

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

TUESDAY

2:00 P.M.

July 30, 2018

CONCURRENT MEETING

PRESENT:

Marsha Berkbigler, Chair
Bob Lucey, Commissioner
Vaughn Hartung, Commissioner
Jeanne Herman, Commissioner

Nancy Parent, County Clerk
John Slaughter, County Manager
Paul Lipparelli, Legal Counsel

ABSENT:

Kitty Jung, Vice Chair

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners convened at 2:00 p.m. with the Reno City Council in concurrent session in the Reno City Council Chamber, One East First Street, Reno, Nevada. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

18-0578 AGENDA ITEM 1C Public Comment.

Ms. Tammy Holt-Still showed pictures of rocks that she alleged were on Washoe County property as part of a project denied by the Planning Commission. She wondered how much of the rock had come from a different project in the City of Reno owned by the same developer. She claimed this would be a violation of the Washoe County Code. She urged the City of Reno and Washoe County to work together regarding development to address flooding concerns before the storm season began. She spoke about families who were still displaced.

Ms. Sharon Frandsen stated despite 30 years of development around Swan Lake nothing had ever been done to deepen the lake bed. She said there had been a plan to use Swan Lake water on construction sites but the County and City did not allow this because the water was contaminated. She alleged the sewage plant in Stead was permitted to pump two million gallons of grey water a day but they were pumping four million. She said the County and City halted another plan to dredge the lake, instead reallocating \$10 million in federal funding to fix Reno parks. She stressed dredging the lake would fix the problems.

Mr. Sam Dehne spoke about the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center, Nevada Attorney General Adam Laxalt, and the Tesla Gigafactory.

Reno City Clerk Ashley Turney mentioned she received public comment from Annemarie Grant and Claudia Hernandez regarding police brutality.

Washoe County Clerk Nancy Parent stated she received an email from Annemarie Grant requesting a letter she attached be put on the record. Copies of both documents were placed on file.

18-0579 AGENDA ITEM 1D Approval of the Agenda. July 30, 2018.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Commissioner Lucey, seconded by Commissioner Hartung, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that Agenda Item 1D be approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

18-0580 AGENDA ITEM 2A Staff Report (For Possible Action): Resolution No. Case No. LDC18-00026 (United Federal Credit Union MPA) Request has been made by Andrew Young of The Redmond Company for a Master Plan amendment within the Special Planning Area/Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan to re-designate ± 2.57 acres of Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential (1 – 2.5 acre lots) and ± 1.02 acres of Open Space to ± 2.73 acres of General Commercial and ± 0.86 acres of Open Space. The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan is a master plan under the joint jurisdiction of the City of Reno and Washoe County and requires approval by both entities for any changes. The ± 3.6 acre site (APN 086-380-20 & -21) is located on the west side of Lemmon Drive, ± 403 feet north of its intersection with Sky Vista Parkway and has City of Reno zoning designations of Arterial Commercial (AC), Large Lot Residential – 1 acre (LLR1), and Large Lot Residential – 2.5 acres (LLR2.5). (Ward 4)

Reno City Clerk Ashley Turney indicated proper notice was given for the hearing and she received one letter in opposition from Ms. Elaine Tudor.

On the call for public comment, Ms. Sharon Frandsen remarked flooding problems and a large cost could have been addressed by dredging Swan Lake. She said a bid went out for companies to dredge Swan Lake but the bid was stopped to reallocate federal funds for park maintenance. She stated insurance companies were not paying many claims or selling new flood insurance because the flooding was man-made. She claimed the day's meeting was not advertised. She reiterated the need to dredge Swan Lake.

Ms. Tammy Holt-Still explained the developer wanted to develop on a location which featured a grade of more than 30 percent. She expressed concern about vehicles illegally turning into the location. She said a representative from the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) told her the Lemmon Valley Sewer Plant's

permit did not have an automatic renewal in place; rather it was for a five-year term. The representative also told her the NDEP had not seen a renewal request and could not give information about conditions until an application was received. Ms. Holt-Still concluded when the plant's permit expired, wastewater would go to the Reno Stead Sewer Plant which was already above capacity.

