



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

Application Review Comments

Date: March 17, 2026

Case Number: PCN26-0004/ MPA26-0001/PD26-0002

Requests: PCN26-0004– Consideration of requests for Foothills at Wingfield Springs to:

- MPA26-0001 – Amend the Comprehensive Plan land use designation from of Open Space (OS) to Low Density Residential (LDR) for a 34.75± acre site generally located northwest of the intersection of Vista Boulevard and Black Hills Drive (APN: 526-010-04); and,
- PD26-0002 – Modify a final approved plan for the Foothills at Wingfield Springs planned development to 1) change the Foothills at Wingfield Springs land use designation from 34.75± acres of Open Space to Builder Lot to facilitate the addition of Village 16; 2) increase the total number of residential units from 2,418 to 2,576; and 3) general updates to text and figures throughout the Handbook to reflect the proposed addition of Village 16 and associated technical studies. The Foothills at Wingfield Springs planned development consists of 690 acres generally located south of La Posada Drive, north of Golden Eagle Regional Park, and west of Voyage Drive in the NUD (New Urban District – The Foothills at 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 Foothills at Wingfield Springs comprehensive plan amendment. The City of Sparks provides the applicant with the property owner mailing list.
2. **Wetlands.** The Preliminary Drainage Master Plan prepared for Foothills at Wingfield Springs indicates the project area contains mapped wetlands. Please explain how the preliminary drainage design will comply with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.
3. **Threatened and Endangered Species.** USFWS data shows Foothills at 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 Foothills at Wingfield Springs.
4. **Wildlife.** Please provide any wildlife surveys that have been conducted for Foothills at Wingfield Springs and indicate if the Nevada Department of Wildlife has been consulted regarding potential mitigation measures for wildlife impacts.
5. **Subdivisions of Land.** The Foothills at Wingfield Springs Handbook includes process deviations from State Law that replace the typical tentative/final map process with an administrative conformance review process. The conformance review process indicates administrators and reviewing agencies will review applications submitted for conformance with the Final Development Plan, Design Standards and regulations, City Code, the Development Agreement, and Nevada Revised Statutes. The conformance review process does not require the considerations specified in NRS 278.349(3) be evaluated.

The proposed changes to the Foothills Wingfield Springs Handbook would generate approximately 0.166 MGD of sewage. 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, the handbook either needs to be revised to specify NRS 278.349(3) considerations are applicable to the conformance review process or the administrative conformance review process needs to be removed and replaced with the regular tentative and final map review process set forth in Nevada Revised Statutes.

6. **Open Space Ownership.** Please clarify if Red Hawk Land Company will retain ownership of the open space proposed to remain adjacent to Village 16.
7. **Fencing.** The Foothills at Wingfield Springs planned development handbook currently requires an ornamental open view fence with wooden caps and posts adjacent to open space areas. Fencing on the east side of Village 4 has been constructed in compliance with this standard. Please provide additional information regarding how the existing fencing will be addressed with the proposed construction of Village 16.
8. **Open Space Adjacent Lots.** Indications are property owners in Village 4 purchased homes with the expectation that their lots would be adjacent to designated open space. Additionally, indications are property owners in Villages 13 and 14 also purchased homes with the expectation that their lots would be adjacent to a large area of designated open space. Please identify whether the requested entitlements would impair the reasonable reliance of these residents upon the provision of the Handbook and whether the requested entitlements further the mutual interest of the residents and owners of the Foothills at Wingfield Springs Planned Development and of the public in the preservation of the integrity of the Handbook as previously approved.
9. **General Handbook Updates.** Please update the Foothills at Wingfield Springs planned development handbook to address the following:
 - a. Update references and/or recontextualize policies and or documents that no longer exist, such as the NSSOI.
 - b. The potential for a pedestrian connection along the remaining open space corridor/drainage facility.
 - c. Update maps to reflect previous and proposed takedown schedules.
 - d. A word version of the handbook that meets WCAG 2.1 Level AA accessibility standards is required.

