



Spanish Springs/District 4 Citizens Advisory Board
Minutes of the regular meeting of the Spanish Springs/District 4 Citizens Advisory Board held on June 17, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. at the Spanish Springs Library.

1. CALL TO ORDER/DETERMINATION QUORUM

Present: Chair Bonnie Billings, Vice Chair Bradley Young, Members Brandon Partain, Shannon Martell, Renate York

Absent: Member Jason Evans

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Terry Plys expressed skepticism about the Planning Department and spoke about construction equipment making noise 40 feet from his fence, Monday through Saturday. He felt nobody was notified of this project, and people were selling their homes because of the noise, including people who recently moved in. He thought property values were being depreciated because of it.

Washoe County Public Administrator Nicole Klitzke indicated she was running for reelection. She provided information about her office and its duties in handling the estates of people who pass away in the community. The Public Administrator's Office inventories personal property, liquidates assets, sells homes, collects financial accounts, and ensures that creditors are paid. She provided her professional history and discussed the importance of continuity in the office. She pointed out that her office is not allowed to give legal advice or handle wills or trusts.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF May 6, 2026

There was no public comment on this item.

Member Martell moved to approve the May 6, 2026, Spanish Springs Citizens Advisory Board minutes as written. Vice Member Young seconded the motion, which carried on a 5-0 vote, with Member Evans absent.

5. WHO APPROVED THIS?! A LEARNING ACTIVITY TO DEMONSTRATE HOW A PROJECT IN WASHOE COUNTY GETS APPROVED

Chair Billings indicated that the purpose of this agenda item was to help constituents better understand how planning and land use decisions were made. Development proposals bring forth opportunities, including economic growth and increased tax revenue, as well as concerns about traffic and public safety, among others. The County ideally balances these factors and makes recommendations that serve the long-term needs of the community. She stated that a fictitious automotive assembly project would be discussed during the item. No questions

would be taken on any specific project, but resources would be provided about where to get answers. She explained the roles that would be filled by each Citizens Advisory Board member and Washoe County staff member at the dais.

Member Young, representing the developer in this hypothetical scenario, provided background information on his auto assembly company. He described the location of the project and the size of the parcel, adding that the County has received all the plans and the request for a building permit. More than 2,300 emails and letters were received. He noted that the work shifts were determined specifically so they would not add to existing peak traffic. He spoke about the number of employees the company planned to hire and broke them down by department, noting that the company would also make engineering scholarships available to Northern Nevada students.

Member Young explained that the construction timeline was aggressive, but he did not want the project to last two or three years. He described the timeline for the project, from submission of all necessary paperwork to the construction of the first units, the addition of utilities, and the building of the warehouse. The project should be completed by August of 2028, which would be accomplished because two shifts would be working six days a week. He recognized that inspections might reveal the need for some repairs or changes. He felt the project was consistent with the Master Plan, and tentative approval had been given based on the plans that were submitted. He reviewed the findings, all of which he thought the project met.

Member Young listed the benefits of the project: the creation of between 600 and 750 jobs, patronage of local businesses, benefits to schools, and a minimum wage over \$20 per hour with 401k benefit plans. He believed the project would not have any detrimental environmental impacts, and they submitted all information to the County regarding its compliance with various Code requirements for noise and water restrictions. Very little water would be used, he mentioned, and traffic should not be significantly impacted due to factors such as the off-peak work hours and the strategic location of the ingress and egress.

Responding to questions from a member of the public, Member Young confirmed that the project would exceed height restrictions, but he hoped to obtain a variance for that. Regarding noise, he pointed out that there was nothing around the site for a quarter of a mile. Chair Billings clarified that the panel would ask those types of questions, and members of the public should focus their questions on the process.

Division Director Kelly Mullin, taking on the role of a staff planner, noted that members of the public and people representing economic development interests were not part of agency review meetings. She clarified that the hypothetical special use permit (SUP) application would be considered by the Board of Adjustment (BOA) within a month and a half, and the project was reviewed by numerous local, state, regional, and federal agencies. She said there was adequate buffering between the proposed structures and adjacent property lines, the proposed loading dock placement would mitigate noise appropriately, and there would be adequate sewer capacity. She pointed out that the project calls for construction to last until 10:00 p.m. while the County has a limit of 7:00 p.m., so that would need to be altered. Citing policies in the area, she stated the structure would need to have a neutral, non-reflective color. Member York, assuming a role focused on transportation and infrastructure, inquired about projections for traffic flows. Member Young indicated that those plans were submitted. Increases of about 300 cars were expected during shift changes, so shifts were moved to begin at 5:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. to alleviate traffic issues. He responded to additional

questions posed by Member York about the traffic volume and potential impacts to the ability of fire and law enforcement to respond to issues. Construction traffic will utilize the same road going into the business park, and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) was currently building a second road. Director Mullin pointed out that acceleration and deceleration lanes were required as part of this project, but no additional off-site improvements would be required.