Mr. Sam Dehne stated development was happening in the wrong place. He suggested the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center, which he called the Citizens Reno Industrial Complex, should pay for development and it should not happen in Reno. He spoke about negative impacts of development and Nevada Attorney General Adam Laxalt.

Mr. Gordon Gossage said he focused on bringing the micro-home to Reno and supported development to increase the housing supply in Reno. He noted there was an affordable housing crisis and he supported increasing transitional housing, affordable subsidized housing, and accessory dwelling units. He felt development needed to be accelerated until local government officials deemed the crisis to be over. He said development either needed to take place within the McCarran Boulevard loop or in the North Valleys. He stated the public needed to be educated that developers and community organizations were part of the solution.

There was no response by the board members to the call for disclosures.

Mr. Jeff Borchardt, Associate Planner with the City of Reno, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Description; Existing and Proposed Land Use Designations; RSCJP Land Use Designation and Zoning (2 slides); Land Use Compatibility; and Joint Planning Commission (2 slides).

Mr. Borchardt explained the request was an amendment to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP) which would change the land use designations on the property. He pointed out the open space designation did not align with the zoning boundary line and the low-density suburban RSCJP designation did not align with the arterial commercial zoning designation. He stated they had to be consistent by State law. The applicant was filing the appeal both to be consistent and also so the site could be developable once the designation was changed to arterial commercial.

Mr. Borchardt, referencing a prior comment made by the Washoe County Planning Commission that the designation was not compatible with surrounding land uses, showed a map illustrating the property was surrounded by commercial land use designations. He pointed out two commissioners on the Reno Planning Commission had expressed concerns about changing the land use without a presentation from the Public Works Director about regional drainage solutions and sewer capacity. He indicated that presentation occurred, but before this joint meeting was scheduled. He stated details concerning traffic, access, and grading would come at the time of a development application; this was simply a master plan amendment.

Ms. Stacie Huggins with Wood Rogers spoke representing the applicant, the Redwood Group representing United Federal Credit Union. She conducted a PowerPoint Presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Project Area; Project Background (2 slides); Project Request; and Summary.

Taking into account the concerns voiced at the joint Planning Commission meeting about the reduction of open space as part of the request, Ms. Huggins indicated the property owner was willing to do a one-for-one change; the 2.57 acres of low-density suburban (LDS) would become general commercial and the 1.02 acres of open space would remain. She showed a map which illustrated that one-for-one change.

Councilmember Duerr asked who currently used the open space at that property. Ms. Huggins replied it was undeveloped land on a steep slope. Councilmember Duerr asked if it was attached to a previous planning decision. Mr. Borchardt responded the RSCJP included a provision about putting open space on developmentally-constrained areas. The open space was added to protect slopes greater than 30 percent. He noted the City of Reno subsequently adopted standards in the hillside development ordinance which protected slopes greater than 30 percent. He added the RSCJP was adopted when the County and City were working together on methodology to address common areas and both jurisdictions adopted similar standards in their codes.

Councilmember Duerr inquired whether the change would acknowledge the regulations the City of Reno imposed on slopes greater than 30 percent. Mr. Borchardt answered the zoning would stay in effect and the zoning maps would be changed to ensure the map coloration matched between the two designations.

Commissioner Hartung confirmed with Mr. Borchardt the property was in the City of Reno. When asked by Commissioner Hartung for clarification on zoning, Mr. Borchardt explained the underlying Master Plan designation was LDS but the zoning in the City of Reno was large lot residential 1 and large lot residential 2.5, which was not consistent with the open space designation. Commissioner Hartung stated the underlying designation was Washoe County's designation, which Mr. Borchardt corrected by saying the underlying designation was that of the RSCJP, not Washoe County. He clarified the RSCJP was adopted at a time when the County had a single-map land use system and much of the nomenclature was adopted as well.