Engineering (General)

1. **Foothills at Wingfield Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment Project Description.** Section 4 is mentioned on Page 4 in the Project Description. Where is Section 4? How about other sections (e.g., Sections 1 through 3)?
2. **Foothills at Wingfield Springs Development Standards Handbook.** Please address the following points. Page numbers reference the redline version of the handbook.
 - a. Please include List of Figures and List of Tables.

- b. Page 24. The third paragraph in this section states “The Lot and Acreage Summaries are contained on page III-10”. Please update the page number for the Lot and Acreage Summaries in this paragraph.
 - c. Page 24 Phasing Strategy. This section is outdated. Please update this section.
 - d. Figure 4C on Page 29. The area east of Villages 11 and 12 is classified as SCH on Figures 4A and 4B while it is classified as VC on Figure 4C. Please revise accordingly.
 - e. Figure 8A (on Page 40), 8B (on Page 42), 8C (on Page 43) and 8D (on Page 44). Village 16 is north of Village 4. However, Figures 8A through 8D show Village 16 east of Villages 11 and 12. Please revise figures accordingly.
 - f. Figure 9B on Page 51. The area east of Villages 11 and 12 on Figure 9B is classified as VC but SCH on Figure 6B. Please verify.
 - g. Figure 11 on Page 53 and on Page 57. There are two Figure 11s in this handbook. Please revise it accordingly.
 - h. Estimated Sewage Generation on Page 55.
 - i. Please provide justification for utilizing a sewage generation assumption of 350 gallons per day per unit plus a per capita multiplier on page 55 of the handbook and in the preliminary sanitary sewer report.
 - ii. Other sections in the handbook call this village Village 16. However, this table calls it Village I. Please make sure the village name is consistent throughout the document.
3. **Appendix F Sewer Study.** In the earlier version, Appendix F is the master sewer report including all villages within Foothills. However, in this version, the master sewer report is replaced by the site-specific sewer report for Village 16 only. Because this is the handbook amendment for Foothills, please make sure the master report includes not only the new village but also the old villages.

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 $d/D = \text{flow depth/pipe diameter}$ to determine pipe capacity. When the flow in a pipe segment reaches a ratio $d/D > 0.5$, it is flagged by our 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 Foothills at Wingfield was not intended to support the

additional residential development proposed in Village 16. 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)

The Foothills at Wingfield Springs planned development handbook indicates that treated effluent will be used for parks and common area irrigation. Please be advised that the City of Sparks is studying it's existing effluent system to determine if additional capacity can be provided to existing users and whether new users can connect to the 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 intersection 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. 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 Traffic Impact Analysis submitted 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 Foothills at 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.

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 – THE FOOTHILLS
 AT WINGFIELD SPRINGS – PD26-0002**

Dear Ms. Sosa:

I have reviewed the submittal *titled Preliminary Drainage Master Plan, The Foothills at Wingfield Springs*. The report was prepared by Wood Rodgers Inc. and is dated January 20, 2026. The proposed project involves redevelopment of an undeveloped open space area known as the Foothills into a single-family residential community on approximately 49 acres within the City of Sparks, Nevada. The Foothills parcel (APN 526-010-04) is located in Section 7, Township 20 North, Range 21 East, MDM, and is owned by Red Hawk Land Company, LLC.

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 Truckee Meadows Regional Drainage Manual (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 (I 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 Flood Hazard Area and CLOMR/LOMR Process

The project proposes development within FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas designated Zones AE per FIRM Panel 32031C3056G. The report mentions Zone A and AH but they do not appear to be within this project area. The report also mentions the GERP channel traversing the project area but the GERP Channel appears to end upstream of the site.

Per TMRDM Section 507.2, all floodplain studies proposing to change a FEMA-designated floodplain must include a proposed schedule for obtaining a Letter of Map Revision. The required schedule must include anticipated dates for:

- 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 floodplain.
- 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 identifies a minimum detention requirement of approximately 98,900 cubic feet and proposes a drainage channel and three downstream detention ponds with notched weir outlets. 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 5-year and 100-year inflow hydrographs are 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 have not been evaluated.

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 hydrologic model needs to include all of the drainage area upstream of the proposed development improvements 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 C and I) 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 or other methods.

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 ≤ 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 from Reaches 6 and 7. The MDP should include the following:

- Impacts of the proposed grading, channels, ponds, weirs, and culverts on the upstream drainage channels and properties.

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 must be documented.

Comment #12 – Nevada State Engineer Dam Safety Permit

The report proposes more than 4.0 million cubic feet (approximately 91.8 acre-feet) of total detention storage through the proposed channel and three ponds combined. TMRDM Section 1306.1 states that detention basins with a storage capacity greater than 20 acre-feet, or an



embankment height greater than 20 feet, require a permit from the Nevada State Engineer. 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 #13 – 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 #14 – 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 #15 – Time of Concentration Calculation Errors

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

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

Comment #16 – 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.

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

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.

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.

Contact Information

Please submit future review requests and updated application materials to developmentreview@rtcwashoe.com. If you have any questions regarding this response specifically, please contact me directly at 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
- Sara Going, Project Manager, sgoing@rtcwashoe.com
- Scott Miklos, Trip Reduction Analyst, smiklos@rtcwashoe.com
- Jeff Wilbrecht, Engineering Manager, jwilbrecht@rtcwashoe.com
- Alex Wolfson, Project Manager, 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:

MPA26-0001 (Foothills at Wingfield Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment)

This memorandum provides the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency's (TMRPA) initial review comments regarding subject cases (MPA26-0001), as stated in the 2024 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan (Policy RC 5).

Although the associated handbook amendment (PD26-0002) 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 MPA26-0001 and PD26-0002 – A request has been made for:

MPA26-0001 (Foothills at Wingfield Springs Comprehensive Plan Amendment): A Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change approximately 34.75 acres of Open Space to Low Density Residential (LDR) in the Foothills at Wingfield Springs Planned Development.

PD26-0002 (Foothills at Wingfield Springs Handbook Amendment): Request to amend the Foothills at Wingfield Springs Planned Development Handbook.

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

APNs: 526-010-04

Potential Conformance Issues

The request to convert a portion of designated open space to residential development, while smaller in scale when compared to the nearby Wingfield Springs request (MPA26-0002), similarly 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. Given its proximity to the larger open space conversion request, the cumulative implications merit thoughtful consideration.

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. As such, this proposal presents an opportunity to maintain and/or refine the project design to better preserve remaining open space, incorporate meaningful buffers, and strengthen trail connectivity and recreational value for surrounding neighborhoods.

Although the proposal may be locally permissible, proposals involving incremental reductions of designated open space — particularly when occurring in proximity to larger conversions — 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 5 – Open Space

NR 9 - Wildland/Urban Interface

NR 10 – Parks and Open Space Connectivity

NR 11 – Regional Trails

NR 12 – Urban Heat Island

TMRPA Initial Review Memo

City of Sparks, MPA26-0001

Page 3

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): None identified at this time

Natural Resource Consideration Areas (NRCA): Notable interactions with NRCA layers include some coverage of Critical Source Water Protection Areas (CSWPA); FEMA flood zones AE and X; within ¼ mile of existing trail heads, 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 rerouting of a drainageway and 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 project proposed 158 units, will the maximum density under the proposed land use of LDR for 48.77 acres is 292 units. Approximately 10 acres to remain open space and appears to be primarily used to reroute the drainageway.

Upcoming Meeting Dates: Unknown at this time

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.

NRCA Interactions with Subject Site: Foothills at Wingfield Springs

Subject site area is: 48.7523759549 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 = 10.763404952 acres (22.0777033759 % 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 = 48.7523759549 acres (100.0 % coverage)

Interaction with Cui-ui distribution = 48.7523759549 acres (100.0 % coverage)

Interaction with Lahontan Cutthroat Trout distribution = 48.7523759549 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 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

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

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

