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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The information presented here represents a snap shot of the wider region surrounding the Truckee Meadows. Wider region stakeholders include counties, cities, towns, tribal entities, other regional planning agencies, and economic development organizations in both Nevada and California. This report is intended to serve as a platform for further coordination between the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency and the stakeholders listed in this report. In no way does this study represent an exhaustive analysis of each stakeholder, it is merely a synopsis of the key geographic, economic and land use planning traits of each. Based on the information collected for each stakeholder, potential relationships between the Truckee Meadows and the wider region are considered. These conclusions are preliminary and should be explored in greater detail in the future.

The report focuses primarily on those issues relevant to the Regional Plan, including land use planning activities, natural resource management, transportation, housing, and recreation. Key themes that emerged throughout the research within these categories include water quality and quantity; population growth; urban/rural dynamics; open space preservation; jobs-housing balance; automobile and non-automobile-related infrastructure improvements; and the expansion of recreation opportunities. Each of these themes is explored within the context of an interconnected region, within which the Truckee Meadows is but one component. Appendix A (page 78) demonstrates the major themes relevant to each of the twenty-four total stakeholders, these include: water, transportation, pressures on rural landscapes from surrounding urban areas, jobs/housing balance, recreation/open space, population growth, and economic connections.

Another notable theme underpinning this report, but not overtly discussed is the notion of the Truckee Meadows as a hub for regional activity. With the exception of some California counties included for their association with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, the wider region relies to a large degree on the Truckee Meadows as a source of education, media, shopping, air travel, and entertainment. While not planning-specific issues, the movement of people, money, and information into and out of the wider region undoubtedly interweaves with regional land use planning matters. Exploration of these potential interconnections may also be relevant for future dialogue with the stakeholder community.

Finally, much of the information contained in this report is derived from review of each entity’s master planning document and related planning resources. In some cases, Regional Planning staff had personal communication with stakeholder representatives. Information obtained from these meetings or phone conversations was also used to develop the stakeholder profiles. As a courtesy to the identified stakeholders, TMRPA distributed a copy of the draft report to each entity with a request for comments. Regional Planning staff received feedback from several stakeholders. All feedback was subsequently incorporated into this final report.

Peter Gower
July 2010
INTRODUCTION
As part of the 2007 Regional Plan update process, a growing interest emerged among participants, including Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) members, in the potential for greater coordination between government entities in the Truckee Meadows and those throughout the wider region. The ensuing dialogue led to the adoption of a new goal and set of policies in the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. Specifically, Goal 4.6 and Policy 4.6.3 direct the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) to “acknowledge and communicate with its neighbors located outside its jurisdiction in order to better coordinate planning efforts.” The growing interest in a wider region planning effort led to the concurrent inclusion of Regional Plan Map 8. Recreated as figure 1 (next page) to show the wider region’s full extent, Map 8 broadened the planning horizon to consider the potential entities that may impact and be impacted by planning and development within the region.

With the policy framework in place, and with RPGB support, Regional Planning staff initiated a research process to identify entities likely to be included as part of the wider region research and outreach program. Staff employed several basic factors to identify potential stakeholders such as proximity to the Truckee Meadows, interest in Truckee River water, interconnectedness via a major highway (Interstate 80 or US 395), and likelihood for crosscutting economies. The wider region consists of counties, cities, townships, tribal entities, regional planning agencies, and economic development organizations. This report does not include state or federal agencies, general improvement districts (GIDs), utility service agencies, or any local government or affected entity already within the TMRPA planning area. The graph in figure 2 on page 8 illustrates the composition of the wider region stakeholder community. It should be noted that this is not a static group. The criteria used to select these entities was not rigid, but rather subjective based on staff’s research and relative geographic proximity. Each stakeholder profile found in the sections below contains more detailed rationale for including that particular entity. Additional wider region stakeholders made be added or others removed based on future research or direction from the RPGB.

With the boundaries of the wider region fairly well established, staff developed a research template in order to describe the key traits and planning framework of each entity. The research addressed factors such as proximity to the Truckee Meadows, total population, nature of master planning and the key themes from the master planning document, key economic and environmental resources, and long-term planning strategies. Based on this information, the research template contains a brief overview of each entity’s potential relationship to the Truckee Meadows in general and more specifically to the Regional Plan. Using the research template as a guide, this report provides an in depth analysis of each of the identified twenty-four regional stakeholders.
Figure 1: The Wider Region
The report is separated into five broad geographic categories. Section one describes the three Nevada cities and five Nevada counties determined most likely to have a stake in or be affected by regional planning in the Truckee Meadows. Section two provides a similar analysis for seven entities in California - six counties and one township. Section three analyzes two proximate regional planning bodies - Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and Sacramento Area Council of Governments - whose planning activities may impact future planning in the Truckee Meadows and wider region as a whole. It is interesting to note both regional government stakeholders discussed in section three pursue regional planning in strikingly different ways than TMRPA. Section four reviews the three major Native American tribal groups with a stake in the Truckee Meadows - the Washoe Tribe, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe and Reno Sparks Indian Colony. Finally, section five provides an overview of four economic development organizations representing the economic interests of many county and city governments throughout the wider region. These organizations include the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada, Sierra Economic Development District, Western Nevada Development District, and Sierra Business Council.

This report relies on five subheadings to profile most stakeholders. These subheadings are: geographic summary, economic summary, existing planning program summary, long-term planning summary, and stakeholder relationship analysis. For the economic development organizations, subheadings are condensed to include: agency summary, economic services and objectives, and stakeholder relationship analysis.