Commissioner Hartung opined he could not see a situation where this property could be used for residential purposes. Mr. Borchardt stated given current zoning standards and restrictions, the arterial commercial section would be subject to increased setback standards and the only place it would be allowed to build a building would be on the existing road. Keeping the designation the same would create variance conditions where nothing could be built on the entire property. Commissioner Hartung pointed out this property was very close to a Walgreens, another commercial property.

Commissioner Hartung asked whether the County could move to remove itself from the joint planning area. He pointed out the developer could not serve two masters and the property was constrained. Deputy District Attorney Paul Lipparelli said the item's title contemplated approving or disapproving the master plan amendment for the parcel which was part of the RSCJP. He did not see a provision that contemplated changing the regional plan to remove the property from the planning area; that action would take a regional plan amendment. He explained Regional Planning's procedures dictated changes to the joint planning area were effective upon approval of the majority of the affected local governing body's membership. He did not think this would be reviewed by the Regional Planning Board unless there was an appeal process.

Councilmember McKenzie asked how long the front portion of the property was designated as arterial commercial. Mr. Borchardt said he could not figure out the exact date for that designation or the reason why the land use designation was not changed. Regarding the large lot residential designation, Mr. Borchardt explained it was part of the RSCJP which was planned jointly with the County, and the designation was LDS even though it was zoned as arterial commercial. He added he could not figure out how that zoning was reached without a master plan amendment.

Councilmember McKenzie opined this seemed like a technical oversight and he guessed the property was originally part of the Walgreens property. Prompted by Councilmember McKenzie's query, Mr. Borchardt replied he did not believe there were any flood control issues on this property. He listed some of the other errors with the designation of the property, such as being zoned differently with a planned unit development while still being in the RSCJP and being zoned as residential while being next to a Walgreens. The applicant was trying to come into conformance with the current zoning and then they would process the zoning map. Addressing Commissioner Hartung's earlier point, Mr. Borchardt noted the zoning map amendment would not have to go through a joint planning process; it would go through the Reno City Council.

The City of Reno moved to adopt the amendment to the RSCJP subject to conformance review by the Regional Planning Board, noting the open space retention agreed to by the appellant in Ms. Huggins' presentation, which motion duly passed on a 5-0 vote.

Commissioner Lucey asked whether the County needed to make findings for their motion. Mr. Lipparelli said the published materials were the City of Reno's documents and he could rely on their extensive staff report.

For the Board of County Commissioners, on motion by Commissioner Lucey, seconded by Commissioner Hartung, which motion duly carried on a 4-0 vote with Commissioner Jung absent, it was ordered that the Resolution for the proposed amendment to the RSCJP be certified and the Chair be authorized to sign the Resolution. The Resolution for same is attached hereto and made a part of the minutes thereof.

AGENDA ITEM 2B Staff Report (For Possible Action): Resolution No. Case No. LDC17-00043 (Echeverria Peavine Property) Request has been made by Peavine Investors, LLC to amend the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP). The RSCJP is a master plan that is under the joint jurisdiction of Washoe County and the City of Reno and requires approval by both entities for any changes. If approved, the proposed amendment would remove ± 559.3 acres from the RSCJP area and re-designate it with only a City of Reno Master Plan Land Use designation. The applicant is also requesting an amendment to the City of Reno Master Plan Land Use Designation from Special Planning Area/Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan/High Density Rural (5 to 2.5 acre minimum lot size) on ± 143.0 acres (between 29 and 57 dwelling units) and Special Planning Area/Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan/General Rural (1 dwelling unit per 40 acres) on ± 416.3 acres (maximum 10 dwelling units) to City of Reno Single Family Neighborhood (SF) (2 to 8 dwelling units per acre) on ± 373.3 acres (between 747 and 3,004 dwelling units), Suburban Mixed Use (SMU) on ± 145.5 acres, and Parks Greenways and Open Space (PGOS) on ± 40.5 acres. The ± 559.3 acre site (APNs 081-031-39 and 081-024-08) is located $\pm 1,700$ feet south of the US 395 and Red Rock Road interchange and has City of Reno and Washoe County zoning designations of Large Lot Residential-2.5 Acres (LLR2.5) and General Rural (GR), respectively. This request to amend the RSCJP requires joint hearings before the City of Reno and Washoe County and will result in a Truckee Meadows Regional Plan Amendment if adopted. (Ward 4)

