

Exhibit D. Public Comments

From: [Angela Fuss](#)
To: [Jeff Foster](#); [Planning Tech](#)
Subject: Fw: Request for a Condition of Approval Amendment to the Santerra-Quilici
Date: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 9:40:11 AM

Please add this to the public comment for LDC24-00045.

--

Angela Fuss, AICP

Assistant Director
Development Services
775-399-3843 (c)
fussa@Reno.Gov
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

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



From: Alice House <kabubehouse@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, April 5, 2024 10:23 AM

To: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Cc: Alice House <kabubehouse@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Request for a Condition of Approval Amendment to the Santerra-Quilici

Good Morning Ms.Fuss, I no longer sit on the CAB. I had to resign because of an illness in my family. That Being said, I have been a long standing member of this community for over 35 years. I feel that my opinion will hold validity on this condition.I strongly believe that this condition should not be removed. Here are a few reasons why: 1. We are out of the legal 6 minute response time for any EMS or Emergency situation that will occur. This is a very dangerous high risk area. It holds the highest risk rating because our entire community and new development borders the Toiyabe National Forest and BLM wildfire lands. I-80 highway is our only excess for any and all fire/emergency equipment and personnel responding to this area. It is often backed up, blocked or closed delaying any response time to the area. This fact must be considered in the council's decision. Adding additional equipment to the Reno Fire Department will not improve their response time for this area. We are in desperate need of any kind of improvement for our EMS and Emergency protection here. 2. The new development is completely entrapping the existing community of Blue Heron and Belli Ranch Estates along with part of the new development. The development is not improving our evacuation chances in fire or emergency situations. The community Blue Heron/ Belli Ranch Estates and part of the new development only have one way in and one way out. Having emergency personnel on scene quickly will secure a better assessment for fire evacuation or EMS occurrences making the outcome of any emergency situation more successful. Emergency response TIME

saves lives for fire and medical emergency situations. Having a temporary station will improve our situation greatly until The city of Reno can fund a permanent station for this area. There are hundreds and hundreds of homes in this new project which will result in thousands of lives needing protection. 3. People are now getting notice that their insurance companies will be dropping them because of the fire danger, there are no hydrants in the existing community and this area is out of legal 6 minute response time for emergencies. Attaining insurance is almost impossible and if coverage is attainable it is at an astronomical cost. Fire sprinkler systems and fire hydrants in the new home development will make improvements for getting insurance for new homeowners. The existing communities must be considered. The fact that there is no fire station and emergency personnel here is a huge consideration for attaining home insurance and the affordability of the insurance for the existing residents. It is the responsibility of the City of Reno to insure the safety of their citizens. It is imperative that a Fire and EMS station be a requirement for the safety of the entire Verdi area, existing and new developments. The temporary station condition must stay in place until a new station can be constructed, equipped and manned by the city of Reno. There were very valid reasons why this condition was put in place and those reasons are still critical today. Please think deeply, respond wisely, safety and lives are at stake. Thank you for taking my response into consideration. Alice C House

On Thu, Apr 4, 2024 at 4:39 PM Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov> wrote:

You are receiving this e-mail because you sit on either the Ward 5 NAB or the West Truckee Meadows/Verdi Township Citizen Advisory Board.

An application has been submitted to the City of Reno to amend a Condition of Approval associated with the Santerra-Quilici development and your review and feedback is requested. A copy of the application is included for your review. As a NAB/CAB member, you are encouraged to review the information and provide your comments to the City staff. The project is scheduled to be heard by the Reno Planning Commission on May 1, 2024.

The City of Reno Fire Department has requested an amendment to a Condition of Approval associated with case LDC21-00017 (Santerra Quilici Properties). The development project was originally approved in March of 2021 to allow for 1,225 residential units to be developed on the land located in Verdi. More specifically, this is the area situated south of the Boomtown/Garson overpass and east of Gold Ranch.

