised, Mr. Evangelatos stated that the adjacent property is Bureau of Land Management land and the proposed plan is for manufacturing with some truck traffic.
- Concerns were raised that the development would block public access to Peavine Peak.
- In response to concerns raised, Mr. Evangelatos addressed drainage and run-off from the site.
- Debra Richied stated for the record, concern regarding the numerous and continuous changes to the master plan.
- There was no opposition heard from the audience.

B. LDC08-00205 – RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property – Dave Snelgrove, Wood Rodgers, 828-7742 representative of the applicant presented the request for a Master Plan amendment to remove ±125.8 acres of property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. The Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same. The site is located ±294 feet to the northwest of the intersection of Lemmon Drive and Sky...
Vista Parkway with portions of the property having frontage along both roads. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and therefore requires review by the City of Reno and Washoe County. The zoning designations for the property are GC (General Commercial); LDS/RR (Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential); HDR (High Density Rural); and OS (Open Space) in Washoe County, and are AC (Arterial Commercial); LLR1 (Large Lot Residential – 1 acre); LLR2.5 (Large Lot Residential – 2.5 acres) and OS (Open Space) in the City. **MOTION**: John White moved to recommend approval of LDC08-00205 as presented. Jack Selin seconded the motion. The motion carried with four in favor and Debra Richied, Francine Donshick and Earl Walling opposed.

**Comments and Concerns**

- Concerns were raised that unincorporated Washoe County residents do not have a voice in the planning process.
- Concerns were raised regarding water flows across the property and any possible negative impacts to Swan Lake.
- In response to questions raised, Mr. Snelgrove stated that this project is intended to be a substantial commercial development. Mr. Snelgrove offered to bring copies of the planned unit development (PUD) handbook to the NVcab for review. There are several larger commercial businesses interested in locating in this site.
- Mr. Snelgrove stated that they are planning a secondary access on Sky Vista and not to use the Lemmon Drive intersection. Paul Solaegui is working on the traffic flows for this development. Mr. Snelgrove also stated that they are looking at transit service.
- Concerns were raised regarding the proposed residential density of the project.
- Mr. Snelgrove stated concern regarding difficulties in trying to schedule joint meetings during the planning process which is necessary if the project is within the joint planning area.
- Support was stated for the safeguards that were intended with the joint planning process. Mr. Snelgrove stated that he would be looking for the CAB to give direction on whether or not to stay within the joint planning process.
- Concern was stated that the problem seems to exist with coordinating and cooperation between the Washoe County and City of Reno planning departments.
- Gary Schmidt stated that in his opinion it is not in the best interest of the public to facilitate making the application process easy for the applicant.
- Mr. Snelgrove stated that whether the plan is within the joint planning area or not, he would be bringing the projects to the CAB for review.

**C. Nevada Highway Users Coalition** – Buzz Harris, Nevada Highway User’s Coalition provided information regarding transportation funding and asked for support for putting additional resources toward highways and roads. Mr. Harris also provided brochures with further information on the coalition. Following his presentation, Mr. Harris was available to respond to and clarify any questions and concerns. Citizens are encouraged to join the Nevada Highway Users Coalition. Information is available at [www.fixnvroads.com](http://www.fixnvroads.com) (This item was informational only and the CAB took no action.)

**Comments and Concerns**

- Gary Schmidt stated that roads should be paid by development impact fees and urged stopping development until they pay their own way.

**D. Gang Activity Issues** – This item was continued to the next agenda. Discussion regarding local gang activity and information from the Sheriff’s Department on what citizens can do regarding gang activity. (This item was informational only and no action was taken).

**8. OLD BUSINESS** – There were no Old Business items scheduled for review.

**9. CHAIRMAN/MEMBER COMMENTS** - (This item limited to announcements of topics/issues posed for future workshops/agendas).

- Debra Richied asked that the CAB invite someone to discuss the Joint Area Plan including whether it is time to sunset the plan.
- **Next Agenda Items**: Election of Officers, Gang Activity Issues.

**10. ADJOURNMENT** – Debra Richied moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:38 p.m. Francine Donshick seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted By: Allayne Donnelly-Everett, Recording Secretary
ATTACHMENT E

Proposed Resolution for LDC08-00205
RESOLUTION
ADOPTING AN AMENDED RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN
A PART OF THE WASHOE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
JOINT WITH THE CITY OF RENO CITY COUNCIL
RENO MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NUMBER LDC08-00205
(RTM SKY VISTA AND ERGS PROPERTY)

WHEREAS, Section 278.150 and 278.210, Nevada Revised Statutes, specifies that the Reno City Planning Commission may prepare and adopt a master plan for all or any part of the City of Reno, subject to Reno City Council approval, and the Washoe County Planning Commission may prepare and adopt a master plan for all or any part of the County, subject to County Commission approval;

WHEREAS, the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan identifies the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN as a part of the City of Reno Master Plan and the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan and, further, NRS 278.02784 and 278.02786 specify the purpose and procedure for the adoption of a joint plan consistent with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan;

WHEREAS, the Reno City Planning Commission and the Washoe County Planning Commission have found that the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, and the most recent amendment, provides a long-term general plan for the development of the City of Reno and Washoe County including the subject matter currently deemed appropriate for inclusion in the City of Reno Master Plan and the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan;

WHEREAS, NRS 278.02784 specifies that the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN shall be submitted to the Regional Planning Commission for review of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan pursuant to NRS 278.028; and, further, that a public hearing on review of conformance of the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, was originally held on June 23, 1999, with the most recent amendment to the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN being held on ____________________, and the Regional Planning Commission found that the amended RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, was in conformance with and promotes the goals and policies of the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan;

WHEREAS, the Reno City Planning Commission, the Washoe County Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Commission have submitted the amended RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, to the City Council of the City of Reno, Nevada, and the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada, for approval and adoption;

WHEREAS, pursuant to NRS 278.02786(5), a joint public hearing on the adoption of the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended
Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, was originally held on July 8, 1999, by the City Council of the City of Reno, Nevada, and the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada, with the most recent amendment to the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN being held on May 11, 2009;

WHEREAS, under the provisions of NRS 278.220, the City Council of the City of Reno, Nevada and the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada find that the amended RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, conserves and promotes the public health, safety and general welfare; and

WHEREAS, the amended RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, an element of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, is the desired pattern and guide for the orderly physical growth and development of the Reno-Steak Corridor based on the projected population growth, with the least amount of natural resource impairment, and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services; now, therefore, it is hereby

RESOLVED, BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RENO, NEVADA, AND THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA, that the Council and Board do hereby adopt and endorse the amended RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, as approved in Reno Case No. LDC08-00205, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, to serve as a guide for the orderly growth and development of the City of Reno, Nevada, and of Washoe County, Nevada;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Reno, Nevada, and the Board of County Commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada, do hereby agree and direct that any amendments to the RENO-STEAD CORRIDOR JOINT PLAN, a part of the Reno Master Plan and the amended Washoe County Comprehensive Plan - North Valleys Area Plan, must be approved by both the Reno City Planning Commission and the Washoe County Planning Commission before being forwarded for adoption to the Council and Board.

