

June 21, 2024 - Reno City Council Meeting - Item # A.3 Public Comment											
Written or Voicemail	Name	On Behalf Of	Ward	Email Address	Phone Number	Address	Support	Oppose	Concerned	Total	Date
							2	0	5	7	
Written	Kirk Davis			kirk.brandon.davis@gmail.com	775-303-7918				1		6/13/2024 11:26
Written	Charles Albright			cralbright@icloud.com	775-324-5102				1		6/13/2024 15:18
Written	Joseph S. Cox			scottc657@everyactioncustom.com		1078 Chesterfield Ct Reno, NV	1				6/14/2024 11:30
Written	Sharon Brown			shagg@everyactioncustom.com		3156 Meadowlands Dr Sparks NV 89431	1				6/16/2024 23:29
Written	Jo Bottenberg			Jobottenberg@gmail.com	775-232-9305				1		6/17/2024 7:26
Written	Nancy Radford			nancyradford@charter.net		7623 Jumson Dr Reno NV 89511			1		6/17/2024 10:42
Written	Debra A.	Bethel AME Church		pdebz@bethelamesparks.com	408-726-7200	2655 Rock Blvd. Sparks NV 89431			1		6/17/2024 11:21

Truckee River Vision Plan Public Comment

cralbright@icloud.com <cralbright@icloud.com>

Thu 6/13/2024 3:18 PM

To:cityclerk@cityofsparks.us <cityclerk@cityofsparks.us>;Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>;Hill, Alexis <AHill@washoecounty.gov>;jherman@washoecounty.gov <jherman@washoecounty.gov>;meclark@washoecounty.gov <meclark@washoecounty.gov>;mcgarcia@washoecounty.gov <mcgarcia@washoecounty.gov>;candriola@washoecounty.gov <candriola@washoecounty.gov>
Cc:Charles <cralbright@icloud.com>;iris@onetruckeeriver.org <iris@onetruckeeriver.org>;Peter Harvey <powpierre@hotmail.com>;Lynn Zonge <lynnzonge3@gmail.com>

Dear Commissioners and City Council Members,

I am writing in regards to the Truckee River Vision Plan, TRVP, and it potential to make OUR TRUCKEE RIVER better for the public as well as it's own habitat. In reading thru the Plan it states many proposals as well as desires for the river and its future. Most are great ideas some are not good or realistic. So here is my summary of the ideas and goals to TRVP.

First as I have been advocating for many years is the Removal of Dams or modification of some of the dams to allow for a much more natural river bed as well the benefit of the river and its environment. Ideally this would start up stream with the removal Fleisch Dam and the decommissioning or the Fleisch Powerhouse which is owned by the Cities of Sparks, Reno and Washoe County. It as well as the other TMWA Diversion Dams DO NOT PAY for themselves as is proven by TMWA records. Each TMWA Diversion Dam de waters long stretches of the Truckee River causing damage to the river habitat and shoreline habitat as well. There are many harms associated with removing a health flow to a very nominal flow. Science confirms this as a sad reality at each Diversion Dam. So those TMWA Dams are Fleisch, Verdi, Washoe Highland and Glendale. Fleisch, Verdi, Stateline and Washoe Highland all do not allow fish passage. All are owned by each of you, Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County. You each claim to be in favor of a healthy river yet you continue to have to get nominal profits at the cost of a much improved river environment. Removal could be augmented by the installation of Solar and Wind Generation at numerous TMWA or City and County sites. Especially at 4th and McCarren.

Next up is the Stateline aka Steamboat Canal Diversion Dam. A VERY HAZARDOUS Dam for river users and recreation by paddle craft. I have had numerous discussions with the owners of Steamboat Ditch and each was a denial of hazards and a denial of any funds to make the dam safer. Pretty much the same as TMWA's responses to hazards associated with there dams. The Dam is in Nevada and is on Washoe County Land. It very much needs to be addressed, Surely there is another way to get water into the Steamboat Ditch. Again there is NO fish passage.

Next up going downstream is the old South Side Dam aka Ambrose Dam. Abandoned in OUR river for many years and the subject of constant recommendations for removal. Yet it still languishes in the river in a Washoe County Park and is a big hazard again to all river users. All of the above dams are from the 1800's. Isn't it about time we considered their removal?

Chalk Bluff is the next dam headed east on the river. Originally built with out any permits and built as a low head "Drowning Machine" design it was modified after river user complaints to be a short 45 degree slope that still is hazardous with a recirculating wave and possible head injuries.

Then there is Glendale Dam. A truly very dangerous dam that is full of hazards. Years ago when SPPCO original proposed the replacement river recreaters were offered input then completely ignored. Again

with this "new" design nothing has really changed. Still super hazardous and no portage route. Numerous hazards there and in the East Side Irrigation Canal as well. Both Reno and Sparks WET Teams do not want anything to do with rescues there due to inherent hazards. My quote is always if you think it is safe then lets take your kids tubing there.

Other concerns:

Page 7: I agree with most set backs and height limits. I strongly disagree with parking limits. I am a handicapped person and already have hard time accessing the river. Parking further away will only make my access harder. 300 feet access limits will be hard to create with current conditions.

Page 12: I agree with making river the river corridor better and more friendly. SAFE Recreation should indeed be promoted. Hazards like those listed above should be removed. There are NO LOW HEAD DAMS but ALL of the dams should removed or modified. The use of FRACKED ROCK anywhere in the TRVP should be greatly discouraged. It is unsafe for public usage.

Page 19: Native American Land Concerns. The best thing to do for them is to work for a more natural flowing river without dam diversions, dewatered sections, and better environment in the river and along the river.

Page 27: I agree with all of this and the best way to have better water quality is to remove dams and obstructions to a free flowing river. Allow the TROA Flow Rates to carry over into a hydro free river. 500 + CFS in a high water year and 400 + in a low water year .

Page 38: Again what better way to make the river and its environment a quality example then these 5 desires. Dam removal does that.

Page 48: This area is best left with no further development. Further development with only destroy the areas appeal. It is already way to overused area.

Thoughts: There is NO need for docks along the river at any site. They will be hazards at high water or any flows. River users only need clear, gravel or sand beaches that are gradually sloped in areas of calm water for access and egress. Near parking areas not very hard to access sites. The thought of moving the Wingfield Park Theater to the east end of Wingfield Island may be a bad idea due to the being in the performers eyes as well as a cost issue.

Page 86: My suggestions on the Sierra to Lake Street river corridor. Fix the south side River Walk art and water features, they were nice when they worked. As for access at City Plaza. The Reno Fire Department had asked for the creation of an eddy for ingress and egress at the steps. That could be created by placing 3 or more boulders up stream of the steps. Consult the RFD WET Team about that. They wanted it but did not get it.

Page 93: Where will river users park or access? Docks will never last and again all we need is a clear flat area near calm water.

Page 94: Changing the current levees will NOT improve flooding damage prevention. Water goes wherever it can, backs up, finds leveling needs where ever it can. This is a huge waste of money with no real return on money.

Page 95: No Docks!! Realign rocks up stream to create a better non obstructed flows.

Page 109: The rock structures in the river above Lockwood are poorly places where river users do not have easy courses thru the few open channels for downstream flow that is un obstructed.

Over all the TRVP is a good step forward. Just a few unneeded ideas, and some efforts that will not work for the betterment of the river.

Thanks for your time this subject. I hope we can all work to create a better free flowing Truckee River.

Charles Albright
1408 Washington Street
Reno NV 89503
775-324-5102 H
775-453-5403 C
cralbright@icloud

Re: Jacobs Entertainment

Debra Whitlock-Lax <pdebz@bethelamesparks.com>

Mon 6/17/2024 11:21 AM

Subject: Request for Documentation and Clarification on Collaboration with Jacobs Entertainment

Dear Attorney Garrett Gordan

I hope this message finds you well.