Specifically, this is a request to amend Condition #20 which requires the applicant to construct a temporary residential fire station and instead require the applicant to provide a \$300,000 contribution to the City of Reno for a fire truck, as outlined below:

Existing Condition #20 - Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the 25th residence within the Project. Developer shall provide for the temporary use of an appropriately modified single-family home or commercial building (the "Residential Station") for purposes of housing a two-person public safety crew and collocated ambulance, police, fire and/or EMS equipment. The Residential Station shall provide direct access to a collector or an arterial road at a specific location to be mutually agreed upon by Developer and the City prior to approval of the first final map and shall be available for use until the City acquires or constructs a fire station with a six-minute response time to the Project.

Proposed Condition #20 – Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for a residential unit within the Project, the applicant shall contribute \$300,000 to the City of Reno for a fire truck.

Please review the attached application and submit any comments here:

[Public Comment for Case #LDC24-00045](#)

--

Angela Fuss, AICP

Assistant Director
Development Services
775-399-3843 (c)
fussa@Reno.Gov
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501



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



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it may contain confidential information that is also legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender and immediately destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner. Thank you.

Development Review NAB Comment

The public comment form has a new entry from a member of the Ward Five (Kathleen Taylor) Neighborhood Advisory Board.

Case Number	LDC24-00045
Compatibility	<p>This request is related to the original permit for the development and the safety-related impacts of residents around it. In terms of "compatibility with the surrounding area", as there is some debate as to whether removing the original condition to provide a temporary residential fire station is appropriate, I would err on the side of caution in safety-related situations and say to do so is incompatible with the City's burden to ensure the safety of the local residents.</p>
Enhancement to the area	N/A
Traffic impacts and pedestrian safety	N/A
Environmental impacts	<p>N/A</p> <p>The safety-related concerns of nearby residents when the development was originally approved by Council WITH the requirement of a temporary residential fire station were clearly THE factor that led the Council to add the related condition. It's fair to say that the Council members were strongly convinced by resident input that the temporary fire station was essential to ensure that EMS response was acceptable by all standards of response time. I believe that it was the clear intent of Council to safeguard the health and welfare of nearby residents. I do not see any evidence that this intent is in any way met by removing the condition in question. Nor do I see much evidence of other mitigating actions promised by the City that would make removal of the condition more acceptable. For example: * While the City is collecting a fire contribution fee of \$1,608 per house built in the development with</p>

Other Comments

the express goal of funding a new permanent fire station, there are currently NO TIMELINES for the construction of such a station. Based on the timing of the house building in the development, it should be possible to project the cash flow of fees paid to the City. If so, why can't the City now commit to building the permanent fire station? *

When the Council originally insisted on the condition in question, they appear to have to have bypassed consulting with City staff and the Finance Department. So, neither staffing of the temporary residential fire station, nor the capital cost of associated vehicles and equipment, has ever been included in the City's budget! And yet, the main stated reason for switching the original condition with a \$300k contribution towards the cost of a new fire truck is that the Fire Department does not have the resources to staff the temporary fire station. I do not have the expertise to judge whether City stations #11 and #19 can respond adequately to the needs of the affected areas. However, I believe it is very important to confirm this before deciding whether or not the condition can be removed. I do not live in, nor am I close to the affected areas. I would therefore defer to the concerns of local residents as to whether the condition should be removed and replaced. That said, as this area is what is termed a "High Hazard Wildland-Urban Interface", I am inclined to recommend rejecting this exchange at this time. I believe it would have been more appropriate to time this transaction while at the same time at least doing the research necessary to put a solid target out to the public for the construction of a new, permanent fire station in the area.

Name of NAB Member

Gary Cecil

Phone Number

916-607-9556

Submitted: 4/11/2024 9:41:45 PM

From: [Angela Fuss](#)
To: [Gary Cecil](#)
Cc: [Jeff Foster](#); [David Cochran](#)
Subject: Re: Request for a Condition of Approval Amendment to the Santerra-Quilici
Date: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 8:25:26 AM
Attachments: [Alice House Public Comment.pdf](#)

Hi Gary,

Here is a response to your questions.