On the call for public comment, Mr. John O'Neill spoke against the project. He thought it was a bad idea to add homes in an area with no bus lines, bicycle lanes, or sidewalks. He felt the area was already overwhelmed and there was a need for more infrastructure. He pointed out it could become confusing which jurisdiction people lived in if the land were annexed; areas of police and fire coverage could become unclear. He felt there was room for some additional housing but not high density housing.

Ms. Sharon Frandsen waived her right to speak.

Ms. Tammy Holt-Still said an additional 3,400 homes would create runoff and she showed pictures of locations on Lemmon Drive. She expressed concern about traffic in the area and the response times for services. She provided an example of dense development in Santa Rosa, California that experienced a natural disaster. She requested solutions for police and fire concerns that could result from the development.

Ms. Donnelle O'Neill showed a map of the neighborhood and pointed out how close it was to her property. She voiced her objection to the proposal and the new City of Reno Master Plan, saying it requested increasing density by 400 percent. She expressed concern about a lack of infrastructure, limited resources, and the proposed development taking place on the only absorption point for rain and snow from Peavine Mountain. Other concerns she raised included the plan not fitting in with the rural

lifestyle, the loss of wildlife population, lack of public transportation, traffic on Route 395, the potential for crime, the overburdening of schools, open land views, and an increase in light pollution.

Ms. Sjana Wagner remarked it was stated during the May meeting that the Reno City Planning Department found the changes to be compatible with the ReImagine Reno Master Plan. She disagreed, citing a section of code that encouraged a variety of house types and lot sizes. She stated statistics from a community profile that 63 percent of citizens wanted to live in a single-family residential dwelling and 15 percent wanted a large lot designation. She felt adding 3,000 homes was not compatible with those wishes. She said residents wanted respectful and responsible development and asked the Boards not to allow the developer to make the same proposal again and again.

Mr. Sam Dehne noted the change from 67 homes to 3,000 was more than a 400 percent increase. He suggested more development should occur at the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center where people would be working.

Ms. Denise Ross stated the numbers given by developers regarding school capacity were ten months old since Washoe County performed its student counts each October. She claimed Lemmon Valley was at 96 percent capacity only because the fifth graders were moved to O'Brien Middle School. North Valleys High School was at 109 percent capacity. She wondered where students from these new developments would go to school and raised concerns about staffing.

Mr. Scott Burner mentioned ten years prior citizens were told the project would be comprised of 2.5 to 5 acre horse properties. He expressed concern about dry creek beds turning into running rivers and washing away homes. He thought the housing density was absurd and urged the Boards to vote against the proposal.

Mr. Danny Cleous alleged developers provided campaign contributions to many of the Board members. He expressed concerns about police and fire coverage, the views of warehouses, and drainage issues caused by development. He remarked a Councilmember stated at a recent Neighborhood Advisory Board (NAB) meeting that the sewer plant was full and Mr. Cleous expressed frustration that more development was approved anyway.

On the call for disclosures, Commissioner Hartung disclosed he had known the Echeverria and Welmerink families for years. Councilmember McKenzie noted he had met with the applicant a year and a half prior and had a recent conversation with one of the representatives. Councilmember Duerr mentioned she met with the applicant to discuss this issue as well.

Heather Manzo, Assistant Planner with the City of Reno, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk, and reviewed slides with the following titles: Echeverria Peavine Property Request; Echeverria Peavine Property – Process; Echeverria Peavine – Slope Map; Current Master

Plan Land Use; Proposed Master Plan Land Use; RSCJP Background; RSCJP Land Use Plan & Policies; Re-Imagine Reno Plan & Policies; Proposed Master Plan Amendment; Existing Zoning – No Change Proposed; and Joint Planning Commission Action.