I am writing to express concerns regarding the submission of documentation to city staff by Mr. Jacobs and Jacobs Entertainment prior to engaging in good faith discussions with Bethel AME Church and the BHDC Board. Despite our repeated requests for a written proposal or vision statement, we have yet to receive a response. My requests for a written statement, which were witnessed by two city council members and community leaders, have been ignored. When we met in person, Mr. Jacobs shared that he would provide a new blueprint and detailed understanding of his vision with BHDC.

I have emphasized the importance of providing my board with a written proposal before meeting with your organization, to ensure we are fully informed. Unfortunately, this request has also been overlooked. The current lack of sufficient documentation from your organization makes it challenging for us to make an informed decision. Again, we need **a clear written statement of intent and an understanding** of the potential impact on our Bell Street property and its access.

To ensure transparency and foster a collaborative relationship, it is reasonable and appropriate for our organizations to request a written statement from your organization outlining the necessary details that you would like Bethel AME to consider prior to making it a public record. As I shared in previous communication, the BHDC Board (as well as community leaders) felt that your vision was unclear and promises made to Bethel undefined. In good faith - a written proposal of which we can review and from which can serve as a platform of negotiation is appropriate.

My goal is to minimize public scrutiny and to work closely with Jacob Entertainment for a mutual win-win amenable solution.

I am willing to arrange a meeting with our board to discuss how we can achieve positive progress together. It is critical that we have a written statement so that all things are done transparently and that we are all working on a clear and stated understanding.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your prompt response.

Best regards,

Rev. Dr. Debra A. Whitlock Lax, CEO & Pastor

Bethel Housing Development Corporation

Bethel African Methodist Church

408.726.7200

cc: Bishop Clement W. Fugh, Prelate of the 5th District

cc: Presiding Elder Harold R. Mayberry, Presiding Elder of the Bay Valley District
cc: Rev. Dr. Rodney Smith, California Conference Trustee Chair
cc: Bobby Sisk, BHDC Real Estate Advisor
cc: Alicia Barber, Community Advisor to BHDC Board
cc: Bethel Steward Board
cc: Bethel Housing Development Corporation Board of Directors
cc: Hiliary Schieve - Mayor of Reno
cc: City Council / Public Comment

NOTE: This transmission contains information which is confidential. The information is intended to be for the exclusive use of the planned recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately.

On Mon, Jun 17, 2024 at 10:31 AM Gordon, Garrett <GGordon@lewistroca.com> wrote:

Good morning Pastor,

We significantly reduced the scope of our plan so it will not have any impact on your parking or access. We are going to move forward with City staff.

In the meantime, we are happy to meet with you and your board to share the reduced plans but are just not handing out anything until we go back to City Council. I hope you understand! Please let me know the dates and times you are available. Thanks again!

Garrett

Garrett D. Gordon

Partner

ggordon@lewistroca.com

D. 775.321.3420

LEWIS  ROCA

From: pdebz <pdebz@bethelamesparks.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 6:01 PM
To: Gordon, Garrett <GGordon@lewisroca.com>
Subject: RE: Jacobs Entertainment

CAUTION: [EXTERNAL to Lewis Roca]

Before I agree to meet with anyone, need to see the written plan

Sent from my T-Mobile 5G Device

----- Original message -----

From: "Gordon, Garrett" <GGordon@lewisroca.com>
Date: 6/12/24 4:58 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: Debra Whitlock-Lax <pdebz@bethelamesparks.com>
Subject: RE: Jacobs Entertainment

Jonathan Boulware and I are available to come visit you on Monday. What time?

Garrett D. Gordon

Partner



ggordon@lewisroca.com

D. 775.321.3420



From: Debra Whitlock-Lax <pdebz@bethelamesparks.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 4:56 PM
To: Gordon, Garrett <GGordon@lewistroca.com>
Subject: Re: Jacobs Entertainment

CAUTION! [EXTERNAL to Lewis Roca]

Hi,

Please ASAP the written plan so that I can pull my board together prior to a formal meeting.