1. How was the amount of \$300k calculated?

Response: A temporary residential fire station is intended to serve as a two-person crew that responds to medical calls but does not respond to fire calls. This type of fire station is equipped with an ambulance/medical vehicle and is not equipped with a fire engine. The cost of a fire ambulance varies but is less than \$300,000. The proposed \$300,000 fee is based on what it would have cost the City to pay for an ambulance to serve the temporary residential fire station.

2. How much does a new fire truck cost?

Response: A new fire truck costs anywhere from \$200,000 to over \$2 million, depending on the type of fire truck.

3. What is an estimate of what the cost to the developer would have been if the Fire Department accepted their offer to allocate one of their new-built homes for a temporary fire station?

Response: There is no specific outlined cost to the developer for use of the temporary residential fire station. The intent was for the developer to use one of their homes to serve as a temporary residential fire station. The developer would be responsible for making sure the garage door was tall enough and wide enough to accommodate the emergency response unit vehicle, similar to an ambulance, plus they would be responsible for providing some of the basic equipment inside the house, such as an air compressor and a generator. The house would then be used until such time as the permanent fire station was constructed, at which time, the house would be turned back over to the developer to sell as a regular house. There are no timelines for when the permanent fire station will be constructed. Once the permanent fire station is constructed, the temporary residential fire station would be turned over to the developer.

The develop is also responsible for paying a fire contribution fee of \$1,608 per house. This will be paid at the time of each building permit. With a proposed 1,225 units proposed in the Santerra-Quilici development, this equates to approximately \$1,969,800 in fire fee contributions. That money will be used to help fund a new permanent fire station. Several

other projects in the Verdi area, including Stan Lucas and Meridian 120 South, also have the same fire contribution fee requirement. It should be noted that the City of Reno does not have a standard Fire Fee tied to development, and this requirement for \$1,608 per door is specific to these Verdi projects and not typical for anywhere else in the City.

4. How does this \$300k request allay the fears that nearby residents had in 2021 when they made public comment with concerns about the 12-14 minute potential response time from the closest existing fire station?

Response: The temporary residential fire station was never intended to respond to put out fires. The purpose of the temporary residential fire station was to serve as a medical response unit, which would be staffed with a two-person crew who can respond to medical calls for service and stabilize a patient until such time as REMSA arrives.

It should also be noted that when the Santerra-Quilici project was approved, Station #19, located in Somerset, was only a two-person crew and did not respond to fire calls, only medical. Since 2022, Station #19 is now a four-person crew and is able to respond to all fire emergency calls. Updated fire response times show that the Santerra-Quilici project is within a 9-minute response time of Station #11, within a 13-minute response time from Station #19 and within 6 minutes from Truckee Meadows Fire Station #40.

5. As the condition of a house to act as a temporary fire station was accepted by Council in 2021, I'm assuming that the Fire Department was consulted at that time to ensure they could afford to staff it. What has changed in their funding such that they now cannot staff a temporary fire station in the development?

Response: The requirement for a temporary residential fire station was placed on the project by City Council at the Council hearing on March 24, 2021. This recommendation did not come from City staff, nor was it vetted through the Finance Department. Neither staffing of the temporary residential fire station, nor vehicles/equipment is included in the City's budget.

6. Will a permanent fire station closer to the development be built and, if so, when?

Response: Per the Mortenson Garson Overlay District (MGOD) a 2.9 acre parcel is required to be dedicated to the City of Reno for a future fire station. The parcel is located on the south side of the Boomtown/Garson Interchange and has been dedicated to the City of Reno. There are currently no timelines as to when the City will construct a permanent fire station. In the meantime, all development is required to follow the International Building Code and Fire Codes, as adopted at the time of a building plan submittal. This includes Fire Department access and fire sprinkler requirements. The project is required to meet the

following additional requirements to address Fire safety:

Condition #5 (Collection of Fire Station Funds) – Prior to the issuance of each building permit for the construction of a residence or commercial building, a contribution for fire facilities in the amount of \$1,608 for every residential unit and \$1,608 for every 1,000 square feet of commercial building area, not including canopy structures, shall be required. This contribution shall be set aside by the City to be applied toward improvements associated with capital improvements for fire facilities to serve the project. The contribution amount may be adjusted prior to issuance of a building permit with the approval of the Community Development Department and Fire Department if the actual costs to construct the fire facilities necessary to serve the project exceed the amount estimated at the time of tentative map approvals as determined at the time of building permit and to the approval of the Community Development and Fire Departments. In the event another mechanism to construct fire facilities is instituted for the contributing properties in the future, the new funding mechanism shall apply in lieu of the contribution set forth in this condition.