Responding to the questions of Member Partain, who represented economic development interests, Member Young stated they planned to comply with all state and federal hiring laws, though their emphasis would be on hiring engineering graduates from state colleges. He anticipated that it would cost \$38.6 million to construct the building, and it would involve a lot of contractor work, especially if construction could go until 10:00 p.m. He thought out-of-state contractors would need to be employed since there were not enough in the Washoe Valleys because so many were already working on other projects. He confirmed that there was a potential to relocate the 50 or so Fallon site employees to the area as many were already asking to be transferred. The project would not seek any tax abatements.

Responding to audience questions, Director Mullin stated that statements made by an applicant about plans to grant scholarships and other things not directly related to the land use process or SUP findings would not necessarily result in conditions of approval requiring them. Member Young described elements of the project that would result in a good economic return for the community. A question was asked about the disagreement regarding construction end times. Director Mullin said those determinations would be made before any public hearings were held on the project, and the developer could ultimately decide to end outdoor construction by 7:00 p.m. while continuing indoor construction afterward.

Member Martell, speaking on behalf of residents, wondered about noise impacts and potential screening for nearby residences. Member Young did not believe the change to 5:00 a.m. would result in significant changes in noise as most housing complexes were anywhere from an acre to five acres away from the subject site. Responding to additional queries, he said the parking structure would be behind the main building, and solar panels on top would reduce the power required. He said he would be available to address any ongoing concerns. He discussed how the expected wages and the taxes generated from the project would benefit the community, adding that project would invest in the youth of the community through professorships and sponsorships.

Dr. Jeremy Smith, representing both the environmental perspective and County Engineering interests, asked questions about air quality. Member Young spoke about the chemicals and materials expected to be used at the factory, noting that all reviewing agencies will be made aware of them. The Engineering Department will handle the record keeping for air quality, and there have been no complaints in the company's history. Dr. Smith remarked that permits would be required for certain pollutants. Member Young noted that the plans that were submitted addressed things like filters.

Dr. Smith inquired about stormwater runoff, pollution prevention, and infiltration. Member Young stressed that the factory anticipated reclaiming and reusing water on the site. Dr. Smith explained that would be considered as part of the stormwater discharge permit process. Member Young recognized the importance of either reusing hazardous materials or safely transporting them from the site. He did not expect any offensive smells that would impact nearby residents.

Dr. Smith asked about grading, truck traffic, and wastewater generation. Member Young responded that no dirt is planned to be imported, though 5 percent of the land is expected to be removed. He said truck traffic should result in no more impacts on roads than normal wear and tear, though he was not an expert. Law enforcement agencies were contacted to determine the best times for delivery trucks. He indicated that the assembly process would not produce much more wastewater than regular use. Dr. Smith replied that County Engineering would verify that connection fees were paid and that the collection system and treatment facility could accommodate the increased wastewater, and on-site and off-site improvements could be necessary. He noted that newer technologies could require additional steps for approval.

Replying to additional audience member questions, Member Young explained that the building would be much larger than the parking garage, but the solar panels would be placed on the garage due to its height. Neil Schwartz expressed concern that the review panel did not adequately address infrastructure issues with respect to sewer capacity and fire protection. Director Mullin said the representative from the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) was unable to attend this mock agency review meeting, and fire concerns would typically be handled by them. Hazardous materials could trigger the involvement of the State Marshal, but lesser concerns would also be handled by the TMFPD, who would provide comments if they felt there were any issues. She did not think there were any concerns in this scenario. Dr. Smith added that sewer and water connection fees were designed to fund infrastructure needs, though some costs were borne by developers. Those elements would all be decided before approval.

Members of the public were allowed to ask additional questions. In response, Member Young mentioned that loading docks would be located away from residences and businesses. Director Mullin indicated that traffic plans were typically sent to and reviewed by the RTC and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). She said Washoe County does not offer incentives for things like workforce carpooling, but RTC might. Projects in certain locations with certain characteristics were sometimes sent to the Nevada Division of Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife to consider any environmental impacts on wildlife. She noted there were requirements in the Washoe County Development Code specific to lighting to reduce spillover onto other properties while ensuring there was sufficient lighting for employees to get safely to their vehicles.

At this point in the hypothetical process, Director Mullin continued, conditions of approval would have been provided by reviewing agencies, and the analysis would be complete. Staff would draft a staff report and make a recommendation for the BOA to consider at a public hearing, which would provide another opportunity for public input. Chair Billings encouraged people to review the two handouts provided as backup materials for this item.

Commissioner Clara Andriola stressed the County Commissioners need to follow the law. Some laws can be changed through the State Legislature, but local ordinances need to go through significant legal review to ensure compliance. She said there were processes in place to address situations where developers do not deliver on their promises. She asked Deputy District Attorney Jen Gustafson to talk about the legal process and jurisdictional requirements any project must go through.

Attorney Gustafson confirmed Via Zoom that there was legal review from the beginning of a

project proposal all the way through BCC consideration, though it varied depending on project complexity. Applications are reviewed by Planning staff in agency review meetings like this one, and the legal team often is involved early on in complex projects. Legal staff also reviews staff reports for Planning Commission (PC) and BOA meetings and is available to answer questions from Planning staff or reviewing agencies. She explained that each type of application has certain findings in accordance with Nevada Revised Statutes or Washoe County Code that need to be made before approval. PC and BOA members must be able to make five findings in order to approve SUP applications, for instance. The BCC is also constrained by those legal findings before it can approve a project. She listed some of the legal aspects that come into play when considering a project, such as master planning and land categories.

