



431 Prater Way  
Sparks, NV 89431  
Phone: 775-353-2306  
Fax: 775-353-2470

## Application Review Comments

Date: March 17, 2026

Case Number: PCN26-0003/ MPA26-0002/PD26-0001

Requests: PCN26-0003– Consideration of requests for Wingfield Springs to:

- MPA26-0002 – Amend the Comprehensive Plan land use designation from 161.6± acres of Open Space (OS) to 160.3± acres of Low Density Residential (LDR) and 1.3± acres of Multi-Family Residential (MF14) for the Lakes Golf Course site which is generally located north of Vista Boulevard, south of General Thatcher Drive, east of the Pioneer Meadows planned development, and west of the Foothills at Wingfield Springs planned development (APNs: 522-010-82, 522-010-44, 522-793-04, 522-061-24, 522-030-16, 522-110-12, & 522-010-80).
- PD26-0001 – Modify a final approved plan for the Wingfield Springs Development Agreement Handbook to 1) modify references to a 36-hole golf course to reflect the proposed removal of the Lakes Golf Course; 2) change the Wingfield Springs land use designations from 161.5± acres of Golf Course to 160.3± acres of Estate Lots and 1.2± acres of Golf Facility; 3) increase the total number of residential units from 2,459 to 3,074; and 4) add development standards for the proposed Estate Lots land use designation. The Wingfield Springs planned development handbook consists of 1,645 acres generally located south of the Cimarron planned development, east of the Pioneer Meadows planned development, west of the Foothills at Wingfield Springs planned development, and north of the Miramonte and Vistas planned developments in the NUD (New Urban District –Wingfield Springs) zoning district.

To: Red Hawk Land Company, LLC

The above-referenced requests have been reviewed by Planning, Engineering, Fire, Environmental Control, and Building Departments for compliance with the Sparks Municipal Code (SMC), compliance with Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), and information needed to facilitate the review of the above-referenced applications by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Please review and address, as applicable, the comments listed below for the proposed requests. Where applicable, please provide all requested information and supplemental materials identified in the comments below in electronic form.

***Please provide all requested information and supplemental materials identified in the comments below no later than 5:00 p.m. on Friday, April 3, 2026, for these requests to be considered by the Planning Commission on May 21, 2026.*** If additional time is needed to address the comments a later Planning Commission meeting date will be identified.

## **Planning**

1. **Neighborhood Meeting.** Please identify when the applicant plans to hold a noticed neighborhood meeting for the proposed Wingfield Springs comprehensive plan amendment. The City of Sparks provides the applicant with the property owner mailing list.
2. **Section 404 Wetlands.** The project description for both the Wingfield Springs comprehensive plan amendment and planned development handbook requests indicate identified wetlands will remain. However, it is unclear where Section 404-mapped wetlands are present in relation to the proposed new villages. Please provide an exhibit and/or update the Wingfield Springs planned development handbook to illustrate wetlands mapped in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act in relation to the new villages proposed in Wingfield Springs. Please also explain how proposed drainage modifications may impact wetlands.
3. **Threatened and Endangered Species.** USFWS data shows Wingfield Springs is located in habitat for the Carson Wandering Skipper, Cui-ui, and Lahontan Cutthroat Trout. Please provide additional information regarding whether these species are present in Wingfield Springs.
4. **Wildlife.** Please provide any wildlife surveys that have been conducted for Wingfield Springs and indicate if the Nevada Department of Wildlife has been consulted regarding potential mitigation measures for wildlife impacts.
5. **Dwelling Unit Transfer.** Page 4 of the project description for the Wingfield Springs planned development handbook indicates the amendment is requesting an increase of 510 units as 82 units will be moved from the unbuilt units for each village in the current handbook. Please provide additional information that identifies the number and location of the 82 unbuilt units proposed to be transferred to new villages.
6. **Maximum Residential Unit Count.** The residential unit total in the proposed land use summary table for the Wingfield Springs planned development indicates allowed residential units total 3,071. However, the flexibility provision starting on page 38 of the handbook indicates total residential

units shall not exceed 3,074. Please clarify the maximum residential units being requested with the proposed Wingfield Springs planned development amendment.

7. **Dwelling Unit Discrepancy – Technical Studies.** Please clarify why various technical studies (i.e., Traffic Impact Analysis, Sewer Report, Fiscal Impact Analysis) analyze the impact of 606 additional units in Wingfield Springs when the net dwelling unit increase requested based on page 4 of the project description is 510. The technical studies should analyze the impact of additional dwelling units requested with the proposed Wingfield Springs planned development amendment.
  
8. **Archaeological Resources.** Pp. 21-24 of the Wingfield Springs planned development handbook indicates a survey for historic and prehistoric resources was completed and prehistoric, archaeological, and historic sites were found. The handbook further indicates three native American village sites in the northern parcel were recommended as significant resources and mitigation should proceed. Ultimately, a Mitigation and Emergency Discovery Plan was approved by the Nevada Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology, the City of Sparks, and representatives of the Washoe Tribal Council, the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, and the Pyramid Lake Tribal Council. Staff has had initial discussions with the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony and Pyramid Lake Tribal Tribe. The Reno-Sparks Indian Colony and Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe staff recommend updates to the handbook that require a new Unanticipated Discoveries Plan for cultural resources be entered into between the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, Reno-Indian Colony, and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. Please incorporate these changes into the draft proposal.
  
9. **Subdivisions of Land.** For the “Northern Parcel,” the handbook includes process deviations from State Law that replace the typical tentative/final map process with a single-step administrative review process. Under current Handbook language, an applicant’s proposed development is consistent with the intent of the Handbook, the applicant proceeds directly with the preparation of a Final Development Plan and Final Map. The Final Development Plan and Final Map must be prepared in accordance with NRS 278.372 (Final Map: Requirements and Contents). This administrative review process does not allow for the consideration of typical tentative map findings set forth in NRS 278.349, including the availability and accessibility of utilities. The proposed changes to the Wingfield Springs Handbook would generate approximately 0.633 MGD of sewage. To ensure sewer treatment capacity is available for proposed future subdivisions, the administrative review process for the “Northern Parcel” needs to be removed and replaced with the regular tentative and final map review process set forth in Nevada Revised Statutes to ensure that the availability and accessibility of utilities, including sewer capacity, and other considerations that are evaluated during the tentative and final mapping process can be properly addressed based on actual availability at the time of any future subdivision application.

10. **Open Space Ownership.** Please clarify if Red Hawk Land Company will retain ownership of the open space proposed to remain in Wingfield Springs.
11. **Fencing.** The Wingfield Springs planned development handbook currently requires rear side yard fencing adjacent to the golf course, lakes, or other open space areas be open view and not exceed 42” in height. The proposed changes to the Wingfield Springs planned development handbook would construct new villages adjacent to existing villages and remove the adjacency of existing lots to the golf course or open space areas. Please provide additional information that details how existing fencing will be addressed with the proposed construction of new villages.
12. **Project of Regional Significance Thresholds.** The proposed changes to the Wingfield Springs planned development handbook increase the number of dwelling units by more than 10% and therefore the changes are considered a project of regional significance pursuant to the Regional Planning Commission Resolution 23-02. Please provide an analysis of the project in relation to all PRS thresholds.
13. **Founders Club License Agreement.** The City has received public comment regarding the “Founders Club License Agreement for Red Hawk Golf Club Wingfield Springs,” as amended, which entitles “Founders,” which City staff understands to include original purchasers of custom or Estate Lots, to twenty rounds of golf on the golf course designed by Robert Trent Jones, Jr. (the Lakes Course) for life, of which five may be played on the Hale Irwin designed Hills Course. Please identify how the Wingfield Springs applications will impact these Founders Club agreements and whether the requested entitlements would impair the reasonable reliance of the residents and owners upon the provision of the Handbook, and whether the requested entitlements further the mutual interest of the residents and owners of the Wingfield Springs Planned Development and of the public in the preservation of the integrity of the Handbook as previously approved.
14. **2006 Settlement Agreement and 2007 Supplemental Development Agreement.** Paragraph 18 of the September 1, 2006 Settlement Agreement between Red Hawk Land Company and the City of Sparks in Case No. CV06-02078 and Section 2(b) of the related August 27, 2007 Supplemental Development Agreement between Red Hawk Land Company and the City of Sparks provide that the golf course and its related banquet and recreational facilities would be a “complimentary annex” of the planned and entitled Lazy 8 casino resort property in Tierra Del Sol and that the golf course and its related banquet and recreational facilities would be marketed in a complimentary manner and on a joint basis with the Lazy 8 casino resort property. Please identify whether and how Red Hawk Land Company intends to comply with these agreements under the requested entitlements and whether the requested entitlements would impair the reasonable reliance of the residents and owners upon those agreements.