ADOPTED This ___ day of __________, 200_.

WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSION

Chair

ATTEST:

Amy Harvey, County Clerk
STAFF REPORT
May 11, 2009

To: Reno City Council and Washoe County Commission
Thru: Charles McNeely, City Manager
From: John Hester, AICP, Community Development Director
Claudia C. Hanson, AICP, Deputy Community Development Director-Planning
Re: LDC08-00205 (RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property)
Date: May 1, 2009

Summary: This is a request for a Master Plan amendment to remove ±98.06 acres of property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. The Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same. The site is located ±294 feet to the northwest of the intersection of Lemmon Drive and Sky Vista Parkway with a portion of the northern end of the property fronting on Lemmon Drive. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions. The zoning designations for the property are GC (General Commercial); LDS/RR (Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential – 2.5 to 1 acre lots); HDS/LDR (High Density Suburban/Low Density Residential – 3 to 7 du/acre); and OS (Open Space) in Washoe County, and are AC (Arterial Commercial); CC (Community Commercial); LLR1 (Large Lot Residential – 1 acre); SF6 (Single Family – 6,000 square foot lots) and OS (Open Space) in the City.

Proposed Motion: I move to uphold the recommendation of the Reno City Planning Commission and the Washoe County Planning Commission.

Please see attached staff report.
CITY OF RENO
Planning Commission
May 6, 2009
Staff Report

CASE NO.: LDC08-00205 (RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property)

APPLICANT: RTM Sky Vista, LLC
ERGS, Inc.

APN NUMBER: 086-380-02 and 036-390-16

REQUEST: This is a request for a Master Plan amendment to remove ±98.06 acres of property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. The Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area would remain the same.

LOCATION: The site is located ±294 feet to the northwest of the intersection of Lemmon Drive and Sky Vista Parkway with a portion of the northern end of the property fronting on Lemmon Drive. The amendment is in a Joint Planning Area and is being noticed for review by the City of Reno and Washoe County Planning Commissions. The zoning designations for the property are GC (General Commercial); LDS/RR (Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential – 2.5 to 1 acre lots); HDS/LDR (High Density Suburban/Low Density Residential – 3 to 7 du/acre); and OS (Open Space) in Washoe County, and are AC (Arterial Commercial); CC (Community Commercial); LLR1 (Large Lot Residential – 1 acre); SF6 (Single Family – 6,000 square foot lots) and OS (Open Space) in the City.

PROPOSED MOTION: Based upon compliance with the applicable findings, I move to recommend that City Council approve the amendment to the Master Plan by resolution, subject to conformance review by the Regional Planning Agency.

BACKGROUND:

On March 5, 2008, the City Council approved the annexation of the overall ±118.3 acre parcel into the City of Reno (see Exhibit A). On January 14, 2009, the Sky Vista Wal Mart (SVWM) was approved by the City Council upon appeal, and on February 11, 2009, the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission found the SVWM in conformance with the Regional Plan regarding the thresholds that were triggered for a
Project of Regional Significance (see Exhibits B and C for the approval letters). If this Master Plan amendment is approved for a boundary change to eliminate the site from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP), it is the applicant’s intent to subsequently apply for a zoning map amendment to PUD (Planned Unit Development) on the property. Originally, the SVWM acreage (±24.3) was a part of this Master Plan amendment application, but was taken out of the request because the existing zoning allowed the SVWM to move forward independent of the anticipated PUD and adhere to their entitlement and construction schedule. This results in ±98.3 acres on the remaining portion (Exhibit D).

Because the property is located in the RSJCP, a joint review and hearing with the Washoe County staff and Planning Commission is usually conducted. When the request was originally submitted on April 1, 2008, staff provided the application to Washoe County staff for their review. However, the application was put on hold in order to process the SVWM project. Upon resuming the review of this Master Plan amendment, the project was noticed for a joint Planning Commission meeting. The joint meeting satisfies NRS Section 278.02784 which requires that the City proceed with projects in a joint planning area in a joint fashion. Washoe County Planning staff provided comments that are attached in Exhibit E.

**ANALYSIS:**

**Key Issues:** Removal of the property from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan

**Land Use Compatibility:** The request is for removal of the property from the RSCJP only. The Master Plan designation of Special Planning Area will remain the same and was applied to the site since it is in the RSCJP. As the City of Reno Master Plan states, the Special Planning Area (SPA) designation is specifically designed for the following:

- Allows any individual land use, or land uses in combination which are compatible and complementary within the project boundaries and with adjoining properties

- Appropriate for large holdings which could be developed with a mix of land uses (e.g. **planned unit developments**, regional centers and transit corridors). Also appropriate for areas undergoing a transition in land use to more intense development, areas that would become more stable with development of mixed uses that complement each other, or areas where the City wants to encourage investment.

While this application is not a request for a zoning map amendment or to change the existing SPA Master Plan designation, taking the property out of the RSCJP will provide for the ability to request a PUD without conflicting policies between the RSCJP, the City of Reno Master Plan and the Reno Land Development Code. While the RSCJP is a
Master Plan document, it contains development standards, some of which conflict with City code.

**Amendment to the RSCJP Boundaries:** The RSCJP policies and standards have not been updated in any significant manner since its inception in 1999; however the Reno Land Development Code has undergone many changes over the last 10 years. It is reasonable to assume that Washoe County’s Development Code has changed as well, although staff has not verified this. There are also conflicts between the RSCJP and the Regional Plan concerning boundaries as well as conflicts with the RTC 2040 plan concerning street classifications (please see the “Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan Review” and “Updating the RSCJP” sections of this report for specific details). Removing the property from the plan in preparation for a PJD will eliminate any inconsistencies between these documents, particularly between the RSCJP and the City of Reno Land Development Code, and will allow the applicant to move forward in a more expedient manner.

**Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan Review:** It should be noted that only the policies in the RSCJP that are applicable to the proposed request have been analyzed.

While the City of Reno and Washoe County work together in a joint manner to administer the plan, Washoe County originally published the RSCJP and has traditionally conducted the revisions when amendments have been approved through the joint planning process. However, the most recent amendment was conducted in 2006 making the plan’s maps outdated.

**Map Data:**

Map 1 in the RSCJP shows the boundary of the plan area and identifies the parcel as within the plan area, but located in Washoe County. The site was annexed into the City of Reno on March 5, 2008, making Map 1 incorrect. Map 2 of the Plan is the “Development Suitability Map” and indicates that while the property has slopes over 15 percent on the overall site, about half of the property is unconstrained. Maps 3, 4, and 5 identify the North Valleys Land Use Plan, the Planned Land Use and the Reno Sphere of Influence respectively. Map 3 indicates that this site is suitable for an SPD Handbook. While the City of Reno no longer utilizes the SPD zoning designation, a PUD can be utilized. Page 8 of the RSCJP states that “If an SPD is not adopted..., then properties will develop according to the underlying zoning” (Exhibit F). Map 4 does not reflect the recent annexation. Map 5 indicates that the property was put in the Reno Sphere of Influence in 2004. As with Map 1, it does not show that the subject property has been annexed and is incorrect. Map 6 is specific to the “Wild Stallion Estates” project and is not applicable. Map 7 shows the parcel in the Washoe County Service Area for public services. Map 8 identifies the street classification system and shows Lemmon Drive and Military Road as an arterial, and Sky Vista Parkway as a collector. It is noteworthy to add that the City of Reno’s Public Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Plan (PSFI) in the City’s Master Plan departs from the RSCJP street classification for...
Sky Vista Parkway. It is identified as a collector in the RSCJP, but as a minor arterial in the PSFI. North Virginia also serves the area and is identified as a Rural Highway in the RSCJP, but as a minor arterial for the segment between Golden Valley Road and Red Rock Road in the PSFI. Given these inconsistencies, Map 8 is also in need of updating.