Population numbers provided in the geographic summaries for county and city stakeholders in Nevada were obtained from the Nevada State Demographer’s 2008 certified population estimates. Populations for California city and county stakeholders is based on the most recent 2009 population data available from the California Department of Finance. Information for the remaining sections was obtained from a variety of sources, including interviews with stakeholder representatives where possible. This report also relies on the US Census for historical population comparisons and, in some cases, employment information.
The purpose of this report is twofold. Foremost, the information contained herein provides Regional Planning staff and the RPGB with a resource to understand each entity in the wider region and their primary economic, environmental, and land use planning motivations. Second, this document is intended to provide the necessary platform for future dialogue and serve as a catalyst for lasting relationships between the Truckee Meadows and wider region stakeholder community.

SECTION I: NEVADA LOCAL GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS

OVERVIEW
Local government stakeholders in Nevada are generally located east and south of the Truckee Meadows. While some of the smaller counties in terms of land area have average population densities greater than the state average (23 persons/square mile), many are significantly more rural. Despite the variable densities, each stakeholder has a population less than 60,000 and most share many of the same planning issues as the Truckee Meadows. Paramount among these issues is water. Every stakeholder analyzed in this section is located within or directly affected by the water resources in either the Truckee River or Carson River basins. Water quality and availability in these basins is expected to be a source of future dialogue common to each entity.

CARSON CITY

GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY
Carson City, Nevada’s State Capital, is a city/county municipality and has a population of 57,600. Carson City’s total land area amounts to 146 square miles making it the smallest county-level jurisdiction in the state. Over 66 percent of all land area is publicly owned and just ten percent of the county is considered developed. With an average population density of nearly 400 persons per square mile, Carson City is the most densely populated county in the state. The second most densely populated county is Clark County with under 200 persons per square mile.

Carson City is contiguous with Washoe County, however, the primary population center of Carson City is approximately 30 miles south of downtown Reno (See Figure 3, next page). The urban portion of Carson City is located east of the Carson Mountain Range, the easternmost range of the Sierra Nevada Mountains and west of the Virginia Range. Formerly Ormsby County, Carson City now occupies the land areas of this vintage county including a portion along the east shore of Lake Tahoe. The lake shore area in Carson City is very sparsely populated and is comprised mostly of public lands. In addition to Lake Tahoe, the primary environmental resource in the City is the Carson River, which traverses the eastern portion of the city before crossing into Lyon County.

ECONOMIC SUMMARY
Economic drivers in Carson City include government activities associated with the state capital, gaming, and tourism. As reflected in the City’s Master Plan, revitalization efforts in...
Figure 3: Carson City, Nevada Vicinity Map
the downtown corridor that emphasize the City’s existing historic and cultural resources punctuate Carson City’s economic development objectives.

Recent development along the southern city/county line with Douglas County is sparking some land use planning and economic issues. Here, both entities are competing for lucrative retail development. However, according to Carson City economic development staff, limited interaction between the two entities in the past is complicating the provision of services and logical distribution of resources. Recent leadership changes in both jurisdictions may favor better coordination in the future.

**EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY**

Carson City adopted an updated master planning document in 2006. The primary governing mechanisms in place to administer this plan are the Carson City Planning Division, Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Additional governing bodies in place with an influence in city and regional planning include the Historic Resource Commission and Carson City Regional Transportation Commission. The Carson Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, which has transportation planning jurisdiction within Carson City and portions of Lyon and Douglas Counties, is an integral component to advancing the transportation-related objectives of the master plan.

**LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY**

The historic commercial center of the City, and the site of the capital building, state legislature and supreme court, is located along Highway 395. A key theme of the City Master Plan focuses on the revitalization and redevelopment of this corridor. The plan also identifies the importance of historic resource preservation and mixed-use development as components of the downtown revitalization efforts.

Considering population growth in light of available water resources is another key aspect of the Master Plan. The City obtains its water from the Carson River, Kings Creek, and Hobart/Marlette Lake system. Even though the Carson River originates outside the City limits and passes through the agricultural intensive Carson Valley in Douglas County, Carson City staff are not concerned about future water availability. Two factors contribute to this sense of security. First, according to the State Demographer’s 2008 report, population growth in Carson City is projected to plateau in coming years, potentially lessening the strain on future water demands. Second, the city holds all water rights and distributes the rights as needed as developments are approved. Per city staff, Carson City has ample water rights to support future development.

Transportation, and specifically improvements to the existing system, is also identified as another key planning theme in the Master Plan. The plan calls for an expanded transit service and increased automobile infrastructure. Focal among the transportation improvements is the new I-580 freeway currently completed from north Carson to Highway 50 in east-central Carson. Once complete in 2014, the freeway will extend from the intersection of
Highway 395 and Highway 431 (Mt. Rose Highway) in Washoe County to the intersection of Highway 395 and Highway 50 near the City’s southern boundary.

**STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS**

Next to the Reno/Sparks metropolitan area, Carson City is the other major population and employment center in Northern Nevada. The limited distance between Carson City and the Truckee Meadows increases the potential for interaction between the two jurisdictions. Currently, Highway 395 serves as the main artery between Carson City and the Truckee Meadows. Soon, the new I-580 freeway will greatly expand the capacity for automobile travel through Pleasant Valley. Although the volume of traffic moving between The Truckee Meadows and Carson City each day along this route is unknown, Carson staff estimate the number of people commuting to Carson City is double the amount traveling from Carson City to the Truckee Meadows each day.

Despite this estimated trend, the combination of growing regional employment centers in south Reno and an expanding housing market in Carson City may increase the number of area residents traveling from Carson City to the Truckee Meadows each day. Future coordination with Carson City should explore this dynamic in more detail to determine the strength of current commuting assumptions and the potential impacts on land use and transportation planning activities.