15. **Estate/Custom and golf course adjacent lots.** The City has received public comment from homeowners claiming they paid a premium to purchase residential lots adjacent to the Lakes Course golf course property. Please identify whether you agree with these representations, including any evidence to support your position, and whether the requested entitlements would impair the reasonable reliance of the residents and owners upon the provision of the Handbook and whether the requested entitlements further the mutual interest of the residents and owners of the Wingfield Springs Planned Development and of the public in the preservation of the integrity of the Handbook as previously approved.
16. **General Handbook Updates.** Please update the Wingfield Springs planned development handbook to address the following:
- a. Proposed updates to the background, existing conditions, and infrastructure and public services sections of the handbook are minimal and do not 1) acknowledge that development that has occurred since the handbook was adopted in 1994, 2) provide context related to the proposed amendment, or 3) discuss new technical studies in relation to the initial technical studies prepared to support the initial adoption to the handbook. Updates are needed to more clearly identify initial approvals and technical studies, address development that has occurred, address the expiration of the Development Agreement, and contextualize proposed changes along with associated technical studies and mapping updates.
  - b. The handbook is currently organized by north and south parcels that existed when the handbook was initially adopted. This is confusing given these parcels have been subdivided to support development.
  - c. Proposed Figure 7a utilizes acronyms for land use categories but neither the legend nor development standards in Chapter 4 explain what the acronyms stand for.
  - d. The proposed Estates Lot land use category includes architectural standards that encourage garage doors to have architectural detailing. This language does not adequately limit garage dominance. Please revise the proposed handbook to include specific and required standards that discourage garage dominance such as limiting the garage length to an overall percentage of the front building elevation or requiring the garage be set back a certain distance from the front building elevation.
  - e. A word version of the handbook that meets WCAG 2.1 Level AA accessibility standards is required.

### **Engineering (General)**

1. **Wingfield Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment Project Description.** Please address the following points:

- a. The first paragraph under Land Use Compatibility on Page 2 states “[The remaining 79.06 acres \(33%\)...](#)”. Based on the acres in this paragraph, 78.76 acres was calculated (240.4 acres – 160.30 acres (LDR) – 1.34 acres (MF14)). Please explain the discrepancy.
  - b. The first paragraph under Land Use Compatibility on Page 2 states “[...522-010-80... from Open Space \(OS\) to Low Density Residential \(LDR\) and ... 522-793-04 from OS to Multi-Family Residential \(MF14\).](#)” Based on the figure titled “Proposed Land Use” in the application, the land use for APN 522-010-80 will change from OS to MF14 and APN 522-793-04 will change from OS to LDR. Please verify.
  - c. Page 4 states “Section 4”. Where is Section 4? How about other sections (e.g., Sections 1 through 3)?
2. **Wingfield Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment Proposed Land Use Map.** Please add “LDR” to where Village D is on the map.
3. **Wingfield Springs Development Agreement Handbook.** Please address the following points. Page numbers reference the redline version of the handbook.
- a. Appendices E through F are mentioned in the handbook. Please provide these appendices and update table of contents accordingly.
  - b. Page 23 of the handbook includes a figure that should be revised to Figure 6a.
  - c. Page 31 of the handbook. Village 32 in the handbook is Village A in the preliminary sewer report. Village 32 shows 181 units while Village A shows 195 units. Please explain the discrepancy. Table 1 should also be added to the table title.
  - d. Sanitary sewer service on page 60. The first paragraph in this section states “[the Master Plan is 1,035,200 gallons per day. The sewage generation worksheet estimate is in Appendix E](#)”. The 1,035,200 gallons per day didn’t include the sewage from the proposed 606 units. Please update this number and Appendix E.
  - e. Storm drainage on page 118 of the handbook. Bullet #1 under Storm Drainage states “[A final hydrology study shall be prepared prior to development of each project phase/village](#)”. Please add “Site-specific” to this sentence so that it will read like “A final site-specific hydrology study shall be prepared prior to development of each project phase/village”.
4. **Wingfield Springs Development Agreement Handbook Project description.** Please address the following points:
- a. On both Pages 1 and 2, it states “[increase the total number of residential units from 2,459 units to 3,074 units](#)”. The difference between 2,459 and 3,074 is 615 units. According to the description, 606 units are proposed. Please explain the discrepancy.
  - b. Second paragraph on Page 4 states “[The new villages identified in the Estate Lots land use designation propose an additional 592 units](#)”. Based on Land Use Summary in the

handbook, Estate lots (ES) have a total of 583 units (181+75+75+18+41+62+37+94). Please explain the discrepancy.

5. **Preliminary Drainage Master Plan.** Section 1.1 Projection Location on Page 3 of Preliminary Drainage Master Plan for Wingfield Springs. The section states “... and have designated Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 522-010-44, 522-010-82, 522-020-01, 522-020-02,...”. However, Parcels 522-020-01 and 522-020-02 are not one of the seven subject parcels. Please verify the parcel numbers.
6. **Preliminary Sanitary Sewer Report.** Please provide justification for utilizing a sewage generation assumption of 350 gallons per day per unit plus a per capita multiplier in the preliminary sanitary sewer report.

#### **Engineering (Preliminary Drainage Master Plan)**

The City of Sparks contracted with a third-party, House Moran Consulting, Inc., to review the Preliminary Drainage Master Plan submitted with the application to amend the Wingfield Springs Development Agreement Handbook. Please review and address the comments provided by House Moran Consulting in Attachment 1 in a revised Preliminary Drainage Master Plan.

#### **Engineering (Sanitary Sewer Collection System)**

The sanitary sewer collection system is modeled based on a method of  $d/D = \text{flow depth}/\text{pipe diameter}$  to determine pipe capacity. When the flow in a pipe segment reaches a ratio  $d/D > 0.5$ , it is flagged by the city’s sanitary sewer collection system model as being in violation of the flow criteria parameters and added to our Sanitary Sewer Master Plan to be addressed in a future Capital Improvement Project. The sanitary sewer infrastructure that was designed and built for the development of Wingfield Springs was not intended to support the proposed residential development of the existing Red Hawk Lakes golf course. Initial analysis of the sanitary sewer model indicates deficiencies in the sanitary sewer collection system that will potentially require offsite downstream improvements.

Please revise the handbook to describe the limitations of the collection system and identify the developer will be responsible for the construction of offsite downstream improvements identified in technical sewer reports submitted with future tentative map requests. Please also note that one of the sanitary sewer mains that would potentially require upsizing is located in Wingfield Springs Road, south of the intersection of Cinnamon Drive, and Eagle Circle. This main is approximately 28 feet deep and may require the demolition and reconstruction of a vehicular bridge spanning the storm water drainage way between holes 7 and 8.