Conservation Policies:

C.1.1: New development shall preserve significant topographic features, i.e. rock outcroppings, vistas.

At the time an application is submitted for a Zoning Map amendment to PUD, City staff will review the entire site and make the appropriate recommendations to preserve the areas of significant relief and any other environmentally sensitive areas. Specifically for this case, there are slopes of 15% or greater and there is a significant ridgeline in the northern 1/3 portion of the site.

C.2.1: Natural or improved open drainageways shall be preserved; alteration of major drainageways is prohibited unless it results in the improvement of the drainageway.

While the drainageway is off the applicant’s site, the City’s Major Drainageway Plan requires that all disturbance, including grading, be setback 15 feet from the grade break.

C.2.2: The use of major drainageways as undeveloped buffers is required.

When the neighboring property owner to the west proposes development, the drainageway on the site will be required to comply with this policy. Any future development on the subject parcel or the neighboring parcel must demonstrate compliance with the City of Reno’s new Open Space and Greenways Plan.

C.3.1: Each development proposal shall be evaluated with the intent to preserve visually prominent ridges and rock outcroppings; and

C.3.2: Building envelopes on ridgetops that are not set aside for open space shall be subject to a minimum 100-foot setback from the horizontal plane of the ridgeline and 50 feet from the vertical plane of the ridgeline, whichever is more restrictive.

The City’s “Significant Ridgeline Map” shows a significant ridgeline in the northern one third of the property. The City’s hillside ordinance protects ridgelines via development standards which will be enforced at the time of development. The City’s Hillside Ordinance also protects rock outcroppings and regulates the location and design of roadways.

Land Use Policies:
LU.3.4: Major drainageways shall be used as buffers between residential development and non-residential development.

The site has no existing adjacent residential development, other than the vacant residentially zoned property on the subject site and to the east off the site.

LU.5.3: New development shall be proportionate to and integrated with the surrounding terrain.

The future PUD Handbook will have standards enforcing compatibility.

Public Services and Facilities Policies:

PSF.2.1: All planned urban and suburban development shall be included in the service area of a centralized community sewage treatment facility: and

PSF.2.2 The City of Reno and Washoe County should collectively evaluate the sanitary sewer needs for future development in the joint plan area.

Water will be provided by TMWA or the County via the Vidler Line, and sewer will be provided by the City's facility nearby on Norton Street, or the County's Facility accessed from Lemmon Drive.

PSF.4.4 Encourage developers of industrial and commercial properties to integrate open spaces within development and provide connections to adjoining public lands and hillsides; and

PSF.6.1 Restrict development on steep slopes, rock outcroppings, playas, drainageways, and wetlands on lands.

The development area has both “most suitable” areas and constrained areas with slopes of 15% or greater. When the property comes in for a zoning map amendment to PUD, the land uses proposed will be reviewed for their appropriateness as they relate to the topography and environmental conditions on the site.

Transportation Policies:

T.4.2 During the development review process, Washoe County and the City of Reno shall require, whenever practicable, that new developments minimize their direct access to all arterial roadways;

T.6.1 Ensure that all development proposals that generate 750 average daily trips include a description of existing or proposed public transportation demand management programs or policies; and
T.6.2 Encourage nonresidential developments to use transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, including providing such employee incentives as car pooling, van pooling, bus vouchers, shuttle service, telecommuting, shower facilities and bicycle racks.

The site takes its primary access off of Sky Vista Parkway which is identified in the RSCJP as a collector and a minor arterial in the City’s Master Plan. When an application is submitted for the rest of the site, access will be reviewed again. Ultimately, the property must have two different access points for emergency access and general safety. This second access will be Lemmon Drive, a major arterial.

Master Plan Amendment Findings: Finding 1 requires that a change in the area has occurred that warrants the amendment. In the past few years, the properties to the north and south have been approved for Arterial Commercial and Community Commercial zoning, and in some cases entitlements for development projects such as the SVWM and the “Silver Peak Apartments” complex. More importantly, construction of the Vidler water importation project will provide needed water to service the general area. This in combination with the recent realignment of Military Road to accommodate additional traffic and the addition of signalized access to the subject property from Sky Vista Parkway will ensure adequate services.

Finding 2 requires that the intensity of the amendment be sensitive and compatible to the existing land uses in the surrounding area. This amendment request ultimately does not have any immediate impacts to the surrounding properties since the Master Plan designation of SPA does not change. Only the boundaries in the plan area will change if approved. The public hearing process for a PUD will still provide for review by all commenting agencies, including Washoe County, the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board (CAB), and the North Valleys Neighborhood Advisory Board (NAB).

Finding 3 requires that the amendment provide for orderly physical growth of the City, enhance the urban core and foster walkable neighborhoods. With the Vidler waterline under way, the recent realignment of Military Drive, and a signalized intersection at Sky Vista Parkway at the entrance to the site that was required with the SVWM, orderly growth is occurring. The SVWM and the subject acreage will have sidewalk throughout the site, including a connection to the adjacent park to the northwest. Additionally, if the request is approved, this area of the City will have the commercial services that many residents have expressed to staff they want during the review of the SVWM. A possible residential component in the future PUD could also provide the City an opportunity to meet the goals of the recently adopted Housing Plan. Most importantly, existing residents who live in Red Rock and the North Valley areas will no longer have to commute as far for the same services, reducing overall traffic on the U.S 395 and I-80.
Finding 4 requires that there be adequate transportation, recreation, utility and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed Master Plan amendment. As stated above, there will be adequate vehicular and pedestrian transportation to the site. An RTC Ride bus stop serving Route 7 is currently located on Sky Vista Parkway adjacent to the subject parcels. US 395 freeway and Lemmon Valley on and off ramps are just over 1,000 feet away making the site appropriate for future intensity. As with the SVWM, water will be provided by TMWA or the County via the Vidler Line. At this time discussions have been ongoing with Washoe County Utilities and TMWA and a “Discovery Report” has been requested to address water service to the site and is forthcoming. Sewer will be provided by the City’s facility nearby on Norton Street, or the County’s facility accessed from Lemmon Drive. A sewage Discovery Report has also been requested. At this time, the site is located within Police Beat 24 and is serviced by the Stead Substation located at 10555 Stead Boulevard. Fire service is provided by Station 13 at 10575 Silver Lake Road and is within Fire District 1304. The nearest Police Station is ±2.7 miles away, and the nearest Fire Station is ±2.19 miles away.

Finding 5 requires that the proposed change be in substantial conformance with the Master Plan. The SPA designation is designed specifically for large holdings of property that can accommodate mixed uses which are governed by Regional Centers or PUD’s, and for properties that are undergoing a transition to more intense development. Because the Master Plan designation is not being changed, the property still conforms to these criteria. The only change is to the boundary of RSCJP which will allow the applicant to move forward in a more expedient manner. Please see the Master Plan section of this report for a more detailed analysis of the Master Plan policies.

**Updating of the RSCJP:** The last amendment to the RSCJP was on October 17, 2006 and consisted of the addition of standards for the Wild Stallion Estates property, and the incorporation of Industrial Outdoor Storage standards within Policy LU.7. As far as staff can identify, no other updates to any other component of the plan, including the policies and standards have occurred. Since 2006, there have been amendments to the plan that include, but are not limited to: the ERGS property (LDC07-00218); the Peavine Peak property (LDC08-00206, and LDC09-00042); and Arroyo Crossing (LDC07-00102). Amendments to the City’s Land Development Code have also occurred. The RSCJP plan needs to be amended to reflect the previous actions after the 2006 amendment. During review of the above requests it became apparent that because the Master Plan and zoning designations have not been updated as each amendment occurs, applications have been submitted by consultants that include errors and omissions. Complicating this is that past practice for amendments for properties in the plan that are in the City of Reno have included assigning the County’s land use designations for some requests (as shown in the plan), as well as assigning City designations on others. With the Peavine Peak submittal, the Zoning Administrator has determined that the City will only assign City designations from this point forward on parcels that are in the City of Reno to avoid confusion.
The maps in the plan also need to be revised. While processing ERGS Crossing shown in Exhibit G, staff discovered that the RSCJP identifies the parcels for this land in the plan area on Land Use Plan Map 3, but there is no assignment of the property with any underlying zoning designations shown on Planned Land Use Map 4. Ultimately, it was determined that the larger parcel of the ERGS holdings was not within the plans boundaries, however staff still offered a review of the request subject to the policies contained in the RSCJP and held joint meetings as a courtesy. In recent discussions with Regional Planning staff, it was indicated that during their review of Master Plan amendments from the City and Comprehensive Plan amendments from the County, that portions of the boundaries were incorrect and needed updating.

In addition, the Draft 2040 Regional Transportation Plan has new standards and polices for regional road infrastructure and classification of streets. These policies have been in use for some time and many are in conflict with the RSCJP transportation policies and road classifications that were written many years ago. Staff has used the Land Development Code and the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan since the City is required to do so by the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. For additional clarity, the RSCJP states that the City’s Land Use Development Code and the standards therein apply for properties in the City and the sphere. The Regional Plan also requires that a master plan for a joint plan be consistent with the Regional Plan (page 5 of the RSCJP).

Finally, initial attempts at reviewing the SVWM request were complex since it is subject to the City of Reno’s relatively new Large Retail Establishment (LRE) ordinance. The RSCJP has been in place since 1999, and while it has had minor amendments to the land use maps, it has not been amended to update the policies and standards. As a result, the most recent amendments to the major drainageway plan and hillside development standards in the City’s code have some conflicting goals and/or policies with the RSCJP. Additionally, the policies, standards and maps in the plan need to be updated to reflect current City and County codes, the RTC 2040 plan, and the Regional Plan.

Public Safety and Improvements: When a PUD Handbook is submitted, public safety and improvements will be reviewed and any necessary infrastructure will be required at that time.

Circulation: With the approval of the SVWM, the road alignment was set for the site, with the primary accesses from Sky Vista Parkway (a minor arterial) and Lemmon Drive (a major arterial).

Master Plan: As proposed and with recommended conditions, the project appears to be consistent with the following applicable Master Plan policies and objectives: CD-1: Encourage new developments with intense activities to locate in existing planned urban centers and areas served by public transit; CD-3: Encourage clustering and protect sensitive environmental resources; CD-20: The City encourages the clustering of services in locations convenient to neighboring residential areas in order to promote
fewer vehicle trips; CD-50: Mix and multiple uses are encouraged. These developments whether large or small, should promote walkable neighborhoods with services, housing, employment and transit in close proximity to one another; and E-24: The City should promote the protection, conservation, and acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands such as prominent ridgelines.

Other Reviewing Bodies:

Washoe County: See Exhibit F

Regional Transportation Commission: No comments

Washoe County Health Department: No comments

Neighborhood Advisory Board: This project was reviewed by the Ward 4 North Valley's Neighborhood Advisory Board on June 16, 2008. A copy of their comments is attached to this report (Exhibit H).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS:

RMC 18.06.301 Master Plan Amendments

FINDINGS:

Master Plan Amendment: Master Plan amendment findings. In order to adopt an amendment to the master plan, the planning commission and city council shall find all of the following:

(1) There has been a change in the area or in the conditions on which the current designation was based which warrants the amendment;
(2) The density and intensity of the proposed master plan amendment is sensitive to the existing land uses and is compatible with the existing adjacent land use designations;

(3) The amendment will provide for orderly physical growth of the city, enhance the urban core and foster safe, convenient and walkable neighborhoods and shopping districts;

(4) There are or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed master plan designation; and

(5) The proposed change is in substantial conformance with the goals and policies of the master plan and other adopted plans and policies.

Staff: Cheryl Ryan, Senior Planner
LDC08-00205
RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property
Subject Site for a Master Plan Amendment to remove ±125.8 acres from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan and remain as a Special Planning Area.
- City Limits
- Master Plan
LDC08-00205
RTM Sky Vista and ERGS Property

Subject Site for a Master Plan Amendment to remove ±125.8 acres from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan and remain as a Special Planning Area.

City Limits
April 14, 2008

Real Trust Management Capital Corp.
Attn: Joe Camarda
8230 Boone Road, Ste. 350
Vienna, VA 22181

RE: Case No. LDC07-00331 (Alta Vista Crossing) - NOTICE OF FINAL ACTION, DECISION OR ORDER

Dear Applicant:

At a regular meeting held March 26, 2008, the City Council passed and adopted Ordinance No. 6012, approving the above referenced annexation.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lynnette R. Jones
City Clerk

LRJ:cdg

xc: Community Development
Traffic Design Engineer
Terry Zeller, Parks, Recreation & Community Services
Patrice Echota, Regional Transportation Commission
Marchon Miller, Regional Transportation Commission
Nathan Hastings, DR Land Company, Inc.
February 10, 2009

RTM-HRCF Sky Vista, LLC
c/o Steve Etzel
250 Park Avenue South, 3rd floor
New York, NY 10003

RE: Case No. LDC09-00029 (Sky Vista WalMart) — THIRD AMENDED LETTER

Dear Applicant:

At a regular meeting held January 14, 2009, and following a public hearing thereon, the City Council upheld the Planning Commission recommendation, subject to a finding of conformance for a Project of Regional Significance, and approved the request for the following:

(1) Special use permits for: (a) hillside development; (b) cuts of 20 feet or greater in height and fills of 10 feet or greater in depth; (c) residential adjacency; (d) 24 hour operations; and (e) a freestanding sign in excess of 25 feet in the CC zone, subject to the following conditions; and

(2) Variances to the Large Retail Establishment ordinance for: (a) the number of exterior entrances for all tenants occupying space in a primary commercial building; (b) orienting the primary entrance away from the primary street(s) that provide access to the site; (c) modifying the parking lot quadrants; and (d) modifying the 8 foot planter along public streets adjacent to the site on a ±118.3 acre parcel located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Sky Vista Parkway and Lemmon Drive in the CC (Community Commercial), LLRI (Large Lot Residential - 1 acre), SF6 (Single Family - 6,000 square foot lots) and OS (Open Space) zones, subject to the following conditions. The ±24.3 acre site proposed for development with this project is zoned CC and is a Project of Regional Significance.
All conditions shall be met to the satisfaction of Community Development Department staff, unless otherwise noted.

1. The project shall comply with all applicable City codes, plans, reports, materials, etc., as submitted. In the event of a conflict between said plans, reports, materials and City codes, City codes in effect at the time the building permit is applied for, shall prevail.

2. The applicant shall apply for all building permits necessary for the Walmart within eighteen (18) months from the date of final approval, and continuously maintain the validity of those permits, or this approval shall be null and void. The phasing of the stand alone buildings shall be in accordance with Condition No. 25.

3. Parking of Recreation Vehicles or trucks with campers for more that 3 hours is prohibited. Signs shall be posted to this effect, and on-site security shall enforce the requirement.

4. No seasonal sales, special event sales, or other sales of merchandise may be conducted in the parking lot area. All seasonal sales, special event sales, or other sales of merchandise must be contained within the building or along the front of the building in a manner that does not block access and circulation within the site. Such events must meet applicable special event and temporary use applications and operation procedures. No parking spaces may be blocked at any time with the sale or storage of any items or cordoned off in any manner. This applies to all tenant spaces on the site.

5. Prior to the issuance of each building permit, including a site improvement permit, a plan for a shopping cart retrieval system for all uses on the site must be submitted, approved, installed and enforced for the site in perpetuity. The final system selection shall be approved by the Community Development Department.

6. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the “stand alone” pads, it shall be demonstrated that the architecture for each of the stand alone pads shall be consistent with the overall design of the Walmart building in color, materials, and articulation and shall have four sided architecture.

7. Prior to issuance of each building permit, including a site improvement permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan that demonstrates compliance with the additional landscaping requirements for parking areas with over 600 spaces. The City’s Landscape Architect shall review and approve the plans and make modifications as necessary.
8. The special use permit for 24 hour operations is specific to the WalMart LRE only. All future tenants in the stand alone buildings must apply individually for a special use permit.

9. Prior to issuance of each building permit, including a site improvement permit, the applicant shall identify a location where large discarded cardboard boxes and other large trash items will be stored. This area shall be enclosed with an opaque screening method that is in keeping with the materials used for the building. At no time may discarded or stored items be placed outside of the enclosed area, nor may items be stacked such that they are higher than the enclosure.

10. Prior to the issuance of each building permit, a roof top mechanical plan shall be submitted. The plans must show the height of the mechanical equipment and the parapet.

11. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, including site improvements, it shall be demonstrated on the final landscaping plan that all disturbed areas are landscaped with ornamental materials. The detention basin slopes shall be revegetated with a seed mix that includes shrubs, grasses and wildflowers on the embankments and bottom, and shall be planted with trees on the embankments. Trees on the detention basin slopes shall be planted in clusters and installed at a rate of 1 tree for every 600 square feet of the area contained on the slopes. The City’s Landscape Architect shall review the plans and require modifications as appropriate.

12. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall have plans approved demonstrating that all retaining walls shall be dry stacked rockery walls or constructed with the “reddie-wall” or “country manor” systems. The color of the walls shall be consistent with the colors of the topography, or consistent with the materials of the building materials, whichever is applicable. Additional walls shall be used, or the height of the walls shall be increased, in order to reduce the length of mechanized slopes along the east side of the site around the knoll. Double or triple walls or an increase in the length of the walls shall be required as determined by staff. Tiered walls must have benches of 8 feet or greater and be ornamental landscaped for erosion control to the satisfaction of the City’s Landscape Architect.

13. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the final grading plan submitted for the project shall demonstrate that the area of disturbance for the detention pond paralleling the major drainageway to the west off the site is 15 feet back from the grade break of the drainageway.
14. Prior to issuance of a building permit, including a site improvement permit for the WalMart structure, the applicant shall submit a detail of the loading dock area that includes a cross section of the docks, the screen walls and landscaping. The City’s Landscape Architect shall review the plans and require modifications as appropriate.

15. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, including a site improvement permit, the applicant shall demonstrate that the final landscaping plan shows the trees on the slopes along Sky Vista Boulevard and the access road that parallels the truck dock are oversized. Trees on permanent slopes west of the access road must be of the same density as shown on the preliminary landscape plan north of Sky Vista Parkway. For the oversized trees along Sky Vista Parkway, Deciduous trees shall be a 50/50 mix of 3 and 4 inch caliper, and the evergreen trees shall be a 50/50 mix of 8 and 10 feet tall. The trees used to screen the loading docks shall also comply with this condition. The City’s Landscape Architect shall review the plans and require modifications as appropriate.

16. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, a reciprocal parking agreement shall be submitted for review, and upon approval, the agreement shall be recorded. It shall also be demonstrated that the CC&R’s include a landscape and property maintenance plan that stipulates how the property will be maintained, including the replacement of dead or dying plant material.

17. Truck deliveries to the site shall be prohibited between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. No idling of trucks or operation of chilling units shall be permitted. All truck docks shall be sealed during loading/unloading of items. Parking lot sweeping and/or cleaning shall be prohibited between the hours of 9:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. This condition shall become null and void should the zoning on the adjacent LLR-1 property be approved for a zoning map amendment to a non-residential zone.

18. Prior to the issuance of any permit, including a site improvement permit, it shall be demonstrated that a dark skies lighting system will be installed. Site lighting shall be 3.3 footcandle on average, with a minimum of 1.0 footcandle between the hours of 11:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. It shall also be demonstrated that in the event that the LLR1 zoning is not changed to a non-residential use, that light poles are restricted to 12 feet within 100 feet of the residential zone. Poles not within 100 feet of residentially zoned property shall be 30 feet in height or less.

19. Prior to the issuance of any permit, including a site improvement permit, it shall be demonstrated that the pedestrian patios in front of the building shown on the civil landscaping plan with stamped colorized concrete will be installed. The final landscaping plans shall indicate the color, stamping pattern and area.
20. Prior to issuance of any permit, the elevations for each building shall show that all CMU used for the WalMart and the stand alone pads be split face. Smooth CMU shall be permitted on a limited basis to provide for changes in texture. Anti graffiti paint or coating shall be required on all buildings.

21. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, or a site improvement permit, it shall be demonstrated on the final plans that the landscaping on both sides of the pedestrian walkways that lead from the parking area to the WalMart building have an overall width of 15 feet (this includes the walkway), and that the sidewalks along perimeter streets are 6 feet in width in accordance with the Large Retail Establishment ordinance.

22. Prior to issuance of any permit, it shall be demonstrated that Building A as identified on Exhibit H, shall be not higher than 14 feet as required in Conservation Policy C.1.4 in the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

23. Prior to issuance of any permit, it shall be demonstrated that lighting for signs meet Land Use Policies LU.9.3 and LU.9.4 in the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

24. The applicant agrees to retroactively pay a Police Concurrency impact fee on a square foot basis for each building permit issued prior to a Council approved fee, if an impact fee is adopted prior to December 31, 2009. After Council adoption, the fee shall be paid at the time of building permit. If a Fire Station is built, credit will be given for the cost of a 600 square foot office space and 4 parking spaces provided in the Fire Station.

25. The stand alone pads and future buildings to the northwest (Buildings A, B and C as shown on Exhibit C) of this report shall be constructed and receive a Certificate of Occupancy 5 years after the Certificate of Occupancy is granted for the WalMart by the City of Reno. If after 5 years the buildings are not completed, the pads shall be planted with a meadow seed mix that includes wildflowers subject to the review and approval of the City’s Landscape Architect.

26. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, including a site improvement permit, the final landscaping plan shall demonstrate that the access road from Sky Vista Parkway to the northern most driveway to the site shall be ornamentally landscaped on both sides for its entire length, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the WalMart structure. The City’s Landscape Architect shall review and approve the final road plan for the location and amount of landscaping and revegetation. A bond to cover the cost of revegetation of all slopes and areas disturbed by grading shall be submitted prior to issuance of a grading permit.
Landscaping on the entire site shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a site improvement permit.

Prior to approval of each permit, the applicant shall demonstrate all necessary on-site and off-site easement(s), vacations, relocations, and grants are complete or prepared, approved, and ready for recordation. These easements include, but are not limited to: project construction, site access and cross access, utility access, emergency access, maintenance access, sewer lines, surface drainage, storm drains, irrigation ditches, and utility improvements. All required access, sewer, storm drainage, and utility improvements shall be constructed and associated on-site and off-site easement vacations, relocations, and grants shall be recorded prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy.

27. Prior to approval of any permit, the applicant shall provide a hydrology report, identifying required mitigation, if any, to maintain the controlled elevation of Swan Lake. Prior to the issuance of any permit, the applicant shall have approved plans for the disposition of storm waters generated on site up to and including a 100 year frequency storm, including any necessary easements. Volumetric analysis is to be based on the 100-year, 10-day storm event, while routing of peak flows shall be based on the 100-year, 24-hour storm event. Final hydrology must account for both the peak and volume of storm flows generated by the 100-year storm event, and final design shall incorporate measures to assure that there is no net increase in the regulatory 100-year water surface elevation at Swan Lake.

28. Prior to the approval of any site improvement permit, excluding grading, the applicant shall have an approved Sewerage Report in accordance with the Public Works Design Manual. On-site sanitary sewer mains and manholes will be publicly owned and maintained. Adequate maintenance access shall be provided for all sanitary sewer improvements per the Public Works Design Manual.

29. Prior to the approval of any site improvement permit, excluding grading, the applicant shall have plans for all required public sanitary sewer improvements approved by the Community Development Department in accordance with the Sewer Report. All required off-site sanitary sewer infrastructure shall be constructed by the applicant and deemed complete and functional by the City prior to the issuance of any certificate of occupancy.

30. Site circulation design, traffic control devices, and operational characteristics of the site accesses, common use driveways, on-site drive aisles, emergency accesses, fire access lanes, pedestrian routes, sidewalks, and parking areas shall be in accordance with the Public Works Design Manual and shall meet with the approval of the City Fire and Community Development Departments.
31. The applicant shall provide sidewalks and demonstrate accessible and ADA compliant pedestrian routes from all adjacent public rights-of-way to the on-site buildings.

32. Prior to the approval of a building permit, the applicant shall have a City of Reno and RTC approved CCFEA traffic study for the project. This study shall evaluate background and project traffic patterns, site accesses, and pedestrian routes and review of the roadway capacities, intersection levels of service for the roadway network included in the project. Prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy for this permit, the applicant shall have all recommended improvements at the intersection of Sky Vista Parkway and the Project Access (including signalization) and the widening of Sky Vista Parkway from Lemmon Drive to the Project Access to four lanes completed.

33. Prior to approval of a site improvement permit, the applicant shall provide a written response from RTC defining transit requirements for this project and shall dedicate rights-of-way or grant appropriate easements and construct transit improvement in accordance with RTC's requirements prior to the approval of any certificate of occupancy to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department staff.

34. Prior to a certificate of occupancy for the first building permit, the applicant shall develop an Employee Trip Reduction Program (TRP), including an implementation schedule, for the project in accordance with the requirements of RTC to the satisfaction of the Community Development Department staff. Said TRP shall be updated to incorporate each non-residential final map and be continuously operated and maintained throughout the life of the project.

35. Prior to the approval of each permit, the applicant shall have plans and appropriate easements for the relocating or undergrounding of all overhead utilities proposed with this project in accordance with City standards and RMC Section 18.12.603 “Underground Utility Services.”

36. Prior to approval of each permit, the applicant shall demonstrate all necessary on-site and off-site easements, vacations, relocations, and grants are complete or prepared, approved, and ready for recordation. These easements include, but are not limited to: project construction, site access and cross access, utility access, emergency access, maintenance access, sewer lines, surface drainage, storm drains, irrigation ditches, and utility improvements. All required access, sewer, storm drainage, and utility improvements shall be constructed and associated on-site and off-site easement vacations, relocations, and grants shall be recorded prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy.
37. Prior to the approval of each permit, the applicant shall have a preconstruction meeting and an approved Construction Management Plan. This plan shall include provisions for on-site and off-site construction material storage, employee parking and shuttle services (as appropriate), and construction activity phasing and staging. The plan shall also depict the proposed construction transportation and delivery routes within the project vicinity. Access to adjacent businesses and properties shall be maintained during construction.

38. Prior to the approval of each permit, the applicant shall comply with the Quality Assurance Program as set forth in the Public Works Design Manual, Chapter VI, titles "Inspection, Testing and Verification" and "Quality Assurance Program."