Sincerely,

Rev. Dr. Debra A. Whitlock Lax, Pastor

Bethel AME Church

2655 Rock Blvd.

Sparks, NV 89431

Cell: 408 726 7200

Email: pdebz@bethelamesparks.com

[Zoom Link](#)

Feel free to call me PDebz

NOTE: This transmission contains information which is confidential. The information is intended to be for the exclusive use of the planned recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution or other use of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately.

On Wed, Jun 12, 2024 at 4:32 PM Gordon, Garrett <GGordon@lewisroca.com> wrote:

Hi Pastor,

Happy summertime. I hope you have been well.

We have a revised plan we would like to share with you. Will you provide a few dates and times that you are available at the end of June?

Thanks,
Garrett

Garrett D. Gordon

Partner



ggordon@lewisroca.com

D. 775.321.3420



One East Liberty Street, Suite 300

Reno, Nevada 89501-2128

lewisroca.com

LEWIS ROCA ROTHGERBER CHRISTIE LLP

This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If the reader of this message or an attachment is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message or attachment to the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the sender. The information transmitted in this message and any attachments may be privileged, is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the intended recipients, and is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §2510-2521.

This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If the reader of this message or an attachment is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message or attachment to the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the sender. The information transmitted in this message and any attachments may be privileged, is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the intended recipients, and is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §2510-2521.

This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If the reader of this message or an attachment is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message or attachment to the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or any attachment is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the sender. The information transmitted in this message and any attachments may be privileged, is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the intended recipients, and is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. §2510-2521.

FW: Public Development Review Comment Received: Unknown

Cali Shy <ShyC@reno.gov>

Mon 6/17/2024 7:26 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

 1 attachments (104 KB)

Public Comment - 59 - Unknown.pdf,

Please see the general public comment below. Mayor Schieve is addressed toward the end.



Cali Shy
([She/Her/Hers](#))

Planning Technician
Development Services
775-393-1039 (o) or 775-895-9019 (c)

ShyC@Reno.Gov

Working hours: Monday-Thursday 7am-5:30pm
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

[Reno.Gov](#) | **Connect with us:**     

From: Carter Williams <WilliamsCa@reno.gov>

Sent: Friday, June 14, 2024 4:23 PM

To: Planning Tech <PlanningTech@reno.gov>

Subject: Public Development Review Comment Received: Unknown

The public comment form has a new entry from the public:

Case Number: Unknown

Comments:

Sorry this is an essay but I did complete an allied health scientific bachelor's degree. This is regarding zoning and approval of affordable housing. I have been in public housing 12 years. Because of NNAMHS, I have found myself doing well in Reno. The State blew up the whole mental health program. They take no insurance, only uninsured because they cannot pass the Medicare requirements to get reimbursement. The staff is junk, no proper qualifications. 1. You need to have in the plan a subcategory of ultra-low income housing!!!! I get \$943/month from Social Security. Now imagine that. I was a stay at home mom to a doctor so I did not accrue enough employment to get the SSD. People who get a lot more money have a car and without any social conflict get all the considerations. You would think of them as poor but they seem rich to me with nice cars and new clothes. Ultra-low income needs a special look. Most programs lump all "affordable" together, however HUD views ultra-low as requiring extra policies for us such as a waiting list (which Steamboat apartments refused to do with turnover of staff every month). I think it's a law. 2. I want you to look at what the developers did