### **Engineering (Effluent)**

Please confirm that the proposed addition of ±533 dwelling units to Wingfield Springs is not proposing to connect to the City of Sparks effluent system.

### **Engineering (Traffic Impact Study)**

The submitted Traffic Impact Study combines the proposed changes for Wingfield Springs and Foothills at Wingfield Springs. This approach makes it difficult to determine the traffic impacts associated with proposed changes for Wingfield Springs and Foothills at Wingfield Springs individually.

Please revise the Estates at Wingfield and Foothills PUDs Traffic Impact Study to address the following comments, which are organized by substantive technical comments and additional informative comments.

#### **Substantive Technical Traffic Comments:**

1. Please provide separate analyses for the Estates at Wingfield PUD and the Foothills at Wingfield Springs PUD, and a combined analysis for both. Each analysis should include:
  - a. Opening Year Level of Service and Queuing Analysis
  - b. Trip Generation, Trip Distribution, and Trip Assignment Figures
  - c. Opening Year Plus Project Level of Service and Queuing Analysis
  - d. Traffic Forecasting
  - e. Future Year Level of Service and Queuing Analysis
  - f. Future Year Plus Project Level of Service and Queuing Analysis
  - g. Recommended Improvements and trigger point by number of dwelling units
2. Page 12, Section 2.4.2. Please include approach and movement level of service for all signalized and all-way stop controlled intersections, and roundabouts. For any individual movement with level of service "F", please include the recommended improvement, or justification if no improvements are warranted.
3. Page 15, Figure 3. The northbound and westbound right turns are channelized slips lanes from the adjacent through lanes, not dedicated right turn lanes. Please update Figure 3 and the Synchro results in Appendix B to reflect the geometric changes as necessary.
4. Page 15, Figure 3, intersection 2. The geometry of access A is coded incorrectly. It shows three through lanes; however, the #1 lane is a dedicated left-turn pocket at Vista and Wingfield Hills. The through traffic needs to be assigned to the #2 and #3 lanes only.
5. Page 21, Figure 5.1. Please provide a detailed explanation for the 23%, 2%, and 10% distribution. Sparks staff are concerned with these new trips assigned into and out of other residential areas.

6. Page 21-22, Figure 5.1. The number of trips assigned is not balanced between intersections. For example, the number of trips departing westbound from intersection 5 totals 23, however at the next intersection, intersection 17, the number of arrivals totals 13. Please rebalance the trip assignments so the numbers are consistent between intersections.
7. Page 21-22, Figure 5.1. Trip assignments are inaccurate. For example, intersections 9, 12, and 13 show trips assigned into and out of approaches that do not exist under current or future conditions. Please correct all intersection trip assignments as needed.
8. Page 21-22, Figure 5.1. Please confirm if there are new access intersections to the project. If so, please include those intersections in the appropriate maps, trip distribution figures, trip assignment figures, and include level of service analyses.
9. Page 39, Table 8. The southbound queuing appears to be overestimated at both intersections 1 and 3. Please verify Simtraffic queuing results either match those in the field for the AM and PM volumes or correct the Simtraffic model as necessary to provide a more accurate queuing result.
10. Page 43. Page 43. Please specify when the listed recommended improvements in section #7 of the report are to be constructed to mitigate level of services dropping below adopted policy level of service based on the progress/phases of the project. Please correlate any assumptions made with projects included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) regarding timing of construction. If policy level of service is violated due to the development associated with the proposed requests prior to the identified RTP projects being constructed, the handbook needs to be revised to specify the dwelling unit trigger that necessitates developer funded construction of roadway improvements needed to maintain policy level of service.
11. If the project is not anticipated to complete construction within the next year (2027), please provide analysis for the opening year.
12. Appendix B. Please verify that all peak hour factors from Appendix A are the same as those used in the Synchro analysis scenarios.
13. Appendix B. Please verify that cycle length, minimum green, yellow, and all-red times for signalized intersections match the timing provided by the City of Sparks. Any optimized signal timing needs to maintain consistent cycle length between coordinated signalized intersections.

14. Appendix B. Please verify that the signalized intersection at Homerun Dr/Scorpius Dr and Vista Blvd is running split phase between the southbound, phase 1, and northbound, phase 2. Update all results as necessary.
15. Please identify whether the submitted Traffic Impact Analysis includes the presence of any type of Northeast Connector (i.e., originating from La Posada Drive or Vista Boulevard) as part of the future roadway network.

**Informative Traffic Comments:**

1. Page 9. SIDRA was not included in the list of software used to evaluate the intersections. Please include information on all analytical software used.
2. Page 11, Section 2.1. Regional roadway is not a functional classification and no RTC classification is provided for the Wingfield Parkway roadway segment. Please verify that all roadway sections include RTP Classification and are correct.
3. Page 19-20, Table 3 and 4. There is a reference to footnote 2 for “DU”, “Weekday PM Peak Hour Rate/Unit”, and “SFD”, but no footnote 2 is included in the tables. Please update the footnotes or callouts as necessary.
4. Page 23, Figure 5.2. The figure for the Foothills Plan Unit Development does not include trip distribution, only intersection geometry and control type. Please include the trip distribution in the appropriate figure.
5. Page 24, Table 5. Footnote 1 is used to reference both delay and one-way stop-control intersections. Footnote 2 is used to reference both for Warrants Met and two-way stop control intersection. Please ensure that all footnotes reference appropriate criteria.
6. Page 30, Section 4. Please provide more information on how the growth rate was developed for the 2050 volumes. Sparks staff will review the information for concurrence once provided.
7. Page 39-42, Table 8. Please summarize any queue storage deficiencies and document any necessary improvements.
8. Please note the Southbound Right-turn is an overlap shared with the Eastbound Left-turn Movement at Vista Blvd and Wingfield Pkwy.
9. Page 43, Section 7. The proposed lane modification at the Wingfield Pkwy and Vista Blvd signalized intersection will prohibit the overlap between the eastbound left and southbound right turn movements from running concurrently and prohibiting right-turn on red from the shared through-right lane. Please outline how the recommended geometric change will improve operations at the intersection.

10. Page 43. Please provide a geometric figure for the recommended improvements.
11. Page 43, Section 7.1. The statement “conversion of the southbound through lane to a southbound through-left lane” conflicts with the proposed southbound through-right recommended previously. Verify which improvement is recommended.
12. Page 43, Section 7.1 to 7.3. Please check table reference numbers are correct. For example, table 10.2 follows right after table 9.1.
13. Page 45, Table 12.2. Please clarify why there is queuing for the free southbound movement at intersection 4.
14. Page 45, Section 7.2. For the Right-In/Right-Out alternative discussed for intersection 4, please either document that the alternative was not analyzed and why, or provide all relevant geometry, level of service, and queuing analysis for this intersection.

### **Building**

The City of Sparks Building Division does not have any comments at this time.

### **Fire**

Current Sparks Fire Department operations include paramedics at Station 5 and a truck company at Station 6. The Sparks Fire Department is currently conducting simulated runs to determine the response time to Wingfield Springs for a full structure fire. This information will be presented at the March 17, 2026, Plan Review meeting.

### **Environmental Control**

Environmental Control does not have any comments at this time.

### **Outside Entity Comments**

Please find comments received from outside entities in Attachment 2.

Please feel free to contact me directly if you have any questions or concerns at 775-353-2410 or via email at [shcarey@cityofsparks.us](mailto:shcarey@cityofsparks.us).