39. Prior to the approval of a grading permit, the applicant shall have final grading plans approved demonstrating compliance with the hillside development standards. Where not retained with rockery or reddie walls as shown on the plans or required by Community Development staff, the grading plan shall show feathering and undulation of slopes (using 2:1, 3:1, 4:1 and 5:1) into the natural topography. A note shall be added to each grading sheet as follows:


40. The Renewal Plan for reuse of the WalMart building shall be submitted to Community Development staff for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

A copy of this letter must be attached to your building plans when making application for a building permit with the Community Development Department.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Lynnette R. Jones
City Clerk

LRJ:edg
xc:  Community Development
    Traffic Design Engineer
    Terry Zeller, Parks, Recreation & Community Services
    Donald Naquin, City Landscape Architect
    Reno Fire Department
    Patrice Echola, Regional Transportation Commission
    Marchon Miller, Regional Transportation Commission
    Dave Snelgrove, Wood Rodgers, Inc.
    Kenny Brown, DR Land Company
February 12, 2009

Rosanna Coombes
Clerk of the Regional Planning Commission
One East First Street, Suite 1100
Reno, Nevada 89501

Dear Ms. Coombes:

On February 11, 2008, the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) held a public hearing and determined that the following matter conforms with the comprehensive Regional Plan:

Regional Plan Conformance Review — project of regional significance, Sky Vista Wal Mart (CR08-038) — a project of regional significance for traffic generation in excess of 6,250 average daily trips and sewage generation in excess of 187,500 gallons per day. The ±118.3 acre project site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Sky vista Parkway and Lemmon Drive in the Community Commercial of Highway 395, west of White Lake Parkway and southeast of White Lake.

This letter has been filed with the Clerk of the Regional Planning Commission on this date and constitutes notice of final action under NRS 278.0235, “Actions against Agency: Commencement,” unless a petition for review is timely filed by a person seeking review of the RPC action or determination pursuant to section 1.3 of the Regional Planning Governing Board’s Regulations on Procedure.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 775/321-8392 if you have any questions on this matter.

Sincerely,

Sienna Reid
Regional Planner

cc: File CR08-038
    John Hester, City of Reno
    Carmi Gunderson, City of Reno
    Armando Ornelas, City of Sparks
    Adrian Freund, Washoe County
    Debra Goodwin, RTC

One East First Street, Suite 1100, Reno, NV 89512
775-321-8385; Fax 775-321-8386
http://www.tmrrpca.org

LDC08-00205
RTM/SKY VISTA & ERGS
EXHIBIT C
EXHIBIT TO ACCOMPANY LEGAL DESCRIPTION

WASHOE COUNTY    NEVADA
PORTION OF THE SE 1/4 OF SECTION 4, T. 20 N., R. 19 E.

TOTAL ACRES = 7.50 ±
Community Development

"Dedicated to Excellence in Public Service"
Adrian P. Freund, AICP, Community Development Director

February 19, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Cheryl Ryan, Senior Planner
Reno Community Development Department

FROM: Lisa Brosnan, Planner
Ph: 775-328-3668  Fax: 775-328-6133
E-mail: lbrosnan@washoe county.us

SUBJECT: LDC08-00205 (Lemmon Drive/Sky Vista Parkway Properties) – Request for an Amendment to the existing City of Reno master plan designations for APN 086-390-16 from OS and of SPA (Special Planning Area) to Parks/Recreation/Open Space and Urban Residential Commercial on 7.5± acres (APN 086-390-16) and removal of a portion of 086-380-02 and all of 086-390-16 from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

Dear Cheryl,

Below are Washoe County Community Development staff’s comments regarding the above project, which falls under Joint Planning Area review.

1. This project has changed since last reviewed in May, 2008. The area proposed for a Wal-Mart has been cut from the plan, reducing the total acreage from 125.8 acres to 98.06 acres.
2. The Master Plan designation (SPA) is to remain the same.
3. At their regular meeting held on May 12, 2008, the North Valleys Citizen Advisory Board heard a presentation on the proposed Lemmon Drive/Sky Vista Parkway Properties project including the possibility of its removal from the Reno-Stead corridor Joint Plan. The North Valleys CAB voted 4-3 in favor of the proposal with the following considerations.
   a. The proposed project would increase negative traffic impacts.
   b. Improvement to adjacent roads would be necessary to handle the additional density.
   c. The CAB fears a loss of voice in the process if taken out of the joint plan.
   d. Concern was expressed over slope and resultant water run off.
   e. The CAB would like assurance that the significant ridgeline will be protected.
4. The subject properties are included in Reno’s Sphere of Influence and are therefore not subject to cooperative planning review by Washoe County. According to the Guiding Principles listed in Appendix A of the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan: The City shall process all development permits and exercise...
any power conferred pursuant to NRS 278.010 through 278.630, inclusive, within the sphere of influence during and after the joint planning process.”
5. At future opportunities for review of this project, County staff will carefully review:
   a. Grading
   b. Buffering between commercial and residential uses
   c. Circulation and traffic impacts
   d. Preservation of ridgelines and steep slopes
   e. Compatibility with uses in the County’s jurisdiction
6. A representative of the applicant has made a commitment to return to the North Valleys CAB as this project moves forward. County staff encourages City staff to ensure that the applicant and the CAB to follow through on this commitment.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please let me know if there is anything else you need from staff on this item.

Sincerely,

Lisa Brosnan, Planner
Washoe County Department of Community Development
C. Land Use

The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan is a document that establishes master plan designations in the joint plan area. For the City of Reno, land use designations are effectuated by adoption of zoning. The City of Reno administers all development regulations for parcels within its sphere. In the case of Washoe County, the master plan designations are also the zoning/land use districts. Washoe County administers development regulations for parcels outside of Reno’s sphere.

In 1999, existing development in the joint plan area consisted of four established communities, three mobile home parks, and scattered commercial and industrial uses. The residential communities were: Anderson Acres, Horizon Hills subdivision, Grandview Terrace subdivision, and properties along Tholl and Cassilis Roads. The densities were generally one-third acre homesites and one- to five-acre homesites, many with livestock.

The dominant land use within the joint plan area was private vacant land with a pre-1993 zoning classification of A-1 (1 dwelling unit/acre [du/ac]). With the adoption of the North Valleys Area Plan in 1991, most of these parcels were designated Low Density Suburban (1 du/ac) or General Rural (1 du/40 acres). The General Rural land use was applied on parcels that either exhibited an environmental constraint (e.g. slopes in excess of 15 percent) or were far removed from public infrastructure. Growth in the North Valleys planning area has brought infrastructure to areas that were until recently far removed from public services. The General Rural land use designation does, however, reflect a rural lifestyle enjoyed by many North Valleys residents.

A number of parcels along Old U.S. 395 were designated Specific Plan. Specific Plan, as a designation, defines areas for mixed uses but requires more detailed planning to identify the appropriate mix of land uses within the area. The 1999 plan retained the recommendation of the North Valleys Area Plan that those properties develop as a Specific Plan Zoning District. This ensures a homogeneous development pattern between uses, building types, and architectural elements. If a Specific Plan District is not adopted pursuant to the City’s Zoning Ordinance, properties will develop according to the underlying land uses assigned by this joint plan.

Vacant lands within the plan area also include public property owned by Washoe County (e.g. the North Valleys Regional Sports Complex and water tanks), Washoe County School District (e.g. the North Valleys Transportation Center) and the federal government (e.g. steep slopes and ridgelines). The U.S. Forest Service may acquire private parcels in this area in an effort to consolidate its holdings in the Peavine Mountain area and protect a valued scenic and natural resource.