Condition #6 (Vegetation Management Plan) – The project site is located in a High Hazard Wildland-Urban Interface Area. Per the State's adoption of the Wildland-Urban Interface Code under NRS 477 and NAC 477.281, a vegetation management plan must be submitted to the Reno Fire Department and the State Forester Fire warden for review and approval.

Condition #7 (Secondary Emergency Access Triggers) – Prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for a residential unit within the Project, the applicant shall demonstrate that the secondary remote emergency access has been constructed, to the approval of the Fire Department.

Condition #19 (Residential Fire Sprinklers Requirement) – All homes within the Santerra Quilici development shall be installed with residential fire sprinklers.

7. Since Council approved the project in 2021, have there been any fires in the areas around the development that would have been served by the temporary fire station and, if there have, what were the results?

Response: This general area is surrounded by Forest Service and BLM land and historically has the occasional fire. During previous fires, fire response has been a joint effort by the City of Reno, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection Agency, Forest Service, BLM and even sometimes other local jurisdictions. This is typical for fires in High Hazard Wildland-Urban Interface areas.

The Santerra Quilici development is located in an area served by automatic aid, which means whichever fire station is located closest to the fire, is responsible for responding to fire calls, regardless of which fire agency serves the area. A temporary residential fire station only responds to medical calls and does not respond to fire calls.

8. Through your noticing efforts to residents in and close to the development, have you received any comments for the record? If you have, may I please see them?

Response: Thus far the City has only received one public comment. The comment is

attached for your reference.

--

Angela Fuss, AICP

Assistant Director
Development Services
775-399-3843 (c)
fussa@Reno.Gov
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501



[Reno.Gov](https://www.reno.gov) | **Connect with us:**



From: Gary Cecil <garycecil621@msn.com>

Sent: Saturday, April 6, 2024 5:30 PM

To: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Subject: Re: Request for a Condition of Approval Amendment to the Santerra-Quilici

Hi Angela, thanks so much for reaching out for NAB members' comments. It's too bad our NAB meeting had to be canceled, as this unfortunately denies local residents the opportunity for a public meeting prior to the Planning Commission meeting on May 1.

During my time on the NAB I have had several colleagues from the Verdi and Somerset areas with history on the Santerra-Quilici project, so I know the issue of adequate fire protection was a big concern of theirs.

I have read the applicant materials and I have a few follow up questions before I feel prepared to make any comments to the City staff. I'd appreciate any help you can give to answer them.

1. How was the amount of \$300k calculated?
2. How much does a new fire truck cost?
3. What is an estimate of what the cost to the developer would have been if the Fire

Department accepted their offer to allocate one of their new-built homes for a temporary fire station?

4. How does this \$300k request allay the fears that nearby residents had in 2021 when they made public comment with concerns about the 12-14 minute potential response time from the closest existing fire station?
5. As the condition of a house to act as a temporary fire station was accepted by Council in 2021, I'm assuming that the Fire Department was consulted at that time to ensure they could afford to staff it. What has changed in their funding such that they now cannot staff a temporary fire station in the development?
6. Will a permanent fire station closer to the development be built and, if so, when?
7. Since Council approved the project in 2021, have there been any fires in the areas around the development that would have been served by the temporary fire station and, if there have, what were the results?
8. Through your noticing efforts to residents in and close to the development, have you received any comments for the record? If you have, may I please see them?

Kind Regards, and thanks

Gary

From: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 4, 2024 4:38 PM

To: Angela Fuss <FussA@reno.gov>

Subject: Request for a Condition of Approval Amendment to the Santerra-Quilici

You are receiving this e-mail because you sit on either the Ward 5 NAB or the West Truckee Meadows/Verdi Township Citizen Advisory Board.