Reviewed by,

Jeff Bickett, Civil Engineer  
Scott Carey, Development Services manager  
Pat Chew, Fire Marshal  
Andrew Jayankura, Transportation Manager  
Sienna Reid, City Planner  
Amber Sosa, City Engineer  
Aaron Viviano, Building Official  
Susan Yang, Senior Civil Engineer

**Attachments:**

Attachment 1: House Moran Third-Party Review  
Attachment 2: Outside Entity Comments



**House Moran Consulting, Inc.**  
*Floodplain Management and Water Resources Engineering*

March 11, 2026

Amber Sosa, P.E.  
 City Engineer  
 City of Sparks, Community Services  
 Engineering Division  
 431 Prater Way  
 Sparks, NV 89431

**RE: REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE MASTER PLAN WINGFIELD  
 SPRINGS – PD26-0001**

**Dear Ms. Sosa:**

I have reviewed the submittal titled *Preliminary Drainage Master Plan, Wingfield Springs*. The report was prepared by Wood Rodgers Inc. and is dated January 20, 2026. The proposed project involves redevelopment of the Red Hawk “Lakes” Golf Course into single-family residential villages on approximately 250 acres within the City of Sparks, Nevada.

My comments on this submittal are as follows:

**Comment #1 – Report Classification and Phasing Requirements**

The document is titled “Preliminary Drainage Master Plan”; however, the TMRDM does not define this as a recognized report type. Under TMRDM Section 502.4, a Drainage Master Plan submittal requires either a Conceptual Drainage Report, a Technical Drainage Report, or both. This report is understood to function as a Master Drainage Plan (MDP) at the Conceptual Drainage Report level with a Floodplain Study. The MDP should establish the overall drainage framework for the proposed Wingfield Springs development. Comments in this review directed toward Technical Drainage Study (TDS) requirements are noted for future reference; they will be required at each individual TDS submittal but are not necessarily required in this conceptual MDP.

Per TMRDM Section 502.4, the MDP report must address: (1) project phasing, including drainage improvements required for each stage or Village (A through H and J) and any interim facilities needed until permanent systems are in place; (2) compatibility with adjacent existing and proposed drainage systems; and (3) compatibility with the Washoe County Flood Control Master Plan and applicable basin management plans. The report should clearly identify which improvements are associated with each Village so that phased TDS submittals can be properly scoped.

**Comment #2 – FEMA Floodplain Compliance and CLOMR/LOMR Process**

The project proposes development within FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas (Zones A, AE, and



AH). Any modifications to the mapped floodplain require a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) prior to construction and a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) following construction. Per TMRDM Section 507.2, the report must include a proposed schedule with anticipated dates for the following milestones:

- Submittal of the CLOMR package to the City of Sparks for review. A minimum 30-day City review period is required.
- Submittal of the CLOMR package from the City of Sparks to FEMA.
- Issuance of the CLOMR by FEMA. FEMA approval is required before the City may issue construction permits for areas within the flood plain.
- Submittal of a draft LOMR package including as-built data to the City for review. A minimum 30-day City review period is required.
- Submittal of the LOMR package from the City of Sparks to FEMA.
- Issuance of the LOMR by FEMA. FEMA approval is required before the City grants final acceptance of public improvements in the subdivision.

### **Comment #3 – Floodplain Development**

The Flood Study sections of the MDP should detail the impacts of the proposed development on the FEMA special flood hazard areas (SFHA), including a comparison of pre- and post-development base flood elevations (BFEs) and proposed modifications to the SFHA boundaries.

For future reference, the following items will be required at the TDS phase and should be addressed with each village TDS submittal, as applicable:

- A no-rise certification (or supporting analysis) for proposed modifications within or adjacent to the mapped regulatory floodway.
- Demonstration of compliance with Sparks Municipal Code (SMC) Section 15.11.0220, which requires residential structures in Zones A and AE to have the lowest floor elevated at least one (1) foot above the Base Flood Elevation as specified in the Flood Insurance Study. Interpolation from the FIRM panel is strictly prohibited per SMC Section 15.11.0220.
- Lowest floor elevation certification requirements per SMC Section 15.11.0230, which requires certification by a registered professional engineer or surveyor upon completion using the current FEMA Elevation Certificate.
- Discussion of compliance with SMC Section 15.11.0135 governing floodplain development permit review criteria.
- A narrative addressing the applicant's obligation under SMC Section 15.11.0190 to submit new technical data to FEMA when base flood elevations are affected by the proposed project.

### **Comment #4 – Existing Conditions Documentation**

The existing conditions documentation is incomplete. Please provide the following:



- The Existing Hydrology figure in Appendix A should include subbasins, topographic contours, channels, ponds, and labels for all of the contributing drainage area upstream of the downstream discharge point.
- Existing pond stage-storage curve.
- Condition assessment and capacity rating for key drainage structures.
- Existing weir and culvert survey data (dimensions, invert elevation, configuration).
- Survey data summary including date, accuracy, and datum used to develop the HEC-RAS model.
- Are existing ponds that are proposed to be filled included in the existing conditions hydrologic modeling?
- Were any of the ponds that are proposed to be filled included in previous development plans as part of the drainage/detention system?
- Existing drainage easement identification and mapping.

#### **Comment #5 – Detention Basin Design Requirements**

The report states that the expanded pond provides 590,000 cubic feet of additional storage versus a required 294,300 cubic feet. Storage volume alone does not demonstrate compliance with detention requirements. The following items are required at the MDP phase:

- Stage-Storage-Discharge relationship for the existing and proposed expanded ponds
- Details of the existing and proposed outlet structures (e.g., notched weir outlet) and emergency spillways
- Survey or record drawings of the existing outlet structure and emergency spillway.
- Hydrologic model with reservoir routings demonstrating that the 100-year inflow hydrograph is attenuated to the required release rate
- A comparison of proposed peak outflow rates against TMRDM pre-development release rate standards, or
- freeboard calculations demonstrating at least 1.0 foot between the maximum water surface elevation and the top of embankment as required by TMRDM Section 1302.2.2.
- Drain time calculations demonstrating the basin drains within 3 days (24-hour drain preferred for major local facilities).
- Sediment analysis showing the recommended three-year sediment storage capacity, per TMRDM Section 1305.2.
- Proposed phasing of the detention storage improvements. Will all of detention storage improvements be completed before the first phase of the development?

For future reference, the following items will be required at the TDS phase and should be addressed with each village TDS submittal, as applicable:

- TMRDM Section 1305.1 requires a trash rack with bar spacing not exceeding 2/3 of the outlet pipe diameter or 6 inches, whichever is less, and a total rack area of at least 4 times the outlet area.
- TMRDM Section 1306.2 requires that the basin drain completely.



- TMRDM Section 1306.5 requires embankment protection against overtopping.
- TMRDM Section 1306.6 requires a maintenance plan specifying inspection triggers, maintenance schedules, required activities, and responsible party designation.
- TMRDM Section 1306.7 siting guidelines regarding proximity to proposed residential lots.

**Comment #6– Detention Sizing Method – Rational vs. NRCS**

The detention volume sizing uses the Triangular Hydrograph (Triangle Method), which is a Rational Method-based approach. However, the hydrologic analysis for this project uses the NRCS (SCS) method. The detention sizing should use a method consistent with the NRCS hydrologic analysis, such as reservoir routing of the NRCS unit hydrograph through the proposed outlet structure.

The proposed detention volume increase is shown in Pond 4 on the Proposed Additional Detention Storage exhibit in Appendix A. However, runoff from Village A and possibly other villages drain to Pond 5 without passing through Pond 4. The hydrologic model needs to include all of the drainage area upstream of Pond 5 with reach and detention routings to accurately compare the pre- and post-development peak flows for the 5- and 100-year storm events.