Water resources also influence the relationship between Carson City and the Truckee Meadows. Although Carson City may not have the burden of constrained water resources, water demand downstream in Lyon and Churchill Counties is a more salient issue. Accordingly, the interrelatedness of the Truckee and Carson River hydrobasins should be considered in greater detail as part of future dialogues.

Finally, it can be assumed that economic activity in either jurisdiction whether positive or negative will impact the other. A facet of this relationship to consider may be the impact of future growth in the Truckee Meadows on Carson City and the reciprocal effects of economic trends in Carson City on the Truckee Meadows. Government activities and economic development are worthy of further consideration in establishing a connection between the two areas. As Nevada’s capital, Carson City is a draw for workers, knowledge and resources. Due to its proximity, the Truckee Meadows likely contributes greatly to this influx, but also benefits from it.

**CHURCHILL COUNTY**

**GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY**

Churchill County, Nevada is one of the few entities included as part of this research that is not contiguous with Washoe County (See Figure 4, next page). The primary urban center of the county is Fallon, which is located approximately 50 miles east of the Truckee
Figure 4: Churchill County, Nevada - Vicinity Map
Meadows in the Lahontan Valley. The county comprises a relatively large geographic area (3.14 million acres) with a population of 26,981, roughly one-third of which reside in Fallon. This disproportionate land area to population size equates to a county-wide population density of roughly 5 persons per square mile (US Census). The county’s primary natural resources are Lake Lahontan, Humboldt Lake, Truckee River water received via the Newlands canal system, the Carson River, and the many wetlands and sinks in north central Churchill County fed by the Carson River and Newlands canals.

Like most of rural Nevada, a majority of land in Churchill County is federally owned. In total, 87% of the county is under federal ownership, with 83% managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The US Navy owns and manages most of the remaining public land not managed by the BLM. This land is primarily associated with the Fallon Naval Air Station (FNAS). As a result of the substantial federal government presence, additional private development potential is limited primarily to the existing urban area surrounding the City of Fallon.

**Economic Summary**

The primary economic drivers in Churchill County are related to agriculture, construction, military, geothermal energy production, and the service industry. The economic element of the county master plan identifies an expanded industrial and high-tech business sector as a key objective for economic growth. Currently the Fallon Naval Air Station (FNAS) employs approximately 3,500 people and is the region’s leading source of employment.

Renewable energy production, specifically geothermal, is becoming a significant element of Churchill County’s economy, and one with a great deal of future economic potential for the county and State of Nevada. County staff identify the undeveloped geothermal energy potential in Churchill County as the largest in the western United States. Currently, geothermal energy production in the county amounts to 360MW, most of which is being exported. County planning staff also indicate outside interest in the county as a source of utility-scale solar power.

**Existing Planning Program Summary**

Planning activities in Churchill County are governed by the county Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. The County’s planning activities are currently guided by the 1990 master plan, which provides for a 20-year planning horizon. Major updates have occurred since 1990 to account for population growth, impacts to resources, and changes in state law. The most recent updates, including amendments to the county open space plan component, were approved in 2005. The county is currently in the process of updating the master plan to address planning activities for the next 15-20 year horizon.
LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY

Primary themes from the master plan center on water resource management, wildlife conservation, open space and agricultural lands preservation, public lands management, preservation of historic and cultural resources, and growth management consistent with available water supplies.

Central among planning concerns in Churchill County is water. The small collection of privately held land in Churchill County, typified mainly by urban development and agriculture, lies at the terminus of the Carson River, and by extension, the Truckee River. In 2007, the county adopted a major amendment to its water resources plan to address concerns of increasing water demand from urban growth and continued demand from the agricultural sector. Since the Newlands project came to life in 1902, the agricultural industry surrounding Fallon has relied heavily on Truckee River water diverted at the Derby Dam to satisfy irrigation demands. However, this water serves a broader constituency in Churchill County.

According to county planning staff, Truckee River water is vital to the region for more than just agriculture. Water diverted from the Truckee River and into a complex series of canals surrounding the City of Fallon accounts for an estimated 95% of all groundwater recharge in the Lahontan Valley. This groundwater then supplies water to over 4,000 domestic and 900 non-domestic wells. Diverted Truckee River water, in conjunction with water received from the Carson River system, also supports the myriad of wetlands comprising the Stillwater Wildlife Refuge, a crucial migratory bird sanctuary that attracts hundreds of thousands of waterfowl each year.

Due to the importance of upstream water supplies to the current and future livelihood of Churchill County, the 2007 County Water Plan seeks to maintain and acquire additional upstream water rights as they become available. The water plan also discusses the option of importing water from Dixie Valley, an adjacent hydrographic basin to the northeast. Future dialogues with Churchill County should focus on the interrelationships between upstream Truckee and Carson River stakeholders and the diverse downstream water needs in Churchill County.

In addition to water availability, water quality is a central planning focus in Churchill County. Like many communities throughout the western United States, Churchill County and the City of Fallon have developed strategies to address the presence of naturally occurring arsenic in municipal drinking water supplies. The arsenic is the result of the geologic composition in the substrata above and surrounding groundwater reserves. The naturally-occurring levels of arsenic vary depending on the groundwater source. For Churchill County, which draws its water from an intermediate aquifer, arsenic levels typically range from 12-16 parts per billion (ppb). In 2007, in response to new water demand at a subdivision and two mobile home parks with failing private systems, the county completed development of a new municipal water system including a sophisticated green sand filtration treatment facility.
designed to treat the arsenic. Per county staff, arsenic levels in the county’s municipal drinking water supply are now undetectable.

**STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS**

As discussed, the primary link between the Truckee Meadows and Churchill County is water. Churchill County has the desire to maintain the necessary water rights to sustain the county’s agriculture sector, domestic uses, and wetlands. The county may also attempt to acquire additional rights for future population growth or to augment the existing supply used for agriculture and wildlife habitat preservation in the Stillwater Wildlife Refuge. As population growth continues in the Truckee Meadows, demand for Truckee River water will increase. A continuing dialogue with Churchill County and other Truckee River stakeholders will be important to ensuring that all water needs are being met, both upstream and downstream.

Due to the high amount of land area under federal ownership in Churchill County, it is unlikely that excessive population growth in Churchill County will become an extra-regional issue. Existing housing in and surrounding the Fallon area, as well as the large employment draw of the FNAS may influence traffic activity on the roadways connecting Fallon and the Truckee Meadows - particularly Interstate 80 and US Highway 50. The prevalence and impact of commuting patterns between the two areas should be explored in more detail especially as it relates to housing, transportation, and air quality.

**CITY OF FALLON**

**GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY**

The city of Fallon is located in Churchill County and is approximately 63 miles east of the Truckee Meadows via Interstate 80 and US Highway 50 (See Figure 4). The current population is 9,258 people, which constitutes nearly one-third of the total population for Churchill County. The total land area of the incorporated City is approximately four square miles, and is generally urbanized in character relative to surrounding unincorporated Churchill County.

Fallon is at the crossroads of two of Nevada’s major north-south arterial roadways - US Highway 50 and US 95. This confluence of automobile traffic helps support a number of services geared toward travelers - motels, restaurants, and auto care shops. The development pattern, especially along the highway corridors is auto-centered. The city has completed major renovations to revitalize South Maine Street as a walkable streetscape with eateries and specialty shops.

**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**

Fallon’s primary economic drivers are service sector jobs and sales, agriculture, cattle ranching and milk production, health services, and manufacturing. The largest local employer is the FNAS, which employs approximately 3,500 people, many of whom reside
in Fallon. According to the 2000 US Census, the median household income in Fallon is slightly less than $36,000.

**Existing Planning Program Summary**
The City of Fallon was incorporated in 1908. Per City Code, the Fallon City Council serves as the City Planning Commission. The Mayor also serves as the Chief Executive Officer for the City, and in this role is actively involved in all matters of city planning.

**Long-Term Planning Summary**
Long-term planning is based upon an existing Master Plan. Plans are implemented through direction of the Mayor acting as Chief Executive Officer and City Council. The City of Fallon owns, operates, and maintains the electrical system, waste water system, and the fully metered water system. In addition, the city provides sanitation services, manages an airport, and operates a municipal landfill that is supported by a solid waste transfer station. The transfer station is open to the public. According to City staff, Fallon’s utility enterprises have undergone substantial improvements in the past ten years, and this infrastructure is generally well prepared to meet the needs of Fallon’s residents for approximately the next 20 years.

One of Fallon’s more notable achievements in recent past involved a substantial retrofit of the existing municipal water system to meet stricter federal drinking water standards. The City of Fallon and Churchill County serve different geographical areas, have separate groundwater sources, and therefore have independent water systems. Unlike the county, which draws its water from the intermediate aquifer, the city pulls water from the deeper basalt aquifer. Naturally-occurring arsenic levels in the basalt aquifer typically exceed 100 ppb. US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) actions that tightened minimum standards for arsenic levels in drinking water to 10 ppb required the city to construct a new treatment facility designed to bring Fallon’s water quality into compliance with the new standards. Accordingly, the City of Fallon and the FNAS collaborated in constructing a new $20 million arsenic filtration facility to serve city residents and the FNAS. This facility went on-line in April 2004 and fully meets EPA standards for treated drinking water.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**
Historically, the City of Fallon and Churchill County have completed their planning activities mostly independent of one another. This is not surprising given the differences between the City’s relatively small and highly urbanized area as compared to the County’s much larger, more agriculturally-centered, and generally more rural character. However, feedback received from Churchill County indicates the potential for more collaborative planning efforts in the future. For instance, the county and city are engaged in discussions related to transportation planning as part of the county’s master plan update process.
The Fallon area is one of the larger population centers in the wider region and is a gateway for travelers entering from the east on Highway 50 and from the South on Highway 95. A regional effort that includes the Fallon area may be valuable in many ways.

Additional stakeholder relationships between and among the wider region stakeholders and the Truckee Meadows mirror those described above in the discussion on Churchill County. These foreseeable points for interaction and future dialogue include transportation from Fallon to Reno and consideration of future water supplies.

**City of Fernley**

**Geographic Summary**
The City of Fernley is located approximately 30 miles east of the Truckee Meadows via Interstate 80. Fernley is the largest population center in Lyon County and is the county’s only incorporated city. The current estimated population is 19,609, more than double the tallied population during the 2000 Census. Fernley’s rapid growth can be attributed to comparatively affordable residential development during the region’s housing boom.

Three important factors contributed to the establishment of Fernley: the Truckee-Carson Reclamation Project (renamed the Newlands Project in 1919); construction of regional transportation routes including the Lincoln Highway (now I-80), the transcontinental railroad, and US-50A and US-95A from Carson City; and its connections with Reno and Sparks. Today, water resources, access to key transportation corridors, and proximity to the Truckee Meadows are still essential for Fernley residents, planners, and decision-makers.

Key geographic features include the Fernley Wildlife Management Area, surrounding BLM desert highland and the Fernley Deep Sand Swales - a portion of the California Trail, and the Virginia Range which traverses the area from west to east. The city planning boundary encompasses approximately 106,000 acres of which 46,578 acres is owned by local, state, or federal agencies *(See Figure 5, next page)*.

**Economic Summary**
The City of Fernley was incorporated in 2001. Key economic drivers include agriculture, construction, manufacturing and trade. Economic expansion is anticipated through ongoing development of the tourist commercial, residential, and industrial sectors through master planned communities including the Sonterra/Crossroads Commerce Center located off of I-80 north of the historic downtown area.

**Existing Planning Program Summary**
The Fernley City Council and Fernley Planning Commission govern planning activities. The city operates under the City of Fernley Comprehensive Plan originally adopted in 2001 and updated in 2005. Public workshops and community meetings held during the Comprehensive
Plan update process revealed several community principles, which now form the basis of the 2005 plan. These principles include: protection of limited water resources; coordination of growth and services; compatibility of new development; balancing competing land use interests; and nurturing the traditional agrarian portions in the city. The city also has a zoning code based on the overarching land uses promulgated in the Comprehensive Plan.

LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY
The Comprehensive Plan has a 20-year planning horizon and is scheduled to be updated every five years. The key elements of the plan include housing, natural resource conservation, land use, transportation, and public service provision. The goals and policies link back to the core community principles identified during the 2005 update process.

A key theme transcending each section of the plan is the desire to balance rapid residential, commercial and industrial growth with the existing rural agrarian land use pattern. A concurrent and potentially competing theme is the desire to encourage new commercial and industrial growth as well as a spectrum of high-quality, yet affordable housing. Moreover, the plan calls for growth to be consistent with the availability of housing, water, and services.
In terms of transportation, the plan recognizes the importance of Fernley’s location adjacent to a major interstate highway (I-80) and several other intersecting highways, including Highway 50 and Highway 95A. The plan calls for close coordination with NDOT to ensure maximum access along these corridors. While the plan also calls for a mixture of transportation modes, the automobile appears to be the dominant mode for the foreseeable future. There is currently no transit service existing or proposed.

The Comprehensive Plan also contains several sub-sections related to water, waste water, utilities, parks and recreation, and schools. Here, the plan references a study conducted by the Public Works Department, which estimates the city will begin experiencing water supply issues when the population reaches 20,000. The plan recognizes there are only water resources to support existing development and a limited amount of the proposed new development. Based on the known (ground) water resources and population growth projections at the time, the plan estimated its water resources would be exhausted in just 3 years. With a drastic decline in construction activity, this projection is likely much different.

Nonetheless, the city will likely be faced with water supply issues again. One proposal identified in the plan entails a treatment facility to pull water from the Truckee Canal to serve domestic needs.

In the areas of wastewater, utilities, recreation and schools, the plan advocates for high levels of public services, compatibility with surrounding land uses, and enhanced coordination with Lyon County and other service providers.

A final component of the Comprehensive Plan is dedicated to the proposed Sonterra Development. As originally proposed and described in the plan, the 4,300 acre Sonterra project consists of 2,350 acres of industrial land, 3,500 single-family residential units, 750 multi-family units, 436 acres of commercial, a 138-acre trail system, two schools, and promises of hundreds of jobs. The development is proposed along I-80 generally northeast of Fernley’s main urban center. To date, the project remains un-built and no development is anticipated in the near term.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**

The City of Fernley is an integral stakeholder in the wider region. The many topics discussed throughout this analysis - water, housing, economic development, and transportation - are all amplified in Fernley. The intensity with which Fernley exhibits trends in these areas is likely due to its rapid growth since the late-1990s and relative close proximity to the Truckee Meadows. Fernley is also a new city with comparably less experience in long-range community planning. Without a well-supported comprehensive plan and common community vision for the future, Fernley may be more vulnerable to changes throughout the wider region, especially with respect to water, the economy, transportation and land use.
Any conversation about development in Fernley considers the issues of water use and availability. Fernley is uniquely positioned at the headwaters of the Newlands diversion and downstream of all other Truckee River water users except for Churchill County and Fallon. The future of Truckee River water use in Fernley may be in question as agricultural lands (the primary beneficiaries of Truckee River water) are converted to residential subdivisions or industrial parks. Existing groundwater supplies may not be sufficient to support long-term growth should the population growth experienced through 2008 return. Prior to the decline, Fernley entered the preliminary phases of negotiating a water importation project from southern Pershing County. With the substantially diminished need, however, this project has likely been tabled.

The diminished need for Newlands water may also spark interest among Truckee Meadows developers or the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe to retain more rights to river water upstream. Such a hypothesis should be explored in greater detail if possible.

The rapid growth and subsequent cessation in housing development in Fernley is one of the starkest examples of how the Truckee Meadows can influence the wider region. As a result of ballooning home and land prices in the Truckee Meadows from 2002-2007, would-be home buyers and industrial developers looked eastward to Fernley for affordability. A community of less than 10,000 quickly doubled in size while accommodating the new demand. After several years of strong growth - both residential and industrial - the sharp decline in home and land values throughout Washoe County decreased Fernley’s competitive advantage and the growth slowed significantly. Better regional coordination from the outset may have alleviated the drastic nature of the relationship described.

Aside from cheaper housing and land values, Fernley’s other major attraction is its close proximity to the Truckee Meadows. At less than 30 miles from Reno/Sparks via I-80, Fernley is accessible for commuters and industrial traffic. I-80 is in many ways the lifeline from the Truckee Meadows to Fernley and supports the dynamic relationship between the two areas. As long as this transportation route is in place, the connection between the Truckee Meadows and Fernley will remain strong.

**DOUGLAS COUNTY**

**GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY**

Douglas County is located south of Carson City approximately 40 miles from the Truckee Meadows. Along with Churchill County, Douglas County is the only other county-level Nevada Stakeholder included in this analysis that is not contiguous with Washoe County. Douglas County has a year-round resident population of 52,131. At 737 total square miles and with a population density of roughly 60 persons per square mile (US Census), Douglas County is the third most densely populated county in the state behind Carson City and Clark County.
Figure 6: Douglas County, Nevada Existing Land Use Map
A portion of Douglas County’s jurisdiction is within the Tahoe Basin (Figure 6 previous page). The Nevada-side of Heavenly Valley ski area and the Stateline casino district are located in Douglas County’s piece of the Tahoe Basin. East of the Sierra crest, Douglas County is characterized by mainly agricultural lands fed by mountain runoff and the Carson River. The primary employment and housing center in the county is the Minden and Gardnerville area. Other key geographic features in the county include Topaz Lake and the Walker River. Douglas County is bordered to the north by Carson City and Lyon County, the east by Lyon County, and to the west and south by El Dorado and Alpine Counties in California.

**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**

The trade sector - gaming and tourism based industries - dominate the Douglas County economic picture. The Stateline casinos are major economic and employment drivers for the county but are somewhat discontiguous from the remainder of the county. Other economic drivers include agriculture, manufacturing, and public service sector jobs. While agriculture accounts for a small and decreasing portion of the county economy, agricultural lands comprise a large area of the Carson Valley and Topaz planning areas. Agriculture is also paramount to the land use pattern in Douglas County and is an important part of the Douglas County lifestyle. According to the 2007 Master Plan, industrial development is poised to acquire a larger percentage of the total economy in coming years, which may result in more direct competition with the more traditional agrarian pattern.

**EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY**

Douglas County has a Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners charged with making decisions related to planning activities in the county. The salient themes from the Master Plan adopted in 2007 are growth management, tribal lands planning, open space and agricultural lands preservation, economic development and historic and cultural resources preservation. Among these themes, growth management stands above the rest as the guiding master planning objective. The balance the county is attempting to achieve is a sustainable relationship between growth on the one side and open space, agriculture lands, and natural resources preservation on the other.

![Figure 7: Douglas County’s Sustainability Objective](image)

(See Figure 7). Growth management is given attention as a separate planning element in the master plan but also permeates other elements including agriculture and land use. Specific tools used include a building permit allocation system, transfer of development rights (TDR), use of urban service areas, and clustering of development including infill development.
LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY
The long term strategies for Douglas County appear predominately linked with sustainable development and growth management. The existing growth management framework is the most robust in the state outside the Tahoe Basin. An advisory ballot question to confirm whether the allocation system should remain in place passed in the recent November 2008 election with 63 percent of voters in-favor. The TDR, urban service areas, and cluster development policies will also remain in place.

Improving the jobs-housing balance is also a key long-term planning strategy for the county. Currently, many high skill workers commute out of Douglas County while trade industry employees often commute into the county, especially to reach gaming jobs at Stateline. The long term strategy includes attracting higher paying jobs to the county while increasing housing affordability.

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS
Since Douglas County is not contiguous with Washoe County and the potential interactions relative to surface water, population growth and transportation are diffused by distance, the relationships between Douglas County and the Truckee Meadows may be less obvious. However, a small percentage of Douglas County residents commute through Carson City to the Truckee Meadows for employment. This interaction presents concern for the adequacy of transportation infrastructure. The new I-580 freeway is proposed to ease commuter congestion through the Washoe Valley for existing commuters, but may also make the commute from Douglas County more attractive to other residents. This scenario may actually increase commuting from Douglas County to the Truckee Meadows, and vice versa, if Douglas County achieves its goal of expanding its job base.

The interaction of the Carson and Truckee River basins also makes it critical to include Douglas County in any dialogue regarding the wider region. The Newlands Project brings water from the Truckee River to Churchill County. Here, the water enters the terminus of the Carson River basin. Water quantity and quality issues in both basins are likely to be primary concerns for ranchers and farmers in Churchill County as well as for residents in the City of Fallon.

Finally, Douglas County is pursuing an aggressive growth management program that may evolve as a model for population control in Nevada. As growth management is a primary facet of the dialogue surrounding the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, establishing a relationship with Douglas County may prove a vital resource in this arena.
LYON COUNTY

GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY
The nearest border of Lyon County is located approximately 30 miles east of the Truckee Meadows. The County shares a 5 mile long boundary with Washoe County near the City of Fernley in northern Lyon County. Otherwise, the county is bordered to the west by Storey County, Carson City, and Douglas County, to the east by Churchill and Mineral Counties, and to the north by Pershing County (See Figure 8, next page).

Over the past two decades, Lyon County has experienced one of the fastest population growth rates of any county in the country. The current population stands at 55,820 up from 34,000 in 2000 and just 20,000 in 1990 (US Census). The primary population centers are Fernley, Dayton, and Yerington. Smaller populated areas are also found in Smith Valley, Moundhouse, and Silver Springs. Fernley, which became an incorporated city in 2001, holds the county’s largest population (19,609 people) and economic activity.

The primary geographic features in Lyon County include the Carson River, Walker River, Lahontan Reservoir, and the Fernley Canal, which diverts Truckee River water to Lake Lahontan. Both the water systems in the county are in jeopardy due to decreased flows associated with upstream demand and drought. In the Walker basin, water diverted for agriculture in the Smith Valley is impacting water levels at Walker Lake. Similarly, water levels at Lake Lahontan fluctuate based on upstream water availability and agricultural demand in the Fallon area.

Approximately 70 percent of all land in Lyon County is publicly owned, while a majority of the remaining land held in private ownership is devoted to agriculture. Overall, the county-wide population density is roughly 25 people per square mile, although this is an average of two extremes.

ECONOMIC SUMMARY
Despite the booming population growth, Lyon County has experienced comparatively little economic growth. This phenomenon is attributable to high rates of residential development with little corresponding commercial or industrial activity. In recent years, heavy commercial and industrial development in Storey County, Douglas County, and in the Truckee Meadows has prompted demand for housing in outlying areas. Fernley emerged as a source of additional housing for workers in the Reno/Sparks area, while Dayton began meeting the demand for housing due to economic growth in Carson City and Douglas and Storey Counties. In the recent economic downturn, dropping housing prices, foreclosures and decreased housing demand have impacted Lyon County’s economy. In some cases, especially in Dayton, municipal infrastructure was extended with the expectation for new subdivisions. Many of these large scale housing tracts have failed to materialize.
Figure 8: Lyon County, Nevada Vicinity Map
Lyon County is optimistic for new light industrial development, especially with the eventual expansion of the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center (TRIC). County planners recognize the need to move away from the practice of providing housing for surrounding jurisdictions while those areas reap the tax revenues from commercial and industrial development. Long-term economic objectives focus on attracting new industrial development, harnessing the county’s copper and gold reserves in the Mason Valley, and eventually tapping into the county’s renewable energy potential - specifically wind and solar power generation.

**EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY**

According to Lyon County planning staff, the planning program to date in Lyon County has supported residential growth without attracting substantial commercial or industrial developments. Planning documents to date have attempted to apply a “one-size-fits-all” approach to the entire county, which has presented difficulties due to the diverse geographical characteristics from north to south. This historic planning program has resulted in haphazard development patterns in portions of the county.

**LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY**

Lyon County is currently in the process of updating its master plan to address growth and development issues facing the county. Due to the varied geography of the county, the new plan proposes eight community planning areas. These more specific plans will address the unique planning requirements of the particular location. For example, public feedback during the planning process in Yerington and Smith Valley emphasized a desire to maintain the existing agrarian lifestyle while focusing growth toward existing urban areas. Community plans in the northern portion of the state where agriculture is less prevalent may have a greater focus on new industrial development projects and housing projects.

A key challenge identified by county planners is planning for communities in transition from rural to suburban. In these areas, planning efforts must be careful to preserve the historically rural quality of life while incorporating new growth and economic development potential. County planning staff advocate the need to reduce the amount of large, historically ranching parcels to twenty and forty acre ranchettes. The new plan sets out to focus population and economic growth to town center areas at higher densities. This strategy is being termed the “core growth concept.”

Moreover, county planning staff advocate the need to provide more options to attract new industrial and high-tech development. A key long-term planning strategy for meeting this goal involves creating more transportation options such as expanded heavy rail access, new or improved arterial roadways, and improved airport facilities. County planning staff also underscore the need for more education opportunities, particularly in high-tech industries, and a requirement for additional services for the elderly.
STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS
As mentioned, Lyon County has emerged as a source of housing for the Reno/Sparks and Carson City areas. The recent downturn in the economy, driven in part by high gas prices and a wounded housing market has reduced demand for housing in Lyon County. While this lull in demand may eventually favor local markets as demand for more proximate housing increases, the greater regional economic crisis is unmistakable. Future dialogue with Lyon County should focus on ways to create a healthy jobs-housing relationship.

Another central theme is water. Northern Lyon County relies in part on water from the Truckee River as diverted via the Fernley Canal. At the same time, Lyon County is an intermediary in a potential struggle between upstream water demand in Washoe County and downstream demand in Churchill County.

The long term vitality - both in terms of quantity and quality - of the Carson and Walker Rivers may influence future relationships among Truckee River water stakeholders. The Carson and Truckee River systems converge at Lahontan Reservoir in northern Lyon County. Should both river systems be impacted by upstream demand and climate change, aquatic, wildlife, recreation, and economic opportunities associated with Lake Lahontan could literally evaporate.

Finally, the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center lies near the convergence of Washoe, Storey, and Lyon Counties. Each jurisdiction recognizes the potential of this development project as a source of future revenue. At the same time, the economic importance of the TRIC to the wider region will likely influence future relations between Lyon County and the Truckee Meadows. As a result, ongoing dialogue with Lyon County is vital.

PERSHING COUNTY
GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY
In terms of proximity to the Truckee Meadows, Pershing County is the most remote of those Nevada counties identified as stakeholders in the wider region. While the county is contiguous with Washoe County (Figure 9 next page), the primary population center in the county, Lovelock, is located roughly 90 miles northeast of the Truckee Meadows via Interstate 80. Despite a large land area of 6,000 square miles (3.856 million acres), the county has a population of 7,192, mostly concentrated in the community of Lovelock (total population 2,458). Pershing County is one of the least densely populated counties in the state with an average population density of only one person per square mile. Approximately 76 percent of the total land area in Pershing County is federally owned, while 20 percent is dedicated to agriculture. Of the remaining four percent of available land, just a fraction of a percent (equal to roughly 7,700 acres) is considered developed.
The key environmental resources in Pershing County include the Humboldt River, Humboldt Lake, Rye Patch Reservoir and vast areas of publicly owned high desert open space. Groundwater is also especially prevalent in Pershing County.

**Economic Summary**

The Pershing County economy is dominated by mining. The largest employer in Pershing County is Coeur Rochester, Inc silver mine. The second largest employer is the State of Nevada, mainly attributable to a large prison facility near Lovelock. Although agricultural activities account for 20 percent of the county’s total land area, the agriculture sector has declined from over 15% of the total workforce in 1970 to less than 3% recently. People identifying themselves as farmers now account for less than five percent of the total county-wide population.

**Existing Planning Program Summary**

The Pershing County Master Plan, adopted in April 2002, guides development in Pershing County. The Pershing County Regional Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners are charged with administering the plan. The Regional Planning Commission was established to coordinate implementation of the Master Plan in both the county and within the City of Lovelock. In addition to these administrative bodies, there is also the County Planning Commission and Lovelock City Council each possessing a role in the administration of master planning. According to local representatives, there is a strong history of communication and sharing of services between the city and county.

**Long-Term Planning Summary**

The long term goals of Pershing County as indicated in the 2002 Master Plan focus on maintaining a rural character while supporting the existing agricultural and mining industries. Another key theme from the Master Plan is the limitation of growth so that it is consistent with available water supplies. The plan advocates concentrating growth into existing developed areas (primarily Lovelock). Future growth should be balanced with the desire to protect agricultural and open space land areas. The Master Plan also advocates and provides strategies for maintaining high levels of service on existing roadways.

Overall, Pershing County is in a similar position as surrounding rural Nevada and California counties in its desire to preserve a rural quality of life while promoting reasonable increases in population and economic diversity. Counties like Pershing County are highly susceptible to industry-specific fluctuations due to a less diverse economy. Local mines and the state prison account for nearly half of the county’s total employment base. A change in mining regulations or closure of the prison could impact the county financially.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**

There are limited direct relationships between the Truckee Meadows and Pershing County mainly due to distance and the rural nature of the county. Moreover, the Humboldt River
watershed is isolated from both the Truckee River and Carson River drainage basins. The Rye Patch River, which flows south from Rye Patch Reservoir eventually terminates near Fallon, Nevada. It is unclear as to whether a reduction in flow will have an impact on planning activities in Fallon. It appears upon preliminary research that the Rye Patch River feeds a portion of the Stillwater Wildlife Refuge in Churchill County and may contribute to groundwater supplies in the Fallon area.

Perhaps more important than Pershing County’s surface water supplies are its expansive groundwater resources. As mentioned above, a private company is reviewing the potential for extracting groundwater from southern Pershing County and conveying it for new development in northern Lyon and/or eastern Washoe Counties. According to Pershing County staff, the likelihood that this transfer will occur is high.

Transportation may also validate Pershing County as a wider region stakeholder. A small number of Lovelock residents may commute to the Truckee Meadows or surrounding stakeholder locations for work. Traffic impacts would be felt largely on I-80. Truckee Meadows residents may also commute east on I-80 for work in the mines or state prison.

Other potential justifications for including Pershing County as a wider region stakeholder include shear proximity (congruent with Washoe County), mining operation benefits to the state economy, housing of criminals from the Truckee Meadows in the prison near Lovelock, potential renewable energy opportunities in Pershing County, and periodic air quality impacts from the Truckee Meadows via prevailing southwesterly winds.

**STOREY COUNTY**

**GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY**

Of the five Nevada Counties bordering Washoe County, Storey County has arguably the most direct relationship and linkage to planning activities in the Truckee Meadows. Storey County is located approximately 20 miles east of the central Truckee Meadows. The county, with a total land area of 264 square miles, has a population of 4,384 people. This translates to a population density of roughly 16 people per square mile. The primary population center in Storey County is Virginia City (1,027 people) with smaller developed areas in the Truckee River canyon and south of Virginia City near Dayton. Despite the fact that 90 percent of Storey County is privately owned, topographic characteristics make development in most locations unfeasible. Steep slopes, poor water quality, generally poor soil characteristics that prohibit retention of water and subsequent groundwater yield, and capacity of existing water conveyance facilities (see below) limit the potential for future development. The major environmental resource in Storey County is the Truckee River.

**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**

Storey County benefits from 90 percent private land ownership and location between the two major development centers in Northern Nevada - Reno/Sparks and Carson City. The
Storey County economy once punctuated by gold mining, shifted to a tourism and service based focus in the 20th Century. The 21st Century economy is likely to be highlighted by another shift, this time toward industrial development. The Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center (See Figure 10), in conjunction with the Lockwood Landfill are now key revenue generators in the county. The TRIC will draw upon proximity to the I-80 corridor and eventually to Highway 50 once a connector road is completed. This large industrial development is juxtaposed against the county’s desire to preserve its historic Comstock-era legacy.

EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY

Storey County’s master plan was adopted in 1994, roughly six years prior to the final approval of TRIC. The County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners are responsible for the administration of the Master Plan. A primary focus of the plan is historic preservation, specifically maintaining the historic and archeological integrity of the Virginia City area. A separate state-sanctioned commission, the Comstock Historic District Commission, regulates development activities in the nationally designated Virginia City historic district.

Another salient theme in the plan is limitation on residential growth due to existing water resources. Currently, the only source of domestic water in the Virginia City area is a 20-mile long pipeline dating to 1873 that conveys water from the Marlette Lake - Hobart Reservoir system located just east of Lake Tahoe to the Comstock. The plan identifies the maximum average daily flow capacity of this line to be 300,000 gallons. A break in this line in early-October 2008 prompted water usage restrictions in Virginia City and Gold Hill for a week.

LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY

Clearly, there are two competing themes in the long-range vision of Storey County. Residents desire to increase county revenues through industrial development in the Truckee River Canyon area while maintaining the historic importance and associated tourism base in Virginia City. According to the TRIC web site, the industrial park will not be directly
connected to Virginia City via a paved road. TRIC developers anticipate the industrial center will cover 54% of the county’s total land area (104,000 acres) at final build-out with 80-million square feet of industrial capacity. The long-term outlook then appears to be a county with primarily heavy industrial land uses, vast areas of undevelopable slopