



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION **DRAFT** Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

Jim Barnes
R. Michael Flick
Linda Kennedy
Daniel Lazzareschi – Chair
Kate S. Nelson
Amy Owens
Rob Pierce – Vice Chair
Secretary
Trevor Lloyd

Tuesday, January 6, 2026
6:00 p.m.

Washoe County Administrative Complex
Commission Chambers
1001 E 9th Street, Building A
Reno, Nevada 89512

and available via
Zoom Webinar

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on **Tuesday, January 6, 2026**, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and via Zoom teleconference.

The meeting will be televised live and replayed on the Washoe Channel at: <https://www.washoecounty.us/mgrsoff/Communications/wctv-live.php> also on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/user/WashoeCountyTV>

1. *Determination of Quorum

Chair Lazzareschi called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Jim Barnes
R. Michael Flick
Daniel Lazzareschi, Chair
Kate Nelson
Amy Owens
Rob Pierce, Vice Chair

Commissioners absent: Linda Kennedy (excused absence)

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Chris Bronczyk, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Tim Evans, Planner, Planning and Building
Jolene Bertetto, Planner, Planning and Building
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
Elizabeth Hickman, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Lazzareschi led the pledge to the flag.

3. Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Elizabeth Hickman provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

4. Appeal Procedure

Secretary Trevor Lloyd recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

5. General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Chair Lazzareschi opened the Public Comment period.

Public Comment:

Ms. Linda Harrison placed a document on file with the Secretary. She expressed concern about traffic that built up whenever there were issues on I-80. She noted there was only one fire station in the area and contested that there would be no backups at the roundabout. She thought the development, which would put roundabouts at the top and the bottom of a hill, should not be approved, citing safety concerns.

Mr. Cliff Low said the Commission will need to decide between following staff's recommendation to approve Agenda Item 8.D. or listen to the public. He pointed out the size of the backup materials for the item and the limited time Commissioners had to review it. Some of the speakers who will speak today have studied the proposal for months and have expertise in the topics they will discuss, he stated, so the Commission should take them seriously. He continued, saying that references to the General Plan and the Washoe County Code will demonstrate why the necessary findings cannot be made and why the application should be denied.

6. Approval of January 6, 2026, Agenda

Vice Chair Pierce moved to approve the agenda for the January 6, 2026, meeting as written. Commissioner Owens seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

7. Approval of November 20, 2025, and December 2, 2025, Draft Minutes

Vice Chair Pierce moved to approve the minutes for the November 20, 2025, Planning Commission meeting as written. Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

Vice Chair Pierce moved to approve the minutes for the December 3, 2025, Planning Commission meeting as written. Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which

passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

8. Public Hearings

A. Abandonment Case Number WAB25-0007 (Rocky Vista Abandonment) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of Washoe County’s interest in three, 33’ access easements along the north, east, and south portions of APN 017-200-11. The easement along the west property line is to remain in place.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Harry Fry
- Location: 15990 Rocky Vista Rd.
- APN: 017-200-11
- Parcel Size: 5 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Planning Area: Southeast Truckee Meadows
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets

- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark
- Staff: Jolene Bertetto, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building

- Phone: 775.328.6101
- E-mail: JBertetto@washoecounty.gov

Planner Jolene Bertetto conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Vicinity Map; Request; Evaluation (2 slides); Noticing; Agency Review; Findings; and Possible Motion.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

MOTION: Vice Chair Pierce moved that Abandonment Case Number WAB25-0007 for Harry Fry be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all three findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.806.20, and a fourth finding in accordance with Nevada Revised Statutes 278.480(3).

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

B. Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC25-0019 (Continuum of Care Cottages) for Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0001 & Tentative Subdivision Map WTM22-001 [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an amendment of conditions for Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0001 & Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number

WTM22-001. To change the use type to senior housing from continuum of care, senior, to reduce the total number of units allowed from 136 to 134, and to remove conditions referring to the use type of continuum of care or medical requirements/equipment by removing Conditions 1.t, 1.u, 1.w, and 1.y.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Silverado Village Eagle Canyon, LLC
- Location: Bethwin Street & Neighborhood Way
- APN: 532-451-02 to 08, 532-452-01 to 10, 532-461-01 to 06, 532-462-01 to 15, 532-453-01 to 14, 532-471-02, 03, 532-461-07, 532-032-19, 532-542-12, 532-453-16 & 532-471-01

- Parcel Size: ±21.56 acres
- Master Plan: Commercial(C)
- Regulatory Zone: Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
- Planning Area: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 302, Allowed Uses; Article 304, Use Classification System; Article 408, Common Open Space Development; Article 438, Grading; Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps & Article 810, Special Use Permits

- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Andriola
- Staff: Julee Olander, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building

- Phone: 775.328.3627
- E-mail: JOlander@washoecounty.gov

Planner Julee Olander conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Request; Vicinity Map; Background (2 slides); Evaluation (2 slides); Noticing; and Reviewing Agencies & Findings/Motion.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC25-0019 for Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0001 for Silverado Homes NV Inc. be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.30.

Vice Chair Pierce seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

MOTION: Vice Chair Pierce moved that Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC25-0019 for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM22-001 for Silverado Homes NV Inc. be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25.

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

C. Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM25-002 and Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP25-0022 (Silver Crossing) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve:

1. A common open space tentative subdivision map on ±11.21 acres for 52 lots, including ±2.07 acres of common open space and lots ranging in sizes from 4,500 SF to 9,254 SF; and
2. A special use permit (SUP) for single-family, detached development in accordance with Table 110.302.05.1 of the Washoe County Code for parcels with a regulatory zoning of neighborhood commercial (NC).

- Applicant: ETL Investments LLC
- Property Owner: Silverado Homes NV Inc
- Location: 401 Neighborhood Way
- APN: 532-031-16
- Parcel Size: ±11.21 acres
- Master Plan: Commercial (C)
- Regulatory Zone: Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
- Planning Area: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 302, Allowed Uses; Article 408, Common Open Space Development; Article 438, Grading Standards, Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps Authorized in & Article 810, Special Use Permits
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Andriola
- Staff: Julee Olander, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3627
- E-mail: JOlander@washoecounty.gov

Planner Julee Olander conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Special Use Permit...; two maps; Background; TM Evaluation; SUP Evaluation; Elevations; site plans; Site Characteristics; Master Plan & Regulatory Zoning; Setbacks and Lot Minimums; Utilities & Public Services; Roadways & Traffic; Silver Crossing Roadway Cross Section; Silver Crossing Tentative Map; Grading; Article 408, Common Open Space; Neighborhood Meeting; Noticing; Reviewing Agencies & Findings; and Possible Motion.

Ms. Olander indicated that the information provided in the presentation about the neighborhood meeting was incorrect, and the applicant can provide more accurate information.

Chair Lazzareschi pointed out that the correct information about the neighborhood meeting was included in the staff report for this item.

Melissa Smith with Wood Rogers conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Project Area; Master Plan and Zoning; Entitlements Requested; Tentative Map; Project Details; Traffic and Circulation; and Site Suitability.

Ms. Smith indicated that the granite trail the applicant agreed to develop would provide connectivity between the subdivision to the north and the memory care facility to the south. She noted the County Code has a residential street tree requirement of one tree per 50 linear feet of street frontage, and this development would exceed that requirement. She pointed out that the applicant performed a traffic study even though the proposal did not meet the 80-trip requirement. All roadways would be private and maintained by the homeowners association, not the County.

Public Comment:

On Zoom, Mr. Felix Caddish expressed concern that this development would increase traffic at the roundabout at Eagle Canyon Drive and Neighborhood Way. While he recognized the development had already been approved, he felt there would be significant traffic impacts during normal commuting hours.

Commissioner Flick brought up potential privacy concerns that could arise from the five-foot side-yard setbacks, though he appreciated that the change in use would reduce the approved density. He also expressed concern about additional traffic that would occur at the roundabout as well as on Pyramid Way. He indicated he would reluctantly vote to approve the proposal.

MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM25-002 for ETL Investments LLC be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25.

Vice Chair Pierce seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

MOTION: Vice Chair Pierce moved that Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP25-0022 for ETL Investments LLC be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.30.

Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, zero against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

6:50 p.m. The Planning Commission recessed.

7:00 p.m. The Planning Commission reconvened with all Commissioners present.

D. Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM24-001 (Sierra Reflections) and Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP25-0019 (Sierra Reflections Infrastructure) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible

action to approve a common open space tentative subdivision map for a 940-lot common open space development, with lots ranging in size from 2,876+/- square feet to 68,008+/- square feet. The project will include major grading of 3.6 million cubic yards of excavation, and 625,000 cubic yards of fill. This project meets the standard for a project of regional significance because it contains housing of more than 625 units, sewage use greater than 187,500 gallons per day, water usage greater than 625-acre feet per year, and traffic counts greater than an average of 6,250 trips daily; as such, any approval by the planning commission is provisional subject to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission's finding that the project is in conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. The applicant also seeks approval of Special Use Permits for utility services (water tanks and two lift stations) and three bridge crossings over the Sensitive Stream Zone and Critical Stream Zone buffers for Steamboat Creek and Browns Creek.

- Applicant/Property Owner: World Properties, Inc.
- Location: 0 S Virginia Street, 0 US Highway 395 S, 0 Pagni Lane, 23805 US Highway 395 S, 23795 US Highway 395 S, 23853 US Highway 395 S, 23855 US Highway 395 S, 23857 US Highway 395 S, 23877 US Highway 395 S, 23455 US Highway 395 S, 120 Pagni Lane
- APN: 046-080-40, 046-060-47, 046-060-45, 046-060-55, 046-090-26, 046-090-25, 046-090-24, 046-090-23, 046-090-18, 046-090-17, 046-090-16, 046-090-15, 046-090-14, 046-090-13, 046-090-12, 046-090-11, 046-090-10, 046-090-09, 046-090-08, 046-090-07, 046-090-06, 046-090-05, 046-090-04, 046-090-01, 046-100-07, 046-100-02, 046-100-03, 046-100-04, 046-100-10
- Parcel Size: 15.29 acres, 23.63 acres, 185.18 acres, 54.98 acres, 154.82 acres, 16.56 acres, 1.10 acres, 0.91 acres, 5.00 acres, 5.00 acres, 0.18 acres, 0.87 acres, 0.99 acres, 2.96 acres, 5.00 acres, 5.00 acres, 4.44 acres, 4.40 acres, 5.00 acres, 5.00 acres, 5.00 acres, 5.00 acres, 5.0 acres, 0.80 acres, 146.66 acres, 40.00 acres, 19.446 acres, 36.00 acres, 5.43 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential, Rural, Rural Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Public/Semi-Public Facilities (PSP), Low Density Suburban (LDS), General Rural (GR); Medium Density Suburban (MDS), Medium Density Rural (MDR)
- Planning Area: South Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark
- Staff: Chirs Bronczyk, Senior Planner; Tim Evans, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department

- Phone: Planning and Building
Chris: 775.328.3612; Tim: 775.328.2314
- E-mail: CBronczyk@washoecounty.gov;
TEvans@washoecounty.gov

Secretary Trevor Lloyd praised the work of County staff and its partner agencies in reviewing the project. Staff worked with the applicant to ensure the staff report was sufficient for the Commission to make an informed decision.

Senior Planner Chris Bronczyk conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background (3 slides); Previous Approval; Request (2 slides); Tentative Map; Density; Common Open Space Development (2 slides); Projects of Regional Significance; Phasing; Trails; Parks; Grading; Hillside Development; Biological Resources; Hazardous Materials; Cultural Resources; Geotech/Soils; Hydrology and Water Quality; School District (2 slides); Fire Service; Sewer and Water; Roadways and Traffic; Public Comment; Neighborhood Meeting (3 slides); Amended Conditions (4 slides); Noticing; Tentative Map Findings; Special Use Permit Findings; Common Open Space Findings; and Possible Motion for Approval.

Mr. Bronczyk stated that in addition to the public comment listed in the presentation, staff received a petition earlier in the day with 1,601 signatures, and eight additional public comments were received between yesterday and today. Many of the concerns raised at the neighborhood meetings were addressed in the staff report. He added that representatives from the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD), the Engineering Department, and Northern Nevada Public Health (NNPH) were available to answer questions.

Ken Krater with Krater Consulting Group conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Previously Approved Site Plan; New Site Plan; Regulatory Flood Zones; Reach IV Sewer Main; and site map.

Mr. Krater summarized the history of the development, saying the proposal was again before the Planning Commission (PC) after an 18-month process to ensure that compliance with Washoe County Code requirements was met. He reviewed the consultants who were hired to help with areas such as civil engineering, environmental issues, landscaping, drainage and hydrology, and traffic and highway design. He discussed the specific considerations for the project that were addressed after the 2014 Comprehensive Plan amendment. He spoke about the improvements that would be made to Steamboat Creek so that no homes would be built in the regulatory flood zone. Water surface elevations would not be increased for upstream or downstream properties.

Mr. Krater noted that the Reach IV Sewer Main was 30 percent designed, and he described the route it would take. He mentioned they worked with the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) to obtain a water discovery to allow for development of a robust public water system in accordance with their 50-Year Sustainability Plan. TMWA sent an email opining that the new public water wells would not impact existing domestic wells, which was a requirement. He discussed how the water in the public system would be used to recharge the aquifer.

Additionally, the project would be built in accordance with the International Wildland Interface Code using Class 1 ignition-resistant standards, which has proven effective throughout the country. Wildland Urban Interface Code requirements for landscaping and vegetation would also be met to provide additional fire breaks. The developer was also expected also pay a pro-rata share for the new fire station.

Mr. Krater spoke about efforts that would be taken to mitigate the mercury issues identified on the subject parcels, including an eight-foot cap, which was double what was used in most similar projects. He believed the development would be attractive to residents because of its safe streets, public parks, equestrian and walking trails, and significant preservation of open space. Efforts were taken to mitigate the mercury-laden soils, minimize liability issues and fire risk for the County, and protect the environment.

Dave Snelgrove with the Bowman Group continued the presentation by reviewing slides with the following titles: Vicinity Map & Notification Area; Master Plan & Zoning; WCDC – Article 408; Site Plan; Slope Analysis Exhibit; Site Access; and Safe Routes to School Program.

Mr. Snelgrove pointed out that the noticing for the neighborhood meetings was sent to a larger area than the noticing for this agenda item. He stated the development was allowed to have 1,083 homes per its zoning, but this proposal only included 940 lots. He said the Regional Plan identified these parcels as suburban and not rural, and the development met all the purpose elements in Article 408. He indicated that nothing would need to come out of the community's coffers or the County's budget to have access to the open space features in the proposed development, and a multi-use trail would ultimately connect the Steamboat area to Brown's Creek. The layout of the development has not changed much since 2007, he noted, because focus was placed on the areas most suitable for development. He discussed the three points of access to the development, with the secondary point being an option for emergency access. The developer accepted all the conditions of approval, Mr. Snelgrove concluded.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd noted that in the early 2000s the City of Reno had been aggressively annexing a lot of County property at the time the comprehensive plan amendment was adopted which established the current zoning, and the County aggressively tried to stop that expansion. This property was part of a settlement agreement, and the current density of the property was established as part of that agreement. Without County action, this property and thousands of other acres would have remained in Reno's sphere of influence.

Public Comment:

Mr. Curtis Coulter said the project designs were not compliant with Article 424 of the Washoe County Development Code by having homes on terraces and not along the natural slope of the land. Further, building designs were not compatible with the character of hillsides and ridgelines. He felt the County's vision for how homes should be placed in such terrain does not match the plan to terrace the development. He said 3.5 million cubic yards of soil were intended to be cut, altering the natural visual

lines in Washoe Valley.

Ms. Judy Coulter agreed that the plan was not compliant with Article 424, citing the massive grading requested in the cut/fill plan. She remarked that the applicant plans to grade the property significantly to create terraces on which houses will be built. She reviewed specific code sections with which she felt the development would not comply, all of which would obstruct views in the area. She felt the proposal was not in line with the character of the area as grading should relate to the area's natural topography as much as possible.

Ms. Beverly Silva brought up a prior development by the same developer where amenities they promised were not delivered, multiple requests for time extensions were sought, and the water and sewer systems were either outdated or never connected. This has caused significant financial and safety impacts on the homeowners association (HOA) and resulted in increased HOA dues. She thought the developer's intent was to maximize profit, not sustain the community, all while shifting liability to homeowners.

Mr. Larry Moulton stated that Envision Washoe 2040 (Envision 2040) promised to keep the South Valleys rural, and many residents moved there for that reason. He spoke about a petition signed by more than 1,600 residents opposing the development, adding that the project had already failed to meet deadlines eight times. He urged the PC to deny the application for its failure to comply with the Washoe County Master Plan and its contrast to the area's existing development pattern and density. He wanted the Commissioners to serve the public interest and protect the integrity of the built environment.

Mr. Richard Cooper did not believe the application met Envision 2040's goals and policies for cultural resources on sensitive landscapes. He spoke about the historic sites on the unique geographic area, adding that historic values were examples of cultural resources. He discussed previous archeological studies covering the area which found 71 archeological sites, demonstrating the significance of the property. Areas of open space disturbed by collateral construction damage would need to be remade, he said. Since the application did not address the significance of the area as a historic site or meet Envision 2040's policy to protect historical values, Finding B could not be made.

Ms. Delia Greenhalgh provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. She talked about her work on the Pleasant Steamboat Valleys Landowners' Association (PSVLA) board and with the County on two Master Plans for the South Valleys. She expressed concern about fires and floods on the property. She believed the developer did not list five previously identified historic sites, and not all sites they listed were properly identified, located, or buffered according to Envision 2040 requirements. She provided an example of a Native American site that she believed was located within a grid of home sites, omission of which raised questions about the identification of other sites in the application. She agreed that Finding B could not be made.

Mr. Cliff Low read Envision 2040's definition of rural character, adding that this

application could not make the required findings for rural character. He said Sierra Reflections would not mirror the existing density of one unit per acre in Pleasant Valley. The development's lot sizes would preclude them from meeting Envision 2040's Priority Principle 6 to maintain agricultural practices or opportunities for livestock and farm animal ownership. He felt the lights generated by this development would significantly diminish the dark night skies in the area. He brought up the plan's inconsistency with the Specific Plan Standards and Procedures. All of the points he addressed demonstrated that Finding B could not be made, and he thought the application should be denied.

Mr. Bob Burke opined that Sierra Reflections did not meet the requirements in Envision 2040 concerning the rural heritage of the area as it purported to convert valuable pasture land into homes on small lots. He discussed some of the challenges faced by local cattle ranchers due to limited pasture land and reduced herd sizes. He cited a provision in the Development Code which distinguished between the high-density, urban character of Reno and the urban character of Steamboat and Pleasant Valleys. While the clustering of housing in the application might technically align with an open space development, he continued, it did not keep with the area's character.

Ms. Lisa Dayton stated the density calculation in the application did not meet the requirements specified in the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan (TMRP), because the developer included areas in development-constrained areas that should not have been included. Areas with slopes of 30 percent or greater constituted 20 percent of the site yet were not deducted from the calculation, nor was the significant body of water or the public facility land. She thought the area of AE floodways should be removed from the calculation too. She believed the inclusion of the wrong calculation made it so Finding B could not be made, and the PC should deny the application.

Mr. Kevin Kemp said the application did not meet the Master Plan requirements for suburban neighborhood development. 257 of the 304 parcels in the first Phase 1 fell within urban standards, with densities as high as 12 units per acre, he noted, but the development did not include an interconnected road and bicycle network or public transit, requirements for urban development. He brought up the goal of suburban neighborhoods to encourage public transit and walkability, adding that his home in the adjoining neighborhood has a walk score of 3 out of 100. He urged the PC to deny the application because the developer did not accurately state the level of urban design proposed in the map or follow neighborhood design standards.

Ms. Charlie Hyatt provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. She indicated the application failed to correctly identify zoning classifications as per regulatory zone development standards and agreed with comments made about homes adhering to urban standards. The application did not address the need for parking and vehicles in a rural area, as Pleasant Valley was described in Envision 2040. She pointed out that certain areas had 11 homes per acre and others had 12 homes per acre, and the homes in each cluster were connected by a single driveway. She believed there was inadequate allotted parking, and the PC should deny the application because Finding C could not be met.

Ms. Clare Holland provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary.

She felt the application could not make the required findings on sensitive migration routes by omitting site analyses for two routes, one being for more than 350 million birds. This development would disrupt the stopover, which was inconsistent with Envision 2040's biodiversity goals. The site also encompassed a mule deer corridor, she continued, and urban sprawl was the biggest challenge to the mule deer population. She thought the proposed 300-foot corridor would be insufficient. The omission of site analyses and the failure to provide adequate migration habitats meant that three findings could not be made, and she requested that the application be denied.

Mr. Mike Goldie provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. The application did not answer a question about the subject property containing rare or endangered animals, he stated, but U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service maps noted the presence of an endangered butterfly, the endangered cui-ui, and a threatened trout species. He felt the application did not comply with open space standards about preserving open space areas and environmentally sensitive habitats, and mitigation measures would be needed to allow for the maintenance of those habits. He listed the findings he felt the application could not make and asked the PC to deny the application.

Ms. Karen Critor provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. Citing Envision 2040, she said Steamboat Creek was the largest nonpoint source of pollution to the Truckee River. She shared a chart showing that pollution loads to Steamboat creek increased when the creek flowed through highly developed areas. The increase in pollution, she said, was inconsistent with significant hydrological resources, Goal 2 of the Nonpoint Source State Management Plan, or Envision 2040's Biodiversity Goal 2.1.4. She felt the development would damage Steamboat Creek, so three findings could not be made. She asked the PC to deny the project.

Ms. Sandi Sullivan provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. She pointed out that the application called for removal of 54 percent of the existing trees on the site, though Development Code Article 412.25 requires that 50 percent of trees be preserved in their existing locations, meaning two findings could not be made. She also believed the tree removal plan did not comply with Article 424.40, so the application could not make another finding. She contested the application's assertion that cottonwoods and willows were not allowed and, because numerous findings could not be made, she requested that the application be denied.

Ms. Gayle Bowers provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. She spoke about her work with the Washoe/Storey Conservation District on the Steamboat Creek Restoration Plan. She felt that no development should be allowed in what she described as a critical ecological area. She discussed the positive impacts that would occur if the beaver population was left undisturbed, as well as the benefits of cottonwood trees to fish populations. She argued that future safety was dependent on abundant space in the floodplain, and the opportunity for watershed restoration would be lost if this development were approved.

Mr. Will Cowan provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. He remarked that nine floods of Steamboat Creek have occurred since 1980. He

expressed concern that the subdivision would destroy the floodplain, putting it out of compliance with Article 418. He reviewed four regulations listed in Article 418 with which he felt the development was inconsistent, adding that two of the required findings could therefore not be made. Constriction of the creek would also result in increased erosion and the flushing of pollutants would negatively impact fish, both of which were inconsistent with Envision 2040.

Ms. Maureen Collins provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. She indicated the 6,000 to 8,000 daily vehicles this proposal would bring did not include service vehicles. She expressed concern about the roundabouts, which were inconsistent with the rural character of the area, too small to safely handle larger rigs, dangerous in winter conditions, and susceptible to fire. They also did not contain bicycle lanes or separate exit or merge lanes. She said the proposed area for the Pagni Lane roundabout flooded frequently, and there would be dangerous sightline issues with the one for Eastlake Boulevard. Because of these issues, she felt three of the findings could not be made, and the subdivision map should not be approved.

Ms. Marilyn Naylor provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. She noted she had been enlisted by Washoe County to complete an application for the Washe Valley Scenic Byway. She highlighted some of the activities in which volunteers participated in that endeavor. She feared that the roundabout at Eastlake Boulevard would require removal of the hillside, eliminating the scenic quality of the Scenic Byway. She quoted from provisions of the TMRP, NR6, Envision 2040, the Washoe County Development Code, and the Corridor Management Plan with which she felt Sierra Reflections did not conform. As such, finding B could not be made.

Ms. Erica Bruemmer provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. She contested that the times used in the original traffic study did not align with the actual peak traffic times of the elementary school. During those peak times, traffic routinely backed up to 20 minutes on Pagni Lane. She said the study was conducted in February 2022, when 23 percent of the school's enrollment attended remotely due to COVID-19, and any projections based on inaccurate baseline counts should be reconsidered. She expressed concern that the proposed plan to divert traffic to Blue River Lane was closed was unclear, so its safety could not be accurately assessed. She thought Finding H could not be made and asked that the application be denied.

Ms. Lynda Bell provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. She stated the South Valleys only accounted for 22 percent of the allocated resources for law enforcement and emergency medical services calls, and she expressed concern that 940 more homes would put an even greater stress on those resources. She believed that Finding B could not be made as a result. She noted that the Sheriff's Office did not respond as was indicated in the reviewing agencies report. She spoke about the poor evacuation times for the Little Valley and Davis Fires, as well as increased response times for TMFPD Station 32, and urged the PC to deny the Sierra Reflections development.

Mr. Tom Johnson provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. He said the application was inconsistent with Envision 2040's provisions surrounding the sustainability of water resources. He read from pages 12 and 14 of the plan,

adding that the Development Code requires all projects to be consistent with Envision 2040 and specific plans. He read from TMWA's work order related to St. James's Village, the Serpa Well Pumping Test Report, and the Nevada Division of Water Resources Basis Status Assessment Map Series, which noted that the Pleasant Valley aquifer was already pumping more water than it could support. The 940 new homes in this development would use 416 acre feet of water per year, he stated.

Ms. Linda Harrison provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. She noted the Falcon Capitol Well was being considered as a possible source of water for Sierra Reflections, but the State Water Engineer would need to approve a water transfer between basins before it could be used. The Serpa Well Pumping Test Report showed both a measurable drawdown of TMWA production wells and an increase in water temperature. She wondered where the water would come from to meet domestic needs after five years. Because the well would not meet the policies in the Washoe County Master Plan, she thought two findings could not be made, and the development should be denied.

Mr. William Naylor provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. He remarked that the project was out of compliance with code provisions about the floodplain. He showed a series of maps that outlined the 100-year floodplain, areas with mercury contamination, the locations of the Natural Resources Consideration Area and the Critical Source Water Protection Area, levels of liquefaction in the area, and the habitats for two endangered and one threatened species. The application proposed not to preserve the floodplain but to cover it with eight feet of soil. He believed eight findings could not be made, and the application should be denied.

Mr. Jay Collins stated the application did not adequately evaluate the seismic and liquefaction risks to public health, specifically failing to comply with Code section 424.15(a)(2) and 424.20(c)(3). He thought the Westex report violated Section 608 of the Code by not identifying all known potential hazards. The site was unsuitable for the type of proposed development due to its earthquake and liquefaction risks, which he pointed out the 2005 report did not even mention. Many of the maps cited in the report were 50 years old and others were obsolete, he said, and updated fault maps and the 2019 opinions of 40 geoscientists were ignored.

Mr. Tom Callicrate provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. He noted that Zone 1 should not be developed and two findings could not be made. He brought up exhibits that showed the locations of Carson City Mercury Superfund sites, Gold-Silver Mill sites, the defined zones, and several geological hazards within the planned subdivision that presented serious health and safety concerns. Mercury contamination was found in the area where 304 parcels were anticipated, and earthquake fault zones were also found throughout the subdivision. He felt the developer would be liable for any mercury contamination resulting from the relocation of affected soils.

Mr. Shea Clark Smith provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary and detailed his professional and educational experience related to mining. He indicated that more than half of Zone 1 has toxic mercury to a depth of four feet, particularly where Phase 2 development is planned, and cut-and-fill remediation

would create mercury repositories, expose residents to toxic mercury, and negatively impact water quality. He said Finding F could not be met and the application should be denied. He reviewed a series of maps showing mercury contamination, areas of toxic mercury, and the incompleteness of UES sampling data. He thought the roads and infrastructure proposed in the application would redistribute toxic soils.

Mr. Kelly Dean provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. He said that the 12-foot masonry wall proposed in park 1 would destroy nearly a third of a mile of the view of Steamboat Creek Canyon, along with natural vegetation and the habitats of certain species. He discussed some of the historical significance of areas inside the retaining wall, saying the developer's actions would fail to maintain the site's natural and cultural heritage. He expressed concern about the length of time the land would be barren while the first phases were built and the spreading of contaminated soil throughout the park. He opined that five findings could not be met.

Mr. Mike Sullivan provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. He said the applicant could not make the findings in Article 408 of the Development Code by not preserving developmentally constrained areas. He felt the proposed remediation would destroy the beneficial functions of the floodplain and spread contamination. Further, the development failed to comply with Article 424 because it would destroy resources through excessive grading, fail to protect large trees, and release untreated pollution water into the habitats of endangered species. He said clustering would destroy environmentally sensitive areas while leaving areas more suitable for development as open space. He suggested the PC deny the project.

Mr. Bob Rusk provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. He spoke about his professional history as a County Commissioner and referenced the petition of 1,600 residents who thought the project was inappropriate and dangerous to the public. He said 28 speakers presented the findings of 20 working groups which demonstrated that the application did not comply with many parts of Envision 2040, nor did it comply with the Master Plan or the Development Code. He summarized that none of the common open space development findings or tentative subdivision map findings could be made, and the application should be denied.

Mr. Mark Ashworth provided documents that were placed on file with the Secretary. He stated he was speaking as a citizen and not on behalf of any realtor organizations. He agreed that the project was incorrect for the site and expressed concern about increased class sizes, the addition of 2,203 vehicle trips per day, and the substantial demand for water resources. He thought the proposal to drill two new commercial wells and would eventually deplete the aquifer. He wondered where funding would come from for the proposed wastewater interceptor.

Mr. Aaron Southerland, president of the PSVLA, said he represented more than 500 homes and 11 businesses requesting denial of the application. More than 51 percent of residents raised agricultural animals, and this development plan did not conform with that. He thought mercury runoff would impact residents downstream from Steamboat Creek, the 20-year buildout period would pose airborne risks to students, and the potential disruption of mercury could contaminate the food prepared at a nearby ranch. Citing the fatalities from a 2018 fire, he said large animal rescue would

be impossible during evacuations, and he did not want poor design injuring residents.

Ms. Cameron McSweeney, Vice President of the PSLVA, discussed her professional experience with homeowners insurance, adding that approval of this project would saturate the area's already limited insurance options. She feared losing the few carriers who were insuring existing neighborhoods. She brought up legislation which allowed carriers to exclude wildfire from coverage, noting that Nevada does not have statewide wildfire coverage like the California Fair Plan. She worried that people would default on their mortgages because of the price of secondary wildfire policies, and approving Sierra Reflections would only make the current situation worse.

Mr. Jason Erickson expressed opposition to the development, because using open space to enable smaller lots was inconsistent with larger lots in the South Valleys. The development requested waivers for setback requirements, turning the property from rural to urban. He thought common open space should not be used to avoid rezoning, and the applicant should apply for high-density suburban or low-density urban zoning. Additionally, he remarked, the proposal emphasized curb-and-gutter systems as the main method for storm drainage, inconsistent with the character statement in the South Valleys Area Plan. This proposal was also inconsistent with the goal of having livestock and equestrian stewardship.

Ms. Jenny Erickson read the definition of "rural" from Envision 2040, adding that this development did not fit that description. Approval of the development could change the characteristics of the valleys. She did not think sidewalks and streetlights should exist in rural neighborhoods. She thought most homeowners in the new subdivision would not have enough property to own horses and wondered about an HOA potentially prohibiting small livestock. She expressed concern about traffic coming off U.S. 395 in snowy conditions, especially if I-580 was closed. She wanted the PC to consider whether the development was in the Area Plan's best interest.

Mr. Mark Toomey read the County's mission statement. He stressed the importance of water to sustain the lives of him and his family. He wanted all safety and security risks to be mitigated. He noted the area's fire station, which only has three pieces of fire equipment, services an area larger than many urban areas. He spoke about neighbors who received notification that their insurance renewals would not be accepted and asked the PC to consider whether this proposal promotes safety, security, and the health of the community.

Mr. Kyle Bou opined that this development jeopardized his vow to give his children a rural lifestyle. He wondered how future generations would deal with environmental changes related to this plan, impacts to wells, traffic, the overcrowding of schools, and the stress on emergency services and state parks. He feared this would allow further high-density developments. He believed the number of children this project would add to schools was miscalculated and asked the PC to deny the application.

Ms. Kim Wallin stated Reno was the fastest-warming city in the country with an average temperature increase of 7.8 degrees since 1970. Open space was crucial to keeping the area from becoming too hot to live in. She requested that if they were approved, conditions be added requiring light-colored exteriors and minimizing the use of pavement and concrete. She expressed concern about funding the new fire

station and its staff. She spoke about the increasing budget deficits in projected County budgets. Any approval should include a development agreement for the developer to build the fire station, and cost-sharing could be established later.

Mr. Jim Noriega expressed his support for all the concerns previously mentioned and urged the PC not to approve the project.

Ms. Mariyke Bekken said the average lot size calculation did not meet the definition of MDS without clustering, and it was disingenuous because more than half of site's acreage was unbuildable. Also, the proposal did not keep with the character of the neighborhood. She expressed concern about the amount of traffic that would be added to the only vehicular corridor in the area. She felt that two-lane roundabouts would not only slow traffic but also increase accidents, and no offset should be allowed for the proposed improvements. She worried about effects on residents' groundwater rights and wanted the PC to deny the application.

Ms. Nanette Oleson spoke about the visionary casting for Nevada as outlined in Envision 2040. She discussed her move to Pleasant Valley 36 years ago and said residents represented what they wanted to protect in their state. She wanted Nevada to have a unique flavor, but removing rural properties would devastate that. She said she would not feel like a Nevadan if this application were approved, adding her displeasure at the prospect of seeing large water towers in the Scenic Byway. She urged the PC to vote against the project.

Ms. Erin Lehman highlighted the amount of community support and passion present in Chambers. She worried that the area views would be compromised by Sierra Reflections. She expressed concern about the dangers and congestion caused by roundabouts, the capacity of the elementary school, water resources, quality of life, and open space. The equestrian lifestyle was very important in the community, she pointed out, and a reduction in farming would be concerning as that was the area's future. Noise pollution would also increase if the project were approved.

Mr. Rick Blake lauded the previous speakers for the points they made and their research. He indicated his insurance carrier would not insure him unless he removed three large cottonwood trees. He expected fires to get worse with this development. He did not understand how houses could be proposed on areas with such a large mercury presence, noting that caps were not proposed on open spaces or trails. He said he lived through three floods, but the risk of flooding would only increase if this development were approved.

Via Zoom, Ms. Iris Jehle-Peppard, Executive Director of One Truckee River, noted that her comments were hers alone but with her organization's objectives in mind. She expressed concern about impacts to the drainage into the Truckee River and cautioned each Commissioner not to ignore provisions in master plans regarding the preservation of natural resources. She urged the PC to preserve open space as well as protect water resources and quality by limiting development in waterways. She wanted the PC to take more time on the proposal to ensure that landscapes reflected native vegetation and had more buffer space to protect waterways, and that any HOA formation documentation supported sustaining natural spaces.

10:07 p.m. The Planning Commission recessed.

10:20 p.m. The Planning Commission reconvened with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

Discussion by Commission:

Chair Lazzareschi praised the organization and coordination of the public commenters, saying they were germane to the findings the PC needed to make. In response to Commissioner Nelson's questions, Mr. Krater stated TMWA would be the service provider for the project, and the developer had enough municipal groundwater and creek water rights to serve all the homes within the project. Those rights came with the property when it was purchased.

Pointing out that TMWA was not strong in its belief that existing wells would not be impacted, Commissioner Nelson asked whether the developer would guarantee to set aside money to deepen existing resident wells or provide additional services.

Mr. Krater discussed the State's and TMWA's processes for approving new wells, adding that testing would be conducted to examine other area wells for drawdown. He noted this was one reason why TMWA was switching to the aquifer storage and recharge process for its wells. He mentioned that TMWA and the State Engineer would not approve the project if other area wells would be impacted. Impacts to Callahan Ranch area wells would also be evaluated, as they were during the Falcon Capital Well test.

Commissioner Nelson expressed concern that the closest sheriff substation to the development would be either in Incline Village or at the 911 Parr Boulevard location, and no plans were included setting aside land for a substation. She inquired about the fire station.

Mr. Krater responded that one of the conditions of approval would be for the developer to provide a roughly 25 percent share of the cost for the fire station.

Commissioner Nelson expressed concern that the condition mentioned the developer exploring funding options but did not state that they would provide funding in any amount. She pointed out that costs were only increasing.

Mr. Krater indicated the developer already referred TMFPD Chief Edwards to a construction consultant. He said the condition was worded as it was to give flexibility for various funding mechanisms, such as per-unit building permit fees, incremental tax increases, or tying in to a special improvement district to make the development more feasible for homebuilders.

Commissioner Nelson pointed out that the development would increase the density of the existing area by a factor of two and a half times, and the developer should have to pay.

Mr. Krater agreed, adding that the proposal did not seek a zone change but rather to use the approved zoning that has been in place for decades. Responding to the Commissioner's question about whether the developer ever considered lower density, Mr. Krater said the project needed to be viable, especially given the costs associated with water, sewer, and electrical infrastructure, and clustering allowed the developer to build less infrastructure that would need to be maintained by outside agencies.

Commissioner Nelson felt that Mr. Krater's answer demonstrated that the site suitability finding could not be made.

In response, Mr. Krater indicated that the fire station would have other facilities that could serve as a substation or a community room.

Chair Lazzareschi spoke about the history of this development and asked why it had not been built in the last 20 years.

Mr. Krater replied that the Great Recession largely shut down development, and substantial development did not resume until 2018. By then, the project was outdated, and the sewer system could only support 300 to 400 units without bringing in new capacity through the Reach IV sewer main. He said the project now meets current homebuilding requirements, and infrastructure costs are viable. He was confident that it would be built. He pointed out there is now more demand for the smaller lot sizes in this proposal that were not available in the prior proposal. The attached townhomes included in the initial development were no longer desirable either.

Commissioner Flick inquired about the property's status as a Superfund site.

Caitlin Jelle with UES stated the Carson City Mercury Superfund Site was unique. It was established and added to the national priorities list in 1990, but not through sampling; most of the site was determined based on downgrading on a map. Though Steamboat Creek will be contaminated forever, she continued, the impacts are lessening over time because the contamination naturally deposits and sinks into the sediment over time. She attributed all the mercury contamination on this site to flood irrigation. Testing has demonstrated that elevated concentrations of mercury are not found only in floodplains. She confirmed there was no cleanup action for this site, and the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection (NDEP) would manage it, not clean it. There is no funding for the site either. She said the only established part of the Superfund site is in Steamboat Creek itself. Funding was used to establish risk-based action levels of 80 parts per million, though the development is expected to be cleaned to a standard of 7.1 parts per million (ppm).

Wes Rubio with NNPH brought up lengthy discussions between his agency, the developer, NDEP, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), after which the developer chose to use the most restrictive levels of 7.1 ppm on residential lots. The EPA's standard of 30 milligrams per kilogram would apply to all other areas, including streets, places where County utilities would be located, and rights of way.

Commissioner Flick asked about the dangers faced by neighbors and potential

residents of the development.

Mr. Rubio responded that capping is the most accepted methodology for mitigating contaminated soils. Capping with clean fill was standard practice, he said, and he spoke about Veterans Parkway as an example. He remarked that sampling would have to show no more than 7 ppm of mercury on residential sites between the surface and eight feet below, and no more than 30 ppm on roadways in an eight-hour time-weighted average. He pointed out that the EPA only requires a two-foot cap of no more than 80 ppm, beneath which levels could be higher. Soil for the cap can be taken from the site, he added, as long as the thresholds were met.

Mr. Rubio explained that the remedial action plan (RAP) was considered a draft, even though it was accepted, until full engineering and design were complete. NNPH would be responsible for overseeing the RAP in conjunction with County staff. In addition to the eight-foot cap, he continued, some type of irrevocable easements would be required in areas surrounding locations of mercury deposition; those would prohibit future uses in relevant areas without mitigating the mercury first.

Chair Lazzareschi wondered whether Mr. Rubio thought the mercury would be safer as it presently was or dug up and capped.

Mr. Rubio said he had no clear answer, but if the site was to be developed, he believed the proposed restrictive limits would ensure the safety of future residents. He spoke about a different development with higher contamination levels that is currently being constructed, and he thought that development would also be safe.

Commissioner Flick expressed concern about water capacity.

Chair Lazzareschi pointed out that TMWA was very focused on planning for future water usage, and they offered to serve the development.

Mr. Krater added that smaller lots used less water than larger lots, providing for more economic development.

Chair Lazzareschi asked for clarification about the impacts to runoff volume and speed downstream of the site.

Amy Miecznikowski with Terraphase Engineering stated 14 detention basins were proposed, ensuring that post-development peak flows into Steamboat and Browns Creeks would be the same as or below existing conditions. The site was zoned AO, she noted, and the proposed narrowing of the floodplain was due more to better site topography, not significant physical changes around the creek. Terraphase's modeling confirmed that base flood elevations upstream and downstream of the area would not increase, and their analysis would need to be reviewed by Washoe County and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). She detailed the steps in the review process: approval of the conditional letter of map revision by Washoe County and FEMA, the start of construction, and approval of the letter of map revision by the County and FEMA. Throughout the process, base flood elevations cannot increase due to the revisions, and because the developer was only planning to revise the flood plain in the project area, there should be no impacts to outside properties.

Vice Chair Pierce praised the public for their organization. He agreed with Commissioner Nelson about being unable to make the finding about site suitability due to issues with police and fire concerns, and he could not support the project.

Commissioner Owens echoed the concerns about fire safety and said she felt the site was not suitable.

Chair Lazzareschi encouraged members of the public to utilize their strong sense of organization to find areas to help, much like the Firewise community did in Somerset.

MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved that Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP25-0019 and Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM24-001 for Sierra Reflections be denied, not being able to find the following findings: under Article 810, Special Use Permit – Consistency with Master Plan, Improvements, Site Suitability, and Issuance Not Detrimental; under Article 408, Common Open Space – Protect Natural and Scenic Resources, Minimize Road Building, and Encourage a Sense of Community; under Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps – Plan Consistency, Design or Improvement, Type of Development, Availability of Services, Public Health, Dedications, and Energy.

Commissioner Nelson explained her justification for being unable to meet the stated findings.

Vice Chair Pierce seconded the motion, not being able to find the following finding: under Article 810, Special Use Permit – Issuance Not Detrimental.

Vice Chair stated he could not make that finding over concerns about police and fire service.

The motion passed unanimously with a vote of six for, zero against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

Commissioner Flick cited Safety and Welfare as the finding he could not make.

Commissioner Barnes said he could not make Findings A, B, C, F, G, K, L, M, and N.

Chair Lazzareschi listed Availability of Services as the finding he could not make given the lack of a sewer system.

Commissioner Owens stated she could not make findings A, C, D, G, P, or K.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

9. Chair and Commission Items

A. Future agenda items

There were none.

B. Requests for information from staff

There were none.

10. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

Secretary Trevor Lloyd noted the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) heard the first reading of the Iveson Development Code Amendment on December 16, with the second hearing scheduled to take place at their January 13 meeting. The second reading and adoption of the housing incentives took place at the BCC's December 16 meeting, as did the first reading of the small housing and infill housing Development Code Amendment. The second reading for that will take place at their January 13 meeting, as will a hearing on the Master Plan and Regulatory Zone Amendment for Sun Valley 48 LLC.

Mr. Lloyd noted the Truckee Regional Planning Agency Governing Board adopted the amendments to the Tahoe Area Plan on December 17. He invited the Commissioners to an annual training scheduled for next Thursday, though they would be able to attend remotely if needed.

B. Legal information and updates

There were none.

11. General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

There was no response to the call for public comment.

12. Adjournment

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 11:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on February 3, 2026

Trevor Lloyd
Secretary to the Planning Commission