

From: Washoe311
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 4:42 PM
To: Planning Counter
Subject: FW: Opposition to Special use permit case # WSUP22-006 (Reno Tahoe Business Gateway)

From: patsuzyo@charter.net <patsuzyo@charter.net>
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2022 4:23 PM
To: Washoe311 <Washoe311@washoecounty.gov>
Subject: Opposition to Special use permit case # WSUP22-006 (Reno Tahoe Business Gateway)

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on links or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Special use permit case # WSUP22-006 (Reno Tahoe Business Gateway)

My wife, Suzy and I are opposed to S3 Development Project. The following are a few of the issues that we have regarding a project of this size in an area that is zoned for light development such as the existing Mogul self-storage facility. The people of Mogul and West Reno fought this same proposal in the past and the city of Reno determined that this development was not appropriate for this location. The S3 Development is now trying to push this through with the county.

The issues: #1 Public Safety

The I 80 west bound on ramp from Mogul is not designed for truck traffic to accelerate with enough speed to enter freeway traffic. It is not possible due to the tight circumference of the on ramp and the short acceleration lane that terminates at the Mogul under/over pass. In other words, if you don't make it to an appropriate speed and get run off the road, you will careen off the highway on to the road and neighborhood below. It is difficult to achieve a safe speed to enter traffic even with a smaller vehicle with a powerful engine. This problem was not addressed in the Special use permit application for the Reno Tahoe Business Gateway.

#2 Public Safety

There is an unguarded railroad crossing just south of the over pass that has been the scene of tragic accidents in the past and is where the access to the S3 Development is located. With the potential of more traffic that risk will increase.

#3 Recreation

The Carcione Open Space and the Canapa Ranch Open Space Recreation Access Plan for a Washoe County Regional Park is at risk with the S3 Development right at the proposed entrance to this potential park. This recreational access plan, www.wahoeconomy.gov/parks/files/carccione-and-canapa-presentation.pdf would be a system of hiking and mountain bike trails, a fishing and watersports opportunity that appears to be similar to the Ballardini Ranch and Hidden Valley Regional Parks. Would a project similar to the S3 proposal be approved on the door step of those two beautiful parks?

#4 History

The Truckee River route of the Overland trail passed through the center of this proposed development and is marked by a historical trail marker that is in the center of the project.

Please listen to the residents of Mogul/Verdi and West Reno and DO NOT approve this development.

Thank you,
Suzy and Pat O'Brien
40 Goshawk Ct
Reno, NV 89523
patsuzyo@charter.net

Ron Kaminkow Statement to the Board of Adjustment April 7th, 2022

My name is Ron Kaminkow and I live at 10265 Mogul Road on the West side of Reno. I have lived in this location since October of 2007. Throughout the course of this time, I have worked as a locomotive engineer based in the Reno area. Like nearly all railroad engineers and trainmen, I have been involved with several vehicle and pedestrian strikes throughout my career, dating back to 1996. On June 24th, 2011, my train, *The California Zephyr* was hit by a tandem truck at the highway 95 crossing at Miriam, Nevada resulting in the death of 6 people, including the conductor, the truck driver and four passengers. My reason for commenting today is because of my concern of the increasing potential for collisions between trains and motor vehicles at the railroad crossing which is directly adjacent to the highway intersection at Exit 7. From what I understand of the proposed development's location, it appears that all traffic that would be entering and exiting Interstate Highway 80 to and from this industrial park would pass within just a few feet of this railroad crossing.

While it is true that traffic destined to and from the proposed site would not make use of this railroad crossing, the additional presence of more vehicle traffic - especially trucks - would pose additional hazards for those who are. There is only a handful of homes on the south side of the railroad tracks, but recent years have seen an increase in traffic over the crossing for recreational purposes including dog walking, fishing, tubing, kayaking and hiking on the property along the Truckee River, now owned by Washoe County. In fact, Washoe County is in the process of developing riverfront property south of the railroad tracks at this location which is expected to result in many more visitors using this corridor in the coming months and years ahead.