at Espirit Townhomes at Veterans Pkwy and Geiger Grade. This is my case example. It should be criminal. That round-about (which was not properly striped and being unlike any other roundabout in town, is improperly constructed) is the convergence of what people treat as 2 hiways. It's loud, very loud, so loud that there are health consequences. The scientific literature is clear on this and I applaud how many sound barriers you have constructed. The Washoe Colony is so fabulously improved. This is loving, and thank you. All those Harley's coming down Geiger then accelerate out of the round about. Most of the public housing is being built on noisy and air-polluted land. It's not healthy. But as stated in the part of plan that failed is the objective to conserve more land (profit for them). We are nothing if we are not wide open with land. They just want to find a sucker to build 50 feet from I-80 and poor poor people who will have no other choice. Air pollution makes people sick and causes Alzheimer's-like lesions in the brains of dogs. If you had a dedicated bus service, you could build property way out in Stead. You can find cheaper land, but that's how developers roll. Point 3 dovetails off of point 2. At Espirit, they have situated the units so close that you could spit to the neighbor directly in front of your balcony. They are not staggered. You look directly into another apartment up close. Of course this saves the precious investor capital developer money coming from out of state, which actually causes housing costs to go up because rich people are just looking for a place to park their money so it will grow faster than the stock market. Real estate goes up in price the more people are trying to make it go up by everyone wanting to park their money there too. I believe the more of the money fund investors there are, they are siphoning off the community. Did you know you can't even get a veterinarian appointment because too many unskilled people are moving here. UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES of this "style" of construction is the occupants domestic experience, which is an amenity and needs more attention. Also, many developments coming up too fast means property managers are untrained and barbaric with people. I won't bore you with why we need licensure for property managers. Make the developers do it right and that is what it will cost. Do any contractors understand ultra-low income? No!!! They squeeze us in and act like they need more money. I feel no sympathy and neither should you. Water flows down hill so don't let the money mongers wash us away. Thank you Hillary. Reno is so so much better since your guidance (no strippers on busses and taxis hooray). 🤗 Respectfully and with much hope for the quality of Reno, Jo Bottenberg 775 232 9305

Email Address: Jobottenberg@gmail.com

Phone Number: 775 232 9305

Name of Commentor: Jo Bottenberg

This comment was submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)

Submitted: 6/14/2024 11:23:11 PM

Agenda Item D.2 Contingency Funds for Fencing Projects

Joseph S. Cox <scottc657@everystationcustom.com>

Fri 6/14/2024 11:30 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Dear City Council Members,

I am a concerned citizen in Reno who cares about public safety and the welfare of the Virginia Range horses. I am writing today in relation to agenda item D.2. I urge you to use some of the contingency funds to fund the South Reno fencing project to protect the public and the Virginia Range mustangs.

Reno is rapidly growing, but the Virginia Range horses and other wildlife in the area were not considered in these developments until recently. Now, grass-lined streets are attracting wild animals to the roads.

But luckily, there is an answer to this – the South Reno fencing project! It has worked in other areas where fencing has been installed and it will help in south Reno.

Funding this fencing project is critical for the safety of the public and of the mustangs who call this area home.

Sincerely,

Mr. Joseph S. Cox

1078 Chesterfield Ct Reno, NV 89523-2717

scottc657@gmail.com

Concerns over LDC23-00021 development

Kirk Davis <kirk.brandon.davis@gmail.com>

Thu 6/13/2024 11:26 AM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed property development in our neighborhood (LDC23-00021 – Valley View Estates). As a resident of this community, I have significant concerns regarding the potential risks and impacts of this project.

Firstly, the increased traffic resulting from the new development poses a serious threat to public safety. On my street alone (Claim Jumper Way), there are three families nearly side by side, all of whom have children under the age of seven. The likelihood of accidents and injuries rises significantly with the surge in traffic. Our streets are not equipped to handle this influx, and the safety of our children, who frequently play outside, would be severely compromised. Claim Jumper Way has had numerous incidents where the Policy were called, due to excessive speeding and unsafe drivers and I fear this problem will only get amplified with another development.

Secondly, the current development plan fails to account for inflation in its budgeting for maintenance. Without proper financial planning that includes provisions for inflation, the long-term sustainability of the infrastructure and services associated with the development is questionable. This oversight could lead to deteriorating conditions and increased costs for current residents, further burdening our community.