**Comment #7 – Hydrograph Reduction Factor Justification**

The report applies reductions of 35-percent at the Vista Culvert and 85-percent at Reach 6 to hydrographs from the 2010 Pioneer Meadows Phase II LOMR HEC-1 model, with the stated purpose of matching published FEMA Base Flood Elevations. Using FEMA BFEs as a calibration target for a model that is then being used to demonstrate FEMA compliance is circular and does not constitute independent technical justification. Additionally, the 2010 HEC-1 model was developed for a different project area and may not accurately represent current conditions at Wingfield Springs. The report acknowledges the analysis is “subject to future refinement” but the off-site hydrology in the MDP should reflect current, existing conditions.

The Drainage Plan should include all off-site subbasins, flow paths, channels labeled, and topographic contours.

**Comment #8 – Wetlands and Clean Water Act Compliance**

The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map in Appendix A identifies mapped wetlands within the project area. The report references Army Corps of Engineers permit No. 199400795 for prior pond modifications but does not address the current jurisdictional determination status of wetlands on the site, evaluate wetland impacts from the proposed pond expansion, or discuss Section 404 of the Clean Water Act or Section 401 Water Quality Certification requirements. Current wetland delineations should be coordinated with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to obtain Please obtain a current Jurisdictional Determination or other documentation recommended by the USACE. If jurisdictional waters are present, identify the applicable permit pathway (Nationwide Permit vs. Individual Permit) and include USACE and Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) coordination documentation with the resubmittal.

**Comment #9 – Culvert Design and Hydraulic Criteria**

The report provides preliminary culvert sizing for four proposed crossings (Culverts A, D, G,



and H) using CulvertMaster. The following items must be addressed.

- 100-year capacity must be verified for all crossings per TMRDM Section 1102.1.1.
- Provide 5-year event analysis to confirm minor storm conveyance velocities.
- Verify the tailwater depth assumptions using the 2D HEC-RAS model.

For future reference, the following items will be required at the TDS phase and should be addressed with each village TDS submittal, as applicable:

- Headwater depths must be verified against TMRDM Section 1102.4 limits ( $HW/D \leq 1.5$  for culverts >36-inch; 5-foot maximum for  $\leq 36$ -inch).
- Outlet protection must be specified per TMRDM Section 1102.3 based on calculated outlet velocity.
- Headwall and wingwall requirements must be addressed.
- Minimum outlet velocity of 3 fps under the 5-year event for self-cleaning must be verified per TMRDM Section 1102.3.

#### **Comment #10 – Off-Site Flow Conveyance**

Table 1 of the report identifies significant off-site inflow peak flows. The MDP should include the following:

- Impacts of the proposed grading and culverts on the upstream drainage channels
- Easements for the piping of off-site flows through the proposed development. For example, Culvert H is shown crossing Village G with no easement, and a proposed channel is needed to convey the off-site flow from the north side of Village H to Culvert H, which would cross 8 or 9 lots. This channel needs to be sized with the required freeboard. The proposed Culvert H is a 12' wide x 6' high Reinforced Concrete Box. The inlet channel would likely be wider, but no easement is shown.

#### **Comment #11 – HEC-RAS Hydraulic Model Documentation**

This is a Master Drainage Plan / Conceptual Drainage Study, and the overall hydrology, detention analysis, and major storm drainage must be documented beyond a planning-level. The HEC-RAS 6.5 2D unsteady-flow model must be submitted for review with this MDP. Minor storm drain and inlet design within individual villages may be deferred to TDS submittals. The following items are required with the MDP resubmittal:

- HEC-RAS model input and output files.
- Water surface profiles for existing and proposed conditions on all modeled reaches.
- Representative cross-sections of terrain and water surface elevations and locations with annotated plan view.
- Velocity distributions for channel design verification.
- Site-specific justification for Manning's roughness coefficients. The report assigns n values from National Land Cover Database (NLCD) categories without verification



against conditions observed during the December 18, 2025 field reconnaissance or recent aerial photography.

- Documentation and justification of 2D breakline adjustments referenced in the text.
- Model calibration documentation. Planning-level calibration is insufficient for this MDP. Calibration to known flood events or FEMA BFEs must be documented.
- Comment #3 – Nevada State Engineer Dam Safety Permit
- The report proposes expanding the existing pond to approximately 590,000 CF (~13.5 acre-feet). TMRDM Section 1306.1 requires a Nevada State Engineer dam safety permit for basins exceeding 20 acre-feet of storage or 20 feet of embankment height. The report does not include calculations for the storage volume of the entire lake – pre- and post-development. Please provide existing and proposed stage-storage calculations and confirm whether a State Engineer permit is required. If thresholds may be met, initiate coordination with the State Engineer prior to resubmittal.

#### **Comment #12 – Water Quality and NPDES Requirements**

Section 5.3 of the report acknowledges that project drainage discharges toward the Truckee River but provides no water quality analysis. The Truckee Meadows Regional Storm Water Quality Management Program requirements applicable to a project of this size and land use type are not addressed. Post-construction structural Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Low Impact Development (LID) measures are not discussed. Nevada Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements for construction-phase discharges, including preparation and filing of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), are not addressed. Please provide post-construction structural treatment requirements in the Water Quality section.

#### **Comment #13 – Model Files and GIS Data**

TMRDM Section 502.2 requires that drainage reports include all spreadsheet formulas, model input files, and supporting equations used in the analysis. Please provide:

- HEC-1 input and output files (digital)
- HEC-HMS model input and result files (digital)
- 2D HEC-RAS model input and result files (digital)
- GIS layers of subbasins, land use, soils, lag time paths, and any other layers used in the models or calculations

#### **Comment #14 – Time of Concentration Calculation Errors**

The Time of Concentration ( $T_c$ ) calculations presented in Appendix C contain the following errors that must be corrected:

- Existing Conditions  $T_c$  Table: Several overland flow lengths ( $T_i$ ) exceed 300 feet.
- Existing Conditions  $T_c$  Table: The sum of  $T_i$  and  $T_t$  does not correctly equal the reported Total ( $T_i+T_t$ ) for several basins.
- Existing Conditions  $T_c$  Table: The existing drainage basins are not urbanized. The Urbanized Basin Check should not be applied to existing conditions basins.



- Proposed Conditions Tc Table: The sum of  $T_i$  and  $T_t$  does not correctly equal the reported Total ( $T_i + T_t$ ) for several basins.
- Proposed Conditions Tc Table: The Urbanized Basin Check calculation does not equal the total length/180 + 10.

**Comment #15 – Drainage Plan Exhibit Requirements**

The drainage plan exhibits in Appendix A do not fulfill the requirements of TMRDM Section 504.2. The following items are missing or shown only at a conceptual level:

- The exhibits should be numbered.
- Proposed and existing topographic contours extending at least 100 feet beyond the property line are not provided.
- Existing and proposed drainage easement boundaries are not clearly identified or labeled on any exhibit.
- Drainage features (e.g., channels, ponds, detention basins, culverts, spillways, etc.) should be shown and labeled on all exhibits.
- Subbasins for the HEC-1 model are not shown on any exhibits.

**Comment #16 – Appendix C Curve Number Sheet Labeling**

The Proposed Curve Number calculation sheet in Appendix C is incorrectly labeled “Existing Curve Numbers.”

The above comments should be addressed and responses submitted to the City of Sparks. Please note that review of the report and plans does not relieve the design engineer and owner/developer of responsibility for correction of mistakes, errors, or omissions. Please note that additional comments may be generated upon resubmittal. Please give us a call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,  
**HOUSE MORAN CONSULTING, INC.**  
*Nevada PE Firm No. 23484*

J. Todd Cochran, PE, CFM  
Senior Vice President



**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION of Washoe County**  
*Engineering & Construction • Planning • Public Transportation*

Scott Carey  
Assigned Planner  
City of Sparks  
[shcarey@cityofsparks.us](mailto:shcarey@cityofsparks.us)

March 12, 2026

**RE: Comments for Wingfield Springs (PD26-0001 & MPA26-0002) and Foothills at Wingfield Springs (PD26-0002 & MPA26-0001)**

Greetings,

This is a response to a request for comments regarding the planned development handbook amendments and comprehensive plan amendments for Wingfield Springs (Parcels: 522-010-44, 522-010-80, 522-010-82, 522-030-16, 522-061-24, 522-110-12, & 522-793-04) and Foothills at Wingfield Springs (Parcel: 526-010-04).

These comments represent a joint review effort by the Engineering, Planning, and Transit Departments of the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County (RTC Washoe). The intent of this letter is as follows:

- Ensuring the project complies with approved RTC Washoe plans, programs, and initiatives.
- Providing recommendations based on the project's proximity to any existing or upcoming RTC Washoe roadway improvements and transit services.
- Encouraging active transportation and transit orientation throughout the region.

2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Below is a list of regional roads within the traffic impact study area.

Regional roads are those with a functional classification of urban minor collector or greater. All regional Level of Service (LOS) standards and Access Management Standards (AMS) are from the [2050 RTP](#), most recently updated February 21, 2025.

All functional classifications have been provided by the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and urban-rural classifications are made using 2020 Census Urban Areas data from the United States Census Bureau.

Regional Roads:

- Vista Boulevard, from Interstate 80 to Wingfield Hills Road, is an urban minor arterial with an AMS of Moderate Access Control (MAC) and LOS D.
- Vista Boulevard, from Wingfield Hills Road to Hubble Drive, is an urban minor collector with an AMS of Low Access Control (LAC) and LOS D.

- Wingfield Parkway is an urban minor collector with an AMS of MAC and LOS D.
- Wingfield Springs Road is an urban minor collector with an AMS of LAC and LOS D.

### Regional Road Impact Fee Capital Improvement Plan

The applicant may be eligible for RRIF Waivers through construction of planned improvements in the [7th Edition Regional Road Impact Fee Capital Improvement Plan](#) (RRIF CIP). For a waiver related to improvements currently present in the CIP, a letter requesting entry into an RRIF offset agreement must be submitted prior to the initiation of work and a fully executed agreement must be in place before completion of work on the eligible improvements.

Questions regarding inclusion of projects in the CIP, credits, or any other aspects of the RRIF program should be directed to Jeff Wilbrecht, RTC Washoe Engineering Manager, at [jwilbrecht@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:jwilbrecht@rtcwashoe.com).

### Traffic Impact Study

The applicant's traffic study indicates that plus project conditions will result in exceeding policy level of service at Vista Boulevard and Wingfield Hills Road in both the existing and cumulative scenario. The study also references the Vista Blvd. Capacity Project from Wingfield Pkwy. to Hubble Dr. listed in the Regional Transportation Plan as a mitigation improvement for that intersection. As the Vista Capacity project is not identified for implementation until the 2035-2050 timeframe, the applicant should provide near-term mitigation improvements so that the policy level of service will be met in the existing plus project scenario.

Additionally, at this intersection, the traffic report recommends converting the southbound Wingfield thru lane to a shared thru-right lane in addition to the existing right turn lane. RTC Washoe recommends that a second dedicated right turn lane on the southbound approach be assessed, so that the right turn overlap phase may be preserved. Lane utilization should also be evaluated, as shared thru-right lanes next to dedicated right turn lanes have poor utilization.

The applicant proposes two right turn in, right turn out accesses on Vista Boulevard accessing "Village I". RTC Washoe is concerned that access to this village from eastbound Vista Boulevard will result in unsafe U-turning at intersection 19: Fire Station 5 Driveway and intersection 20: Black Hills Drive. The applicant should provide a trip distribution for this village and show project-generated trips at these driveways. The applicant should assess and provide mitigation measures which may include eastbound left turn and deceleration lanes to mitigate unsafe U-turn deceleration and storage at the mentioned intersections.

Right turn deceleration lanes should be provided at all proposed new project accesses on Vista Boulevard.

The applicant's traffic study should be updated to identify implementation sequence for proposed village phasing. The applicant should identify at which phases intersections are expected to perform less than policy level of service to occur and when roadway improvements will be implemented.

## Transit

This development is within the Spanish Springs FlexRIDE service area and may also be a good candidate as an origin point for vanpool commuting trips. RTC Washoe requests the applicant provide promotional materials for [Smart Trips](#) in their sales office. For more information about Smart Trips, and to obtain promotional materials, please contact Scott Miklos, RTC Washoe Trip Reduction Analyst, at [smiklos@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:smiklos@rtcwashoe.com).

## Contact Information

Please submit future review requests and updated application materials to [developmentreview@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:developmentreview@rtcwashoe.com). If you have any questions regarding this response specifically, please contact me directly at [sleague@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:sleague@rtcwashoe.com).

## Recommendation Summary

1. Applicant to comply with applicable LOS/AMS.
2. Please update the traffic study and improvement recommendations in the manner detailed above.
3. Please provide Smart Trips promotional materials to future residents.

Sincerely,

*SLeague*

Shay League  
Senior Transportation Planner

- Graham Dollarhide, Planning Manager, [gdollarhide@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:gdollarhide@rtcwashoe.com)
- Sara Going, Project Manager, [sgoing@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:sgoing@rtcwashoe.com)
- Scott Miklos, Trip Reduction Analyst, [smiklos@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:smiklos@rtcwashoe.com)
- Jeff Wilbrecht, Engineering Manager, [jwilbrecht@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:jwilbrecht@rtcwashoe.com)
- Alex Wolfson, Project Manager, [awolfson@rtcwashoe.com](mailto:awolfson@rtcwashoe.com)

## INITIAL REVIEW MEMORANDUM

TO: Scott Carey, City of Sparks

FROM: Chohnny Sousa, TMRPA

DATE: March 11, 2026

SUBJECT: **TMRPA initial review of the City of Sparks Comprehensive Plan Amendment for The Following Case:**  
**MPA26-0002 (Wingfield Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment)**

---

This memorandum provides the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency's (TMRPA) initial review comments regarding subject case (MPA26-0002), as stated in the 2024 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan (Policy RC 5).

Although the associated handbook amendment (PD26-0001) does not require regional review, it will be used by TMRPA staff in their analysis for additional context.

The following constitutes an initial review based on the limited information available at the time of this memorandum. TMRPA recognizes that this proposal may change through the jurisdictional review of the case. Should the case be approved through the City of Sparks, the proposal will need to be formally submitted to TMRPA for a review of conformance with the 2024 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan in its entirety.

The request, as described in the materials provided by the City of Sparks, is the following:

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Case Numbers MPA26-0002 and PD26-0001 – A request has been made for:

**MPA26-0002 (Wingfield Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment): A Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change ±161.64 acres of Open Space (OS) to ±160.30 acres of Low Density Residential (LDR) and ±1.34 acres of Multi-Family Residential (MF14) in the Wingfield Springs Planned Development.**

PD26-0001 (Wingfield Springs Handbook Amendment): Request to amend the Wingfield Springs Planned Development Handbook.

[TMRPA notes: **bolded text** identifies the portion of the request that is subject to review under the Regional Plan]

Per Regional Plan Policy RC 6 – Project of Regional Significance (PRS), a project that the RPC has found in conformance with the Regional Plan and that is subsequently proposed to be amended is considered to fall within the definition of a PRS and therefore becomes subject to conformance review if the proposed

## **TMRPA Initial Review Memo**

### **City of Sparks, MPA26-0002**

#### **Page 2**

amendment will increase the impact of the overall project by 10% or more for any of the thresholds contained in the PRS guidelines that qualified the original project as a PRS.