Member Partain wondered who provided the data that is reviewed for each project. Director Mullin responded that projects can involve hundreds of pages of data about traffic impacts, geographic information, and cultural studies, all of which must be prepared by certified professionals. Those data are then reviewed by experts from the reviewing agencies, who provide comments and concerns.

With respect to an additional audience member question, Attorney Gustafson remarked that every staff report and all supporting materials for every PC, BOA, and Parcel Map Review Committee are sent to legal for review. Commissioner Andriola emphasized that the BCC is bound by legal findings. She brought up a recent project that was sent to 32 agencies for review, 13 of which provided more than 200 conditions of approval.

Regarding the mock project, Commissioner Andriola said it was consistent with the Master Plan and met regional requirements. She asked about traffic and water standards. Director Mullin said projects are reviewed by Washoe County Engineering, RTC, and NDOT, and developers of projects which would exceed certain traffic thresholds are required to conduct traffic studies stamped by certified traffic engineers. Those traffic agencies then review the studies and add conditions of approval if necessary. She indicated that Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) also reviews almost all applications, where experts address water concerns and ensure there is adequate water capacity. County water rights experts also weigh in, and state water agencies are contacted on some projects. Dr. Smith stated TMWA is dedicated to 50-year water goals, and he described how aquifers are recharged during the winter months.

Commissioner Andriola emphasized the importance of resident input. If any project is appealed through judicial review, the judge will use findings as the basis for their decision. Commissioners can also impose certain conditions on projects. Director Mullin encouraged people to sign up for the County's email list to receive notifications about projects. Neighborhood meetings occur for most projects prior to submission of an application, allowing people who might be impacted to learn about the project, ask questions, and request changes. Dr. Smith added that the County and regional agencies regularly update their plans, and that is another opportunity for the public to get involved.

Commissioner Andriola spoke about the challenges associated with housing shortages, noting that some area plans have been in place for 30 years. Property rights and zoning were also significant legal factors in legal review. She encouraged residents to submit their comments about regional plans and individual projects to staff, as their voices are very important.

Replying to questions from online attendees, Attorney Gustafson said people needed to consider the master planning and zoning of a property to know what they might be entitled to do on it. The property would also need to meet all Development Code and statutory requirements. If all legal findings are met but the public does not want a project, the Supreme Court has opined that substantial and specific evidence needs to exist supporting that a legal finding cannot be made. The public not wanting a project alone would not be sufficient reason to deny it. Commissioner Andriola remarked that the BCC has a responsibility to hear from experts to ensure all concerns have been addressed.

Don Christensen spoke about his time on the BOA and assured members of the public that those boards read all letters and neighborhood meeting notes for each project. Those boards must also ensure that the findings are met, but they hear and deliberate on public feedback. He wished more properties would be notified of meetings to try to gather more input.

Another member of the public thought some of the codes pertaining to noise and light needed to be reconsidered or better enforced given the increase in population, and the juxtaposition of industrial and residential zoning should be addressed. Director Mullin admitted there were some conflicts with industrial parks, though some of them resulted in changes to the code. One of the BCC's priorities was a dark skies ordinance, which received widespread support. Commissioner Andriola recognized that change does not always happen as quickly as everyone would like.

Paul Augustin expressed frustration with zoning issues that result in warehouses being next to housing developments, echoing the desire for them to be reviewed. He wondered who approves things like that. Chair Billings said that could be a topic for a future agenda.

6. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no response to the call for public comment.

7. CAB MEMBER ANNOUNCEMENTS/REQUESTS

Chair Billings stated that the topic of zoning laws would be agendized for a future meeting. She thanked everyone who participated in the simulated exercise. She announced that this would be her last meeting as chair of the Spanish Springs/District 4 Citizens Advisory Board (CAB). Commissioner Andriola presented a certificate of appreciation to Chair Billings, who talked about her experience on the CAB. A brief discussion ensued regarding the preparation required to put together this meeting.

Chair-Elect Young noted that Dr. Jeremy Smith would give a presentation on master planning at November's CAB meeting. The next CAB meeting on July 1, 2026, would feature a presentation about go bags and Smart911. Noting that there would be no meetings in August or November, he reviewed some of the topics expected to be heard throughout the rest of the year.

8. COMMISSIONER ANNOUNCEMENTS/ UPDATES

Commissioner Clara Andriola announced there was an opening on the Planning Commission and encouraged people to apply by June 22. There was also a vacancy on the Deferred Compensation Committee, with an application deadline of June 30. She also urged interested people to apply for the seat on the Spanish Springs/District 4 Citizens Advisory Board vacated

by Chair Billings. She discussed the process to update Citizens Advisory Board bylaws and maps, through which succession was contemplated.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Member Partain moved to adjourn the meeting. Member York seconded the motion, which carried on a 5-0 vote, with Member Evans absent.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

DRAFT