While many of us who live here have had regular experiences with this railroad crossing and are aware of its dangerous nature, the occasional day-use drivers are not cognizant - given the distractions of such an unusual intersection - that there are two main railroad tracks 50 feet apart within the crossing, upon which a train may be moving in either direction, on either track, at any time.

Traffic heading west on 4th Street, entering the crossing from the north has the right-of-way to proceed to the railroad crossing. Traffic on the eastbound I-80 ramp must stop. Likewise, traffic on Mogul Road (the frontage road) to/from the proposed site must stop. A vehicle on 4th Street then proceeds straight but must slow to a STOP at the crossing stop sign in front of the eastbound traffic. After determining that there are no trains approaching, the motorist then climbs the steep dirt road embankment to cross Main #1, drives 50 feet further and crosses Main #2. The exercise is confusing and convoluted as it is with the existing amount of traffic. The confusion will no doubt increase with additional car and truck traffic generated by the proposed industrial park. Note: Whenever a motorist approaching the rail crossing prepared to cross the tracks, and a train is seen approaching, the motorist must stop and wait. In doing so, the entire intersection is now blocked, preventing eastward movement of traffic on Mogul Road. The stopped motorist can back up, but now is blocking the eastbound exit ramp from I-80. With a dramatic increase in traffic the proposed development would create, the prospects of this confusing and unsafe scenario occurring regularly would dramatically increase.

Meanwhile traffic heading from the south (the river side of the tracks) must STOP at the stop sign and after determining that no trains are coming on either track, proceed across the crossing. Upon approaching the 5-way intersection located immediately adjacent to the north side of the crossing, the motorist has the right-of-way. This is intentional to prevent the crossing from being incumbered by cross traffic from the eastbound off-ramp and most importantly, from the frontage road. Any increase of traffic including long trucks on this frontage road would increase the likelihood of a motorist being blocked on the crossing and struck by a train on Main #1. Because the eastbound motorist sees only a small dirt road, and because the elevation of Main #1 prevents a clear view of the traffic approaching from the south, eastbound traffic is prone to stop and then go, regardless of traffic approaching from the south across the railroad tracks.

I am a locomotive engineer, not a traffic engineer, so I have limited understanding of what can be done to ensure public and railroad safety in the event of development and increased traffic in and around this intersection and adjacent crossing. Perhaps a reconfiguration of the intersection complete with traffic lights is the solution. Given the complexity of the intersection and the limited amount of land space between the highway and the railroad track, I am not sure that this would work. A fully protected railroad crossing with flashing lights and gates that activate automatically when a train is approaching, is estimated at \$250,000. This would certainly help. Perhaps what is needed is crossing protection *and* traffic lights. Even then, as any locomotive engineer or trainman will tell you, when railroad crossings are in close proximity to traffic intersections, a confusing and hazardous situation is inevitable.

Kim Toulouse

70 Lemming Drive
Reno, NV

RE:WSUP22-0006

April 6, 2022

Washoe County Board of Adjustment Member

Washoe County

Dear Board Member:

I am writing in reference to Special Use Permit Case Number 22-0006: Reno Tahoe Gateway Business Park. I had every intention of attending the meeting regarding this case; but unfortunately, due to circumstances regarding my property damaged in the Beckwourth complex fires last year, I will be unable to attend. Therefore, please accept my comments regarding this case in written form.

As a resident of Mogul Meadows for more than 30 years, I will be immediately impacted by this development and have several serious concerns. I will attempt to be brief and concise with those concerns.

1. Reno Tahoe Gateway Business Park while not in its present form (it's been slightly modified from original plans - still flex space) was presented to both the Reno Planning Commission; where it was **denied** and then appealed to the Reno City Council; where the **denial was upheld**. If the City thought this was not a good project when it was under the Sphere of Influence, why would it be a good project when it's not in the Sphere of Influence?

2. The Cart is before the Horse. The two properties in question must undergo a **Master Plan Amendment** in order to be accepted back into the County. This has **not yet occurred** and is not scheduled to occur **until May**. While the Staff report mentions this and states it is proposed the parcels be accepted back with the current zoning; it is possible something else could occur and the parcels be zoned something else entirely. Therefore it is my opinion the **Board of Adjustment should not consider this matter until the parcels are properly and legally taken back by the County**.