In 2003, 2,260 units were seen and approved as a PRS. The current proposal to change  $\pm 161.64$  acres of OS to  $\pm 160.30$  acres of LDR and  $\pm 1.34$  acres of MF14 in the Wingfield Springs Planned Development will result in an additional potential of 980 units resulting in a 43% increase, while the applicants materials state 606 housing units which is a 26% increase. Therefore, the proposed project establishes the need for a PRS conformance review. It should also be noted that this increase in units to the overall project may not be the only threshold that triggers a PRS review, and more may be identified, i.e. sewer, traffic, etc. through the conformance review process.

**APNs:** 522-010-82, 522-010-44, 522-793-04, 522-061-24, 522-030-16, 522-110-12, and 522-010-80

#### **Potential Conformance Issues**

The request to convert a substantial area of designated open space to residential development underscores the importance of fully implementing the City of Sparks' existing intent to preserve and enhance open space resources, as reflected in both the Sparks Comprehensive Plan and the Sparks Municipal Code, consistent with Regional Plan Policy NR-5.

While both City of Sparks' documents contain intent language and development standards supporting the conservation of open space and the provision of recreational amenities, neither currently includes a stand-alone policy that establishes specific strategies for preserving public open space with natural resource, scenic, or recreational value, as envisioned by NR-5. This proposal therefore presents an opportunity to revisit and refine the project design to better preserve open space, incorporate meaningful buffers, and enhance trail connectivity and long-term recreational value for current and future residents.

Although the proposal may be locally permissible, proposals involving large-scale conversion of open space warrant careful review to ensure continued alignment with regional open space objectives.

Additionally, while each proposal associated with this area (MPA26-0001 and MPA26-0002) is being considered independently, reviewing them in context with one another provides an opportunity to thoughtfully assess cumulative effects and explore design approaches that maintain the area's open space character and connectivity consistent with regional objectives.

TMRPA staff recommends a high-level of community engagement to create a shared vision between the applicant and nearby residences. As mentioned, this may be an opportunity to create a project design that preserves remaining open space, incorporates meaningful buffers, and strengthens trail connectivity and recreational value for surrounding neighborhoods while also increasing housing in the Truckee Meadows.

#### **Regional Plan Policies for Consideration in The Analysis Performed by the Jurisdiction**

RF 2 – Priority Hierarchy for Development in the Region

RF 3 – Density Requirements and Nonresidential Standards

RF 11 – Compatibility Factors

NR 3 – Development Constraints Area

NR 5 – Open Space

NR 9 - Wildland/Urban Interface

NR 10 – Parks and Open Space Connectivity

NR 11 – Regional Trails

NR 12 – Urban Heat Island

PF 1 – List of Facilities and Service Standards

RC 9 – Conformance Review Findings

### **Data and Information Related to Regional Plan Implementation**

Regional Land Designation: Tier 2

Regional Utility Corridor: None identified at this time

Development Constraint Areas (DCA): DCA significant water bodies present on site

Natural Resource Consideration Areas (NRCA): Notable interactions with NRCA layers include some coverage of Critical Source Water Protection Areas (CSWPA); FEMA flood zones A, AE, AH, and X; within ¼ mile of existing trails and future trails; slopes 15 – 30%; and Mule Deer distribution. Please view **Attachment: NRCA Readout** for more specific details.

### **Other Organization/Entity Comments**

Due to the presence of CSWPAs TMRPA will request comments from the Western Regional Water Commission, as well as Truckee Meadows Trails for further advisement on inclusion of trail connectivity and buffers within the project. We will forward all comments to City of Sparks staff.

### **Other Notes**

The request is for 161.64 acres, while the parcel total is ±240.4 acres. The remaining ±79.06 acres will remain open space, however much of that area is water bodies or drainageways. The traffic study report combines both Wingfield Springs and Foothills Wingfield Springs, totaling 764 units. Materials state the intent behind the proposal: “As costs of operating and maintaining the golf courses continue to increase, the Applicant has looked at various ways to help offset the costs to continue to operate both golf courses. However, without other viable options and considering the need for housing within the area, the applicant is proposing to modify the Handbook and the underlying Comprehensive Plan to a compatible land use that addresses the financial burden of operating all 36-holes by reducing it to a more manageable 18-hole course, while providing the City of Sparks with land suitable to help meet the housing needs of the region.”

**Upcoming Meeting Dates:** Unknown at this time.

**TMRPA Initial Review Memo**

**City of Sparks, MPA26-0002**

**Page 4**

Please do not hesitate to contact TMRPA staff at 775-321-8385 if you have any questions or comments on this initial review memorandum. For more information or helpful tools, you can access the [2024 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan](#) and the [Regional Data Viewer or the NRCA Data Viewer](#) at [www.TMRPA.org](http://www.TMRPA.org).

## **NRCA Interactions with Subject Site: Wingfield Springs**

Subject site area is: 240.262882148 acres

### **NRCA 1: Agricultural Lands**

Interaction with Agriculture Deferred Land = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with USFS Range Pasture = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

### **NRCA 2: Critical Source Water Protection**

Interaction with CSWP polygon = 57.5521206974 acres (23.9538126667 % coverage)

### **NRCA 3: Endangered/Threatened Species**

Note: These endangered and threatened species interactions are provided for information purposes only and are not designed to replace any required surveys or disclosure regarding endangered species on the site. These data represent a spatial assessment of the potential distribution of these species based on a variety of methods. Please contact TMRPA for more information.

Interaction with Carson Wandering Skipper distribution = 240.262882148 acres (100.0 % coverage)

Interaction with Cui-ui distribution = 240.262882148 acres (100.0 % coverage)

Interaction with Lahontan Cutthroat Trout distribution = 240.262882148 acres (100.0 % coverage)

Interaction with Sierra Nevada Red Fox distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with Sierra Nevada Yellow-legged Frog distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with Steamboat Buckwheat distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with Warner Sucker distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with Webbers Ivesia distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with White Bark Pine distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with Yellow-billed Cuckoo distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

#### **NRCA 4: Floodplains**

Interaction with FEMA flood zone A = 18.6941688651 acres (7.78071448155 % coverage)

Interaction with FEMA flood zone AE = 7.98988928803 acres (3.32547800001 % coverage)

Interaction with FEMA flood zone AE FLOODWAY = 0 acres (0.0 % coverage)

Interaction with FEMA flood zone AH = 48.1620530766 acres (20.0455653599 % coverage)

Interaction with FEMA flood zone AO = 0 acres (0.0 % coverage)

Interaction with FEMA flood zone D = 0 acres (0.0 % coverage)

Interaction with FEMA flood zone X = 64.1769896911 acres (26.7111545143 % coverage)

#### **NRCA 5: Regional Trails**

Within 1/4 mile of existing trailheads = NO

Within 1/4 mile of trails = YES

Within 1/2 mile of future trailheads = NO

Within 1/2 mile of future trails = YES

#### **NRCA 6 - Slopes 15% to 30%**

Slopes 15% to 30% = 8.53112789311 acres (3.55074733843 % coverage)

Slopes > 30% = 0 acres (0.0 % coverage)

#### **NRCA 7: Wildfire Risk/Hazard**

Interaction with EXTREME fire risk areas = 0 acres (0.0 % coverage)

Interaction with HIGH fire risk areas = 0 acres (0.0 % coverage)

Interaction with MODERATE fire risk areas = 0 acres (0.0 % coverage)

Interaction with LOW fire risk areas = 240.262882148 acres (100.0 % coverage)

**NRCA 8: Wildlife Habitat/Migration Corridors**

Interaction with Bighorn Sheep distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with Black Bear distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with Sooty Grouse distribution = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with Mule Deer distribution = 240.262882148 acres (100.0 % coverage)

Interaction with Mule Deer movement corridors = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

Interaction with Pronghorn movement corridors = 0 acres (0 % coverage)

For more information please contact TMRPA - 775.321.8385 - [input@tmrpa.org](mailto:input@tmrpa.org)

## Carey, Scott

---

**From:** shcarey@cityofsparks.us  
**To:** Cheyenne Trueblood  
**Subject:** RE: Wingfield Springs HB Amendment - Wildlife Comments

Hi Scott,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Wingfield Springs Development Project. The Nevada Department of Wildlife (“the Department”) has reviewed the available materials (PD – Wingfield Springs Handbook Amendment, and CPA – Wingfield Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment) and provides the following wildlife-related comments and recommendations. Detailed, project-specific comments are included in the attached document.