For these reasons, I urge you to reconsider the approval of this property development. It is essential that we prioritize the safety of our residents and ensure robust financial planning to maintain our neighborhood's quality of life.

Thank you for your attention to these pressing concerns.

Sincerely,

Kirk Davis

Delta Sigma Pi Alumni - Deltapi Chapter

International Business Student Chapter Alumni

University of Nevada, Reno - International Business, Economics, & Information

Systems

775-303-7918

Re: Ban the use of toxic biosolids as fertilizer and compost

Mikki Huntsman <HuntsmanM@reno.gov>

Mon 6/17/2024 10:42 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>; Nancy Radford <nancyradford@charter.net>
Cc: Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Hello Nancy,

Thank you for your comments. They will be sent to the Reno City Council for review and will be part of the official record.

*Please note, for consistency in record keeping please email all future comments to Publiccomment@reno.gov.

Take care,



Mikki Huntsman
([She/Her/Hers](#))

City Clerk
City Clerk's Office
775-334-2030 (o) or 775-399-4741 (c)
Huntsmanm@Reno.Gov
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89505

[Reno.Gov](#) | Connect with us: [f](#) [t](#) [@](#) [in](#) [d](#)

From: Nancy Radford <nancyradford@charter.net>

Sent: Monday, June 17, 2024 7:30 AM

To: City Clerk <CityClerk@reno.gov>

Subject: Ban the use of toxic biosolids as fertilizer and compost

Dear Ms. Huntsman,

I urge you to institute an immediate moratorium on the land application of biosolids and prohibit the sale of compost, fertilizer, or other agricultural products and materials containing sludge and septage.

The use of toxic PFAS-laden sewage sludge as fertilizers and compost has led to the contamination of soil and water, and in turn, food, across the nation.

Thousands of farms covering millions of acres are likely contaminated, with PFAS chemicals making their way into farm animals and crops, in some documented cases, at levels thousands of times higher than what is deemed safe. Tests have shown vegetables, meat, milk and eggs may be poisoned with PFAS.

Not even certified organic farms, which are prohibited from using biosolids, have escaped the crisis.

Many organic farms that were once under conventional production have been found to be contaminated. PFAS chemicals, also known as Forever Chemicals, do not break down in the natural environment and can linger in soil for, theoretically, forever.

Municipalities and for-profit companies have also sold and distributed compost and fertilizers made from biosolids to homes and businesses for landscaping needs, further exposing communities to harmful PFAS.

Local municipalities have played a role in promoting toxic fertilizers and compost made from biosolids as a waste management strategy. Now, municipalities must correct their misguided policies.

Because of federal inaction, this problem has become a devastating crisis. Every day that passes means more cancer, more sickness, more disease. Municipalities must take action to ban biosolids NOW.

Sincerely,
Nancy Radford
7623 Jimson Dr
Reno, NV 89511

Agenda Item D.2 Contingency Funds for Fencing Projects

Sharon Brown <shagg@everyactioncustom.com>

Sun 6/16/2024 11:29 PM

To:Public Comment - CC <PublicComment@reno.gov>

Dear City Council Members,

I am a concerned citizen in Reno who cares about public safety and the welfare of the Virginia Range horses. I am writing today in relation to agenda item D.2. I urge you to use some of the contingency funds to fund the South Reno fencing project to protect the public and the Virginia Range mustangs.

Reno is rapidly growing, but the Virginia Range horses and other wildlife in the area were not considered in these developments until recently. Now, grass-lined streets are attracting wild animals to the roads.

But luckily, there is an answer to this – the South Reno fencing project! It has worked in other areas where fencing has been installed and it will help in south Reno.

Funding this fencing project is critical for the safety of the public and of the mustangs who call this area home.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sharon Brown

3156 Meadowlands Drsparksnev Sparks, NV 89431

shagg@att.net