Ms. Manzo explained the applicant was not requesting a zoning map amendment at this time, only the Master Plan amendment; they would return later with a planned unit development (PUD) request. She noted the public process for amending the Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP) and removing property from it involved multiple steps. She remarked the neighborhood meeting was held at a property close to the proposed site. She indicated both the Washoe County and City of Reno planning commissions voted to deny the applicant's request at the April 2018 joint meeting.

Ms. Manzo pointed out the two drainage ditches were delineated on the slope map and about 76 percent of the site was situated on slopes of less than 15 percent. Areas of red on the slope map were on slopes of 30 percent or greater. As part of the applicant's request, areas surrounding the drainage ditches were proposed to be open space. She noted a railroad line ran through the two parcels and the applicant's designation request reflected that line. She stated high density rural (HDR) zoning in the RSCJP allowed for densities of one lot per 2.5 to 5 acres and general rural (GR) allowed for one unit per 40 acres. As a result, the maximum current density was 57 units on the entire 560-acre site. She remarked about 73 percent of the properties in the joint plan area had been annexed into the City of Reno; this property was annexed in 2008.

Ms. Manzo said the applicant's request was in response to the adoption of the ReImagine Reno Master Plan in December 2017. The development of the plan was a two-year process incorporating public input, which saw a greater interest in more diverse options regarding residential and commercial density and uses. She stated the applicant's request for zoning on the southern portion of the site would allow for two to eight dwelling units per acre. She stressed there was no specific request for density at this time; the request would set the framework for potential development. In this case that could result in between 745 and 3,000 residential lots on the southern side while the suburban mixed use designation on the north side would allow for residential and non-residential development to support surrounding neighbors.

Ms. Manzo indicated the Planning Commission's staff report and analysis examined the RSCJP and how ReImagine Reno incorporated some of those policies into their new Master Plan framework. She added the property was within a cooperative planning area which incorporated sections of an ordinance encouraging lot matching and open space buffers between existing rural neighborhoods and more intense development. She said single-family neighborhood density was suburban and not something found in an urban setting.

Ms. Manzo indicated land use characteristics and policies specific to the area were not modified in the Joint Plan amendment in 2010, so the maximum residential density was two to seven dwelling units per acre. She explained several hazard mitigation policies focused on the wildland-to-urban interface and encouraged safe development that

could be protected in the future. She reiterated the applicant did not request a zoning map amendment at this time; adopting the Master Plan amendment was the first step in a multiple-step process. A zoning map amendment would be required to develop anything in conformance with a Master Plan designation.

Ms. Manzo stated the Reno Planning Commission felt the plan was outdated and an update might be appropriate. The Planning Commission also pointed out it took a lot of time for an amendment to go through the process of adoption. Because the property was within a cooperative planning area, City of Reno staff sought input from Washoe County. The County felt they would be taken out of the planning process if the site was removed from the planning area. She said there were concurrency standards in the Master Plan that required services and infrastructure be addressed during development. She noted analysis was provided in the Planning Commission staff report and when a zoning map amendment or a PUD was proposed there would be more information about density and the need for services. She remarked she prepared motion options for both boards if they wanted them.

Andy Durling from Wood Rodgers, representing the Echeverria family, conducted a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was placed on file with the Clerk. He reviewed slides with the following titles: Project Location (2 slides); Project Request; Existing Master Plan; Existing Zoning; Proposed Master Plan; Site Suitability; Proposed Master Plan (3 slides); and two slides of photos. He reviewed the size and location of the parcel and noted the Echeverria family had owned it since the 1970s. He explained the property was bisected by a railroad and the property was annexed by the City of Reno in 2009.