### Wildlife Considerations:

Both direct and indirect disturbances from development can affect wildlife by altering movement and seasonal use patterns, breeding and nesting behavior, and overall demographic rates. Even when a project’s physical footprint is relatively small or does not overlap with critical habitat or designated seasonal use areas, indirect and cumulative impacts from continued habitat encroachment can contribute to habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation, resulting in long-term effects to wildlife populations.

The project area is located within year-round mule deer habitat, and the southern parcel overlaps crucial winter mule deer habitat. The southern parcel also overlaps crucial winter pronghorn habitat. However, because the project area is largely surrounded by existing development, the Department does not anticipate substantial impacts to big game species. The Department recommends continuing to incorporate wildlife-friendly Best Management Practices into fence design and installation to reduce the risk of injury or mortality to mule deer, pronghorn, and other wildlife. Fencing elements that may increase risk include arrow-shaped post tops, barbed wire that does not meet rangeland specifications, and spacing configurations that could allow wildlife to become entangled.

### Additional Design and Habitat Recommendations:

The Department’s attached comments primarily focus on minimizing indirect impacts to wildlife through design-level considerations. Key recommendations include reducing light pollution through fully shielded, downward-directed lighting; incorporating wildlife-safe design features into detention basins and drainage infrastructure (e.g., gentle slopes, vegetated benches, and escape features); maintaining wildlife movement and connectivity through appropriate crossing design and wildlife-friendly fencing; and protecting wetland, riparian, and aquatic resources through avoidance and minimization measures and coordination prior to disturbance. The Department also recommends nesting bird surveys where vegetation removal may occur, timing construction to avoid the avian breeding season where feasible, and incorporating naturalized drainage and vegetation treatments where possible to maintain habitat function.

Given the aquatic habitats in the project area, the Department recommends conducting surveys for sensitive and rare aquatic species that may be affected by any development.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,



**Cheyenne (Acevedo) Trueblood**

Western Region Supervising  
Habitat Biologist  
Habitat Division

**Phone:** (775) 688-1145

**Email:** [cheyenne.trueblood@ndow.org](mailto:cheyenne.trueblood@ndow.org)

Nevada Department of Wildlife  
1100 Valley Road  
Reno, Nevada 89512

***Support Nevada's Wildlife... buy a  
Hunting & Fishing license!***

*State of Nevada Confidentiality Disclaimer: This message is intended only for the named recipient. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited*

#	Document	Comment / Concern
1	AR26-0001 – Afton Multi-Family Carports	The project proposes the installation of approximately 21 additional ceiling-mounted lights beneath carports. Recommend use of fully shielded, downward-directed fixtures and minimal illumination levels to reduce spillover beyond parking areas and light pollution that could impact nocturnal wildlife, migratory birds, and bats.
2	AR26-0002 – Monticello at D’Andrea	The project routes public stormwater through the site to a golf course pond and includes a private detention basin. Recommend detention basins and drainage features be designed with wildlife-safe slopes, benching, or escape features to prevent wildlife entrapment and reduce hazards to birds and small mammals. Any fencing adjacent to open areas should be wildlife-friendly and avoid entanglement risks.
3	PD26-0001 – Wingfield Springs HB Amendment	The application identifies approximately 42 acres of jurisdictional wetlands and pursuit of a Section 404 permit for impacts to approximately 4.2 acres. Recommend providing detailed wetland impact maps, avoidance/minimization measures, and compensatory mitigation plans, and coordinating with NDOW prior to ground disturbance near wetland areas.
4	PD26-0001 – Wingfield Springs HB Amendment	The project proposes open space integration along the Orr Ditch corridor with crossings and low fencing. Recommend that wildlife movement and connectivity be maintained through appropriate crossing design and wildlife-compatible fencing specifications.
5	PD26-0001 – Wingfield Springs HB Amendment	The project describes riparian vegetation and mature trees near lakes and wetlands. Recommend nesting bird surveys before construction begins and appropriate buffers if vegetation removal or disturbance occurs. Timing of construction should not occur during avian breeding season where feasible (approximately March 1 through August 15).
6	MPA26-0002 – Wingfield Springs CPA	The project proposes removal of certain irrigation lakes and redesign of drainageways. Recommend evaluating whether removal of aquatic features could reduce habitat value for birds and other wildlife, and encourages use of naturalized drainage designs with native vegetation where possible.
7	PD26-0002 – Foothills at Wingfield Springs HB Amendment	The project proposes replacement of existing detention with an engineered channel and downstream detention ponds. Recommend designs incorporate gentle slopes, vegetated benches, and wildlife escape features in all detention ponds, and avoid steep or fully armored channels that may pose wildlife hazards.
8	PD26-0002 – Foothills at Wingfield Springs HB Amendment	Support the use of open fencing near open space; recommend specifications that are wildlife-friendly, avoid small-mesh materials, and maintain ground clearance where appropriate to allow small wildlife movement.
9	MPA26-0001 – Foothills at Wingfield	The project replaces existing detention features with downstream detention and channel improvements. Recommend ensuring downstream improvements do not adversely affect wetlands and that designs ensure wildlife safety with gentle slopes, vegetated benches, and wildlife escape features.

## Carey, Scott

---

**From:** shcarey@cityofsparks.us  
**To:** Chisholm, Kyle W  
**Subject:** WCSD Comments

---

**From:** Chisholm, Kyle W <Kyle.Chisholm@WashoeSchools.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 10, 2026 1:48 PM  
**To:** Carey, Scott <shcarey@cityofsparks.us>  
**Cc:** Rodela, Brett A <Brett.Rodela@WashoeSchools.net>  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] COS Application Intake - Deemed Complete 1/21/26

Dear Mr. Carey,

In regards to City of Sparks Case Nos. PD26-0001, MPA26-0002, PD26-0002, and MPA26-0001, the Washoe County School District (WCSD) offers the following information:

WCSD does not typically provide enrollment projections for Master Plan amendments, as actual development timing and buildout can vary significantly. However, due to the overall size of the proposed amendments and the possibility that the project may meet thresholds for a Project of Regional Significance related to impacts on public schools, WCSD is providing preliminary student generation estimates based on currently available data and observed enrollment trends.

Assuming a maximum buildout of 764 single-family lots as reflected in the project materials, and assuming buildout occurs in the near term, WCSD estimates the development could generate approximately 332 students. This includes an estimated 162 elementary school students, 79 middle school students, and 91 high school students. The schools currently zoned to serve this area are Van Gorder Elementary School, Sky Ranch Middle School, and Spanish Springs High School.

As additional information becomes available through future entitlement stages—particularly Tentative Maps that identify specific lot counts and anticipated phasing—WCSD will be better able to refine these projections and evaluate timing of enrollment growth. WCSD has existing funding mechanisms available to support enrollment growth and will continue to plan accordingly to ensure adequate school capacity as development proceeds.

Thank you for your continued partnership with WCSD.

Please let me know if you have any questions.



**Kyle Chisholm**  
**School Property Planning Manager**

WCSD – Capital Projects

Office: 775-789-3810

[www.washoeschools.net](http://www.washoeschools.net)