3. Findings. The Board must make five findings in order for the project to proceed. While I take issue with Staff's comments on several of these findings; my main focus is Finding D - Issuance not Detrimental. The issuance of this **SUP will be extremely detrimental to the Mogul Meadows**

neighborhood and to the homes that are immediately adjacent to the project site. You may know this area is part of the Tahoe -Pyramid Bike Trail. On any day of the week numerous cyclists are found on Mogul road, which is a fairly narrow, relatively, unlined road with no shoulders. **State law says motorists must remain 3 feet from cyclists at all times.** This will be impossible for truck traffic to maintain once the site is developed. Additionally, **Washoe County Parks is proposing the development of river access, trail heads and parking areas along this same stretch of road.** Another use is incompatible with this type of development.

On any warm day, numerous **pedestrians, hikers, dog walkers, skaters and others can be found on this same road; again, uses not compatible with flex or heavy industrial use.**

Finally, in the winter months **frequent road closures of Interstate 80 find the Mogul on and off ramps completely backed up with trucks that are stopped awaiting the lifting of chain controls.** It is a dangerous situation. To add to this would create unnecessary additional burdens on this overloaded area.

I am opposed to the proposed Special Use Permit. Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely,

Kim Toulouse

Sent: Wednesday, April 6, 2022 11:08 AM
To: Washoe311 <Washoe311@washoecounty.gov>
Cc: Brown, Eric P. <EPriceBrown@washoecounty.gov>
Subject: Comment: Reno Tahoe Business Gateway WSUP22-0006

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

To the Board of Adjustment:

Please do not approve this project in its current form. It is hard to understand how the County and the City of Reno can be moving forward on designating trailheads and access to the Truckee River, in the same area as this project. Shouldn't the land use decisions in the Mogul area be coordinated somehow? Please consider this.

Also, when this project was formerly under the City of Reno's sphere of influence, numerous comments were submitted by the public as to the severe traffic impacts this project would have on the very limited I-80 on and off ramps in this location. As you may know, there is an offramp eastbound, and an onramp westbound. There are no other ramps. It is almost inconceivable as to how the developer could mitigate for the impacts of large trucks entering and leaving the freeway at these two very short ramps. This interchange is very limited at current traffic levels, so it's difficult to understand how this project would even be a possibility in this location.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Mary Lou Cotton
9084 Cabin Creek Trail
Reno 89523

Sent using the mobile mail app

Additional Information not in Staff Report

Concerning WSUP22-0006 (Reno Tahoe Business Gateway)

Dear Council members,

It is sad for citizens to read this Staff report which is the base for the legislative body to make important decisions, because it seems to be missing/mis-presenting the following points:

1. Incomplete presentation of zoning background of the lots
2. Incorrect description of the surrounding land use of the lots
3. Missing important background information

1. Incomplete presentation of zoning background of the lots

The 2 lots on Mogul Road were zoned industrial in the City of Reno, but with a COMMERCIAL land use, due to the ReImagine Masterplan. I think this is important, because this the zoning will have a big impact on the character and size of the development. The City saw the incompatibility with industrial use, and put a commercial land use over it. This might be important information.

2. Incorrect description of the surrounding land use of the lots

On page 7 the Staff Report talks that "to the south is Union Pacific Railroad and undeveloped land". This is incorrect. To the South is the Railroad and a Residential Area, and there are residents to the West, and to the North of the 2 lots. Not to mention the Truckee River to the South with access to recreational areas. Mogul is 98% residential. The 2 lots on Mogul road are surrounded by houses to the North, West, and South. Additionally, the Carcione-Canepa Open Space will underline even more the natural and recreational aspect of the area and make it even more incompatible for development. A development here affects hundreds of residences and decreases their values.

3. Missing important background information

2019: After years of public hearings and meetings, the City of Reno turned down the development of the 2 lots on Mogul Road. Major concerns were "incompatibility of surrounding areas and (...) traffic" (City Staff Report 7-28-21). The SUP for grading turned out to be the stumbling stone for the developer.