In 1999, the most concentrated area of commercial activity was located in the North Valleys Shopping Center located at the intersection of Lemmon Road and U.S. 395. Additional commercial uses included stand-alone commercial businesses on Red Rock Road and the North Virginia Street corridor. Industrial activity was scattered throughout the plan area, particularly on lands bounded by U.S. 395 and North Virginia Street. These uses included open storage, warehousing, and vehicle and machinery repair shops.

The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan area is surrounded to the north and east by the Reno City limits. In 1966, upon disposal by the United States Government, the Stead Air Force Base and surrounding properties were annexed to the City. Over time, the City annexed lands contiguous to the former military base. During the same period, the City’s main northern limits were expanded. One objective of this joint plan effort is a first step toward establishing a contiguous municipal jurisdiction for the City of Reno, connecting the Truckee Meadows sector with the Stead-Lemmon Valley community.
Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan
Boundary Analysis

Prepared February 20, 2009
PROJECT REVIEW FORM
Ward Four North Valleys
Neighborhood Advisory Board

Case No. LDC08-00205
Date: 6-16-08

Case Name: RTM SKY VISTA & ERGS PROPERTY

Case Planner: CHERYL RYAN

NAB Member Name: BARRET INLE

Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:

IS THIS THE PROPOSED SITE FOR INNKEEP?

NOT AT LIBERTY TO SAY!


Issues/Concerns: The “sample issues” box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

________________________________________
NAB Member Signature

LDC08-00205 RTM/SKY VISTA & ERGS EXHIBIT H
Case No. 06.08 - 00205  Date: 06.16.08

Case Name: 125m Sky Villa & ELB's Project

Case Planner: Cherry Lynn

NAB Member Name: Byward Davis

Community Liaison: Lisa Mann

NAB COMMENTS:

---

Issues/Concerns: The "sample issues" box below may be used as a guide during the project review process.

SAMPLE ISSUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auto &amp; Pedestrian Access</th>
<th>Public/Fire Safety</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>School Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Compatibility</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity/Density</td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Location</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Environmental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested modifications to the proposal to address NAB concerns:

---

NAB Member Signature
NAB Comments - Janet L Pirozzi

I am not opposed to changing this property from a Joint Planning area to the City of Reno. However, I am opposed to the project itself.

The proposed project will create more traffic in this already somewhat congested area.

there are already storefronts vacant and we keep on building. There are storefronts vacant in the Smith strip mall, Scollaris strip mall and Starbucks adjacent storefronts. In addition, there are vacant storefronts in Stead strip mall and the new Red Rock strip. I don't see how building new buildings will bring new services if the current storefronts have not attracted new services that last.
STAFF REPORT
May 11, 2009

To: Reno City Council and Washoe County Commission
Thru: Charles McNeely, City Manager
From: John Hester, AICP, Community Development Director
      Claudia C. Hanson, AICP, Deputy Community Development Director - Planning
Re: Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan
Date: May 1, 2009

Summary: This is a request for a Regional Plan amendment to delete the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

Proposed Motion: I move to uphold the recommendation of the Reno City Planning Commission and the Washoe County Planning Commission.

Please see attached memo.
Community Development Department

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 6, 2009
To: Reno Planning Commission and Washoe County Planning Commission
From: Claudia C. Hanson, AICP, Deputy Community Development Director - Planning
Subject: Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan

At the March 25, 2009 City Council meeting, the Reno City Council sponsored an amendment to the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan and initiated a Joint Plan Amendment to amend or delete the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. The Regional Plan amendment request will be forwarded to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency to be processed.

Map 6 of the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan identifies the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan boundary. This map does not match the plan boundary map that is currently within the joint plan. Multiple amendments within the plan boundary have occurred that are also not reflected in either the Regional Plan or the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. During the development process City staff has had conversations with property owners and developers in this area that have requested changes to the regulations and boundaries in this area. Some areas have been developed and should no longer be subject to the joint plan. Some properties are located within the TOD corridor, also required by the Regional Plan, which has conflicting policies. According to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency, the boundary discrepancies must be resolved in order to find any proposed amendments in conformance with the Regional Plan.

Policy 4.2.2 in the Regional Plan identifies the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan with a reference to Map 6 within the Regional Plan. This Policy and/or Map 6 would need to be amended with any of the 3 options discussed below.

1. Option number one is to clean up the boundaries to reflect the amendments that have been processed within the plan boundary. This will include but not be limited to removing the North Virginia Transit Corridor from the joint plan boundary.

2. Option number two would be to reduce the joint plan boundary to only include sensitive areas such as existing residential neighborhoods and significant natural features.
3. Option number three would be to eliminate the joint plan. There are multiple issues which support this option. They are discussed below.

The plan has been difficult to administer since its adoption. The main reason for this is that the County zoning is based on a “one map” system. The Master Plan policies and the zoning standards are contained in the same document. In the City of Reno a “two map” system is used. This is where the Master Plan/Land Use Map and the zoning code/map are contained in separate documents and have independent review processes. The Joint Plan was written under a “one map” system and adopted by the City of Reno as a portion of the Master Plan, not a zoning document. This is further supported on Page 19 of the plan where it explains that “the Joint Plan was incorporated as a City of Reno Master Plan element.” This provides development policies and general land use designations. When a specific development comes in for review, Title 18 “Annexation and Land Development of the City of Reno” is used to determine the specific development standards. The development standards within the plan were not adopted as part of Title 18 and therefore are not used by the City of Reno as development standards.

On page one of the Joint Plan it states “The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan area includes 4,656 acres wholly within unincorporated Washoe County and the North Valleys planning area.” A large portion of the Joint Plan area is now located within the City of Reno. With all of the land located within unincorporated Washoe County, it would have been correct to write the plan through the “one map” system. As properties are annexed into the City, the Joint Plan is no longer effective.

Many policies and sections of the Joint Plan are now covered in more detail in the Public Services, Facilities and Infrastructure Plan and the Open Space and Greenways Plan. These sections within the Joint Plan are now out of date.

There are statements throughout the Joint Plan that are incorrect or cannot be administered as written. One example of this is Policy LU.2, which requires the City to process new business license applications within the Sphere of Influence. The City has no authority to do this.

There are conflicts present between City policy/standards and Joint Plan policies. One example is the North Virginia Street Transit Corridor (NVTC). The NVTC has been adopted into the Regional Plan since the adoption of the Joint Plan. The development concepts within the NVTOD are in sharp contrast to those encouraged within the Joint Plan.

Appendix A of the Joint Plan is titled “Guiding Principles”. There is no amendment process outlined within the Joint Plan. In addition to Nevada Revised Statutes, these principles are the only direction to the maintenance of the plan. Principle number one states, “The Planning Commissions agree that completing a joint plan at this time is necessary, otherwise will recommend a Regional Plan amendment to remove the joint planning designation.”
The City of Reno staff is recommending Option three and requesting a Regional Plan amendment to delete the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. If this option is selected, a Master Plan amendment would be necessary for the properties located within the City of Reno Sphere of Influence. This process would include public meetings with notice to property owners within the plan boundary.