An application has been submitted to the City of Reno to amend a Condition of Approval associated with the Santerra-Quilici development and your review and feedback is requested. A copy of the application is included for your review. As a NAB/CAB member, you are encouraged to review the information and provide your comments to the City staff. The project is scheduled to be heard by the Reno Planning Commission on May 1, 2024.

The City of Reno Fire Department has requested an amendment to a Condition of Approval associated with case LDC21-00017 (Santerra Quilici Properties). The development project was originally approved in March of 2021 to allow for 1,225 residential units to be developed on the land located in Verdi. More specifically, this is the area situated south of the Boomtown/Garson overpass and east of Gold Ranch.

Specifically, this is a request to amend Condition #20 which requires the applicant to construct a temporary residential fire station and instead require the applicant to provide a \$300,000 contribution to the City of Reno for a fire truck, as outlined below:

Existing Condition #20 - ~~Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the~~

~~25th residence within the Project. Developer shall provide for the temporary use of an appropriately modified single-family home or commercial building (the "Residential Station") for purposes of housing a two-person public safety crew and collocated ambulance, police, fire and/or EMS equipment. The Residential Station shall provide direct access to a collector or an arterial road at a specific location to be mutually agreed upon by Developer and the City prior to approval of the first final map and shall be available for use until the City acquires or constructs a fire station with a six-minute response time to the Project.~~

Proposed Condition #20 – Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for a residential unit within the Project, the applicant shall contribute \$300,000 to the City of Reno for a fire truck.

Please review the attached application and submit any comments here:

[Public Comment for Case #LDC24-00045](#)

--

Angela Fuss, AICP

Assistant Director
Development Services
775-399-3843 (c)
fussa@Reno.Gov
1 E. First St., Reno, NV 89501

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



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This e-mail transmission, and any documents, files or previous e-mail messages attached to it may contain confidential information that is also legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of any of the information contained in or attached to this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender and immediately destroy the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner. Thank you.

Development Review Public Comment

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

Case Number	LDC24-00045
Position	In Opposition
Comments	Upon reading the Chief Fire Marshal's reasoning for not wanting a temporary fire station due to problems staffing it sounded like a weak argument. \$300,000.00 for a new truck instead doesn't sound like enough money plus a crew needed for that truck still places a staffing shortage on the department. Either way when the area is regarded as high risk for fire something is definitely required and the issue should be seriously considered. 15 minutes is a long time for a fire department response in what appears to be a densely populated new project. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Email Address	motties2@yahoo.com
Name of Commentor	Joanne Regan
Phone Number	7753036011

Submitted: 4/24/2024 5:36:04 AM

These comments were submitted on behalf of: (self if blank)

Development Review Public Comment

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

Case Number

LDC21-00017, condition amendment

Position

In Opposition

Comments

Fire Chief David Cochran in his letter dated February 7, 2024 states "the temporary fire station was intended to be for a two-man crew that could respond to medical calls." Chief Cochran also states that a temporary station would "create a hardship" because "new or reallocated fire department staff, equipment and vehicles, may be needed or better served in other areas of the city." By Chief Cochran's own words the temp station was to handle MEDICAL CALLS. City staff have only addressed fire calls in their response. Mutual/automatic aid will not handle the medical calls. The verbiage on "create a hardship" "better needed or served in other areas" throws the future residents under the bus by ignoring their medical needs. The condition for a temp station for MEDICAL CALLS needs to be left in. The City needs to figure it out on how to staff the station for medical emergencies. There is little doubt the City will never build a permanent fire station in the area and the \$300,000 will simply be used for the new fire station downtown. If this condition is changed, the \$300,000 needs to be set aside, along with the \$1,608 per door contribution , for a fire station to be built in the area in the future. The money needs to stay in the area.

Email Address

dawgiewalks54@yahoo.com

Name of Commentor

Addie Argyris

Phone Number

775-343-2959