The City asked for input from citizens for alternative uses, which were ignored. Instead, Neoma Jardon and S3 development pursued the removal of the lots from the SOI behind closed doors.

The applicant S3 Development, who is NOT THE OWNER, wants to buy the land for \$5 million. The sale is contingent upon the lots being "developable", zoned industrial, and in the County. The sale is especially contingent upon approval of this grading SUP.

Local, well-connected applicant S3 development wants to bypass City's legislature and push for a development in a 98% residential area, in the beautiful, historical Truckee River Valley. I

understand that the owner of the land has a right to try to pursue development. However, development by the owner has been turned down. Does the economic interested of a potential buyer excuse maneuvering between different legislatures and wasting public tax payer money with all these meetings?

What kind of signal does this give to voters/ residents, who have built their houses and lives here and thought they can raise their families in a residential area?

Sincerely,
Emanuela Heller-MacNeilage

From: Sam Limerick <samlimerick@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 7, 2022 9:57 AM
To: Planning Counter <Planning@washoecounty.gov>
Cc: Janet Phillips <janet@tahoepyramidtrail.org>
Subject: Comment on SUP Case # WSUP22 - 0006 (Reno Tahoe Business Gateway)

[**NOTICE:** This message originated outside of Washoe County -- **DO NOT CLICK** on **links** or open **attachments** unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Washoe County commissioners,

Regarding the Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0006 (Reno Tahoe Business Gateway), the Tahoe Pyramid Trail (TPT) offers the following comments.

The TPT is a pedestrian and bicycle trail that follows the Truckee River; when complete it will run 114 miles from Lake Tahoe to Pyramid Lake (see <https://tahoepyramidtrail.org/>). One section now open is from Lake Tahoe to Sparks. The TPT uses W. 4th St and Silva Ranch Rd on the north side of the subject project. This portion of the TPT is a very popular road bike route for Reno-Sparks residents. Thus we are concerned with the potential for heavy truck traffic on these narrow roads as a result of the Reno Tahoe Business Gateway project.

We are glad to hear that a detailed traffic study is planned. If the project proceeds, TPT requests that there be appropriate safety mitigation, especially reduced speed limits and stop signs at the I-80 undercrossing and for the approach streets north of I-80.

Thank you for considering our comments.

Janet R. Phillips
President & Founder
Tahoe-Pyramid Trail
4790 Caughlin Parkway, #138
Reno, NV 89519

Weiche, Courtney

From: Planning Counter
Sent: Thursday, April 7, 2022 1:42 PM
To: Weiche, Courtney
Subject: Fw: Opposition to proposed Mogul Development (Tahoe Gateway Park)

FYI

Please tell us how we did by taking a quick [survey](#)
[Fill | Customer Satisfaction Survey - Planning Division](#)




Planning Counter
Planning & Building Division | Community Services Department
planning@washoecounty.us | 775-328-6100
1001 East 9th St., Reno, NV 89512

From: Lori Leonard <lori_m_leonard@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 7, 2022 1:04 PM
To: Planning Counter <Planning@washoecounty.gov>
Subject: Opposition to proposed Mogul Development (Tahoe Gateway Park)

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

[Box](#)



Please see my presentation in the following link, stating why the proposed "Reno Tahoe Business Park is NOT" a safe, nor appropriate development for this specific area.

I'm writing in **OPPOSITION** to the proposed "Reno Tahoe Business Park" development, which is being requested by Blake Smith from S3 in the Mogul neighborhood. The primary concern and reason for opposition relates to the **road safety**.

The below intersection (in yellow), is the **ONLY** access In or Out of the area proposed for development (in Red). This is a 5-way intersection that includes a RR crossing, which does not have gates, nor can you see if vehicles are crossing over the TWO sets of RR tracks. If a train is crossing, just 3 cars would completely block the entire intersection.

Also, this area is completely surrounded by residential (in Blue) development and Open Space (U.S. Forest Service and Washoe County Parks) (in Green).



There is only ONE way into and out of the Proposed development area (in Red), and that is the line if Black (Mogul exit 7). As you see from the Mogul exit sign, this is a Residential



Area.