Mr. Durling said the decision for the property to be removed from the RSCJP needed to be made by both boards. He explained the RSCJP utilized County Master Plan designations and City of Reno zoning, which created inconsistencies. He felt general rural and high density rural zonings were not consistent with the findings of the supporting studies and outreach that went into the ReImagine Reno effort. He stated there was a desire to have a more diverse mix of housing which could be addressed by implementing single family neighborhood and suburban mixed use designations. Mr. Durling confirmed the applicants did not request zoning at this time but they would come forward with a PUD in the future. With that PUD they could address concerns such as public safety, water, sewer, and traffic impacts.

Mr. Durling reviewed the proposed Master Plan map and noted more than 1,000 acres had been removed from the RSCJP. He added the County and the City jointly planned to address those annexations over time. Some of the developable land not annexed into the City of Reno included the North Valleys Regional Park and some developmentally constrained areas to the west. He indicated the applicants were asking to come out of the RSCJP to help support the ReImagine Reno master planning effort. He stated because of a regional settlement agreement put in place in the mid-2000s, there were standards in code and a mechanism in place for Washoe County staff to make recommendations to the City on all relevant development cases.

Mr. Durling mentioned the proposal responded to two studies regarding housing needs in the area; a pattern of larger single-family lots predominated development in the past but this proposal would include a middle-sized housing product. He added this was a national issue and not specific to this area. This would result in smaller single-family lots, townhomes, and multi-family residences which would address housing needs.

Mr. Durling explained the middle-sized housing product would be more in line with median household incomes. He pointed out while the subject area was largely undeveloped, areas directly to the north included a significant suburban-to-urban style of development; he said it was an opportune time to have the same style south of Route 395. He mentioned Washoe County had a place on the Regional Planning Board so they would have the opportunity for additional input there.

Councilmember McKenzie remarked the Master Plan amendment would increase density by 600 percent and there was no infrastructure in place to support that. He opined the proposal did not address infrastructure and the time was not right for this type of drastic change.

Councilmember Duerr said she heard the concerns of residents and the City of Reno had been working on development in the North Valleys for some time. She praised the applicant for considering the type of housing mix that was needed and she felt it would result in a more affordable product. She stated she did not want to leave the County out of the process by taking the property out of the RSCJP unless that was acceptable to them. She understood the delays caused by joint planning and said that was somewhat intentional. She agreed there was not currently the infrastructure to support this but added there was no specific project proposed yet.

Commissioner Hartung stressed the amendment would remove 559.3 acres from the RSCJP area and re-designate it with City of Reno Master Plan land use designations but it was not a project. Regardless of what decision was reached, Washoe County would still review this at a regional level. He pointed out the land had already been annexed and Ms. Manzo confirmed that happened in 2009.

Commissioner Hartung stated he understood Councilmember McKenzie's position regarding the lack of infrastructure but right now he felt the issue before the boards was removal of the property from the RSCJP. He asked whether Mr. Durling felt the landowners would offer more than the required mitigation regarding stormwater and other issues. Mr. Durling responded the traffic study to understand the magnitude of the impact dealt with a hypothetical project and an assumed number of units. With no project yet there was no data to analyze regarding impacts to sewer and traffic. He noted the property provided opportunities to make improvements in the region by improving interchanges, widening North Virginia Street, and modifying drainage to retain water rather than have it funnel into Silver Lake.

Commissioner Hartung told a story of a developer in Spanish Springs who offered to build a stormwater utility in exchange for 750 dwelling units. It was denied by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) and residents ended up having to pay for the utility. He felt there was an opportunity to work with the applicants to implement substantial infrastructure that would benefit the Silver Lake and Swan Lake areas. He mentioned the Echeverrias provided huge amounts of material for sandbagging for free.

Vice Mayor Jardon recalled Ms. Manzo's comment that the boards would have to take two separate actions and asked whether the Joint Planning Commission took two separate actions. Ms. Manzo replied the Washoe County Planning Commission's action concerned whether to adopt a resolution to remove the site from the RSCJP. The City of Reno Planning Commission considered removing the site from the RSCJP and also re-designating the Master Plan. She believed they denied both the request to remove and the request to re-designate in a single motion.

Vice Mayor Jardon asked whether the proposal would move along faster if the property was pulled out of the RSCJP. Ms. Manzo replied it would. If both bodies reversed the Planning Commission's decision, the request could be forwarded to Regional Planning for conformance review and a potential Regional Plan amendment. If the City Council did not approve the Master Plan amendment, the applicant would have to return at a future date for a Master Plan amendment. Ms. Manzo confirmed Vice Mayor Jardon's assertion that the removal from the RSCJP would not happen if either board denied it.

Vice Mayor Jardon asked what the developer's next steps would be if removal was not approved. Ms. Manzo responded if the request was denied the application would be denied. Vice Mayor Jardon stated the applicant would then have to substantially change the request, a point confirmed by Ms. Manzo.

Commissioner Herman stated she was on the record supporting a moratorium on building until Swan Lake's issues were solved. She expressed apprehension about moving forward with any plans until that was done.

Commissioner Lucey pointed out most of the property to the east and southeast of the subject property had already been designated as City of Reno property. He agreed having two governing bodies in the process was laborious. He felt if the City of Reno sought to move forward with any development in this area, it should go through their NABs and their Planning Commission. He said he would be willing to make a motion to remove the property from the RSCJP.

Commissioner Hartung asked how much time it would take before the project had a final map. Ms. Manzo answered, assuming it was a City of Reno project, it would go to Truckee Meadows Regional Planning for conformance review, which could take four to six months. She imagined a PUD for a 560-acre project would likely trigger the designation of it as a project of regional significance, which could take 6 to 12

months for final approval. She estimated it could take a couple of years until it got to the final map phase.

Commissioner Hartung asked how long it would take to build the project. Mr. Durling agreed with the 2 to 3 year estimate to get a final map and he estimated it could take 10 to 15 years to build a project of this size. Commissioner Hartung pointed out RSCJP, which was jointly adopted in 1996, anticipated a 20-year planning horizon. He stated he hoped Reno would give the same consideration to the County in joint planning areas.

Chair Berkbigler stressed the County would not lose control because the proposal still had to go to the Regional Planning Governing Board. She added it was a project of regional significance in a key location.

Councilmember McKenzie stated the process would take time once the project came forward as a PUD. Once the master plan amendment was approved to increase the density by more than 600 percent, then it would go through the zone change process, then a site map, and then the developer could build. He noted there was no requirement to build site maps in a way that would trigger the designation as a project of regional significance. He said many developers proposed segmented projects that did not require traffic studies, the allocation of land for schools, or road improvements. He feared this would occur if the intensity of the project was increased under the Master Plan. He was okay with pulling the property out of the RSCJP if the County wished it but he did not want to move forward with a Master Plan amendment until they could review a project which addressed the mitigation of any impacts.

For the Board of County Commissioners, on motion by Commissioner Lucey, seconded by Commissioner Hartung, which motion duly carried on a 3-1 vote with Commissioner Jung absent and Commissioner Herman voting "no", it was ordered that the Resolution for the proposed amendment to the RSCJP be adopted and the Chair be authorized to sign the Resolution. Commissioner Hartung clarified the Resolution removed the subject property from the RSCJP and re-designated it with City of Reno Master Plan use designation.

The City of Reno approved the amendment to the RSCJP to remove the site from the plan area but to leave the existing Master Plan designation on the properties. Ms. Manzo requested a sponsorship of a Regional Plan amendment. The City of Reno approved the preparation of a Resolution reflecting the motion for regional planning.

Commissioner Hartung asked whether the County needed the same motion and if it should be done at a Board of County Commissioner meeting. Deputy District Attorney Paul Lipparelli answered he did not see language in the County agenda about sponsoring a Regional Plan amendment. He recommended the County forward a copy of the Resolution they authorized the Chair to sign to the Regional Planning Board, which could glean whatever intent they wanted.

Vice Mayor Jardon asked whether Reno's legal counsel desired for the County to take action. Reno City Attorney Karl Hall said he felt any recommendation to the Regional Planning Commission should be done by Resolution. He proposed the City do it that way but deferred to Mr. Lipparelli to advise the BCC. Chair Berkbigler said they could put the item on the agenda for the next BCC meeting.

Ms. Manzo said she believed Washoe County staff could prepare a Resolution for signature. Mr. Lipparelli responded the motion made by Commissioner Lucey was to adopt a Resolution for the Chair to sign and, since there was no Resolution in the County's staff report, it would be prepared after the fact. He clarified the sponsorship of a plan amendment was a specific thing not contemplated by the BCC agenda; if the Board sponsored such it would have to be done after a vote held at a subsequent meeting.

Councilmember Duerr maintained the motion made by Councilmember McKenzie's was important and a PUD would be necessary to understand the benefits and impacts of any proposed development before making an informed decision. She pointed out the current Master Plan designation was low density. She added any proposal would have to address the impacts of the development in a comprehensive manner.

Chair Berkbigler stated residents would no longer worry which agency was responsible for certain things as now it would all now be the City's responsibility.

Councilmember McKenzie indicated there was a requirement when doing a Master Plan Amendment to have evidence of concurrency; here they could not approve that amendment since there was no evidence. He said making findings was difficult without reviewing a specific project. Regarding a comparison made to the StoneGate development, he explained there was an extreme density already assigned to that property. He added they still had to meet concurrency standards in order to modify the Master Plan from industrial to residential. He stressed changing from 67 units to a minimum of 3,004 required the Council to have a better idea of concurrency before approving the measure.

Vice Mayor Jardon asked Ms. Manzo to clarify the next steps in the process for members of the public. Ms. Manzo answered once she received the Resolution from Washoe County, they would put together an application package for submittal to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency, which had up to 90 days to deem the application complete and schedule a regional planning meeting date. That could be expected to happen in several months. Ms. Manzo confirmed the meeting would take place at the County Commission Chambers. She added if the Regional Planning Commission found the request in accordance with the regional plan, it would be forwarded to the Regional Planning Governing Board for consideration. She concluded it could take six months before the Regional Planning Board rendered a decision. Prompted by Vice Mayor Jardon's query, Ms. Manzo said the best place to read about the posting of the meeting was the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency's website.

18-0582 AGENDA ITEM 3 Public comment.

Ms. Tammy Holt-Still said she appreciated that the boards did not approve the Master Plan and it would require further steps before reconsideration. She expressed frustration that Washoe County gave up their say in the development. She indicated the Desert Research Institute Corps of Engineers would perform a study in the area and she requested a moratorium on building until the specific amount of water flowing into Swan Lake was determined. She claimed retention and detention ponds were not working and stated developers needed to mitigate issues for the residents.

Ms. Melissa Wiseman thanked Councilmember McKenzie and Commissioner Herman for thinking ahead about development. She cautioned the City of Reno against extending their boundaries without addressing the amenities within the City. She expressed concern about the lack of infrastructure in the plan, poor notification of public meetings, and the potential increase in density for the subject property.

Ms. Sjana Wagner stated lot matching was brought up in the City of Reno's presentation but she stated the new suburban mixed-use zoning would not match the density of the adjacent lot. She expressed concern about the potential increase in light pollution. She stated people were leaving California because of urban sprawl and they did not want that to encroach upon them. She wished to see lot matching be considered more of a priority.

Ms. Donnelle O'Neill stated she was fine with some development but suggested mixed-use housing should be placed at the base of Peavine Mountain, not directly behind her property. She expressed frustration that very few people were informed about this meeting and about potential conflicts of interest.

* * * * *

4:17 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, on motion by Commissioner Hartung, seconded by Commissioner Lucey, which motion duly carried, the meeting was adjourned.

MARSHA BERKBIGLER, Chair
Washoe County Commission

ATTEST:

NANCY PARENT, County Clerk and
Clerk of the Board of County Commissioners

Minutes Prepared by:
Derek Sonderfan, Deputy County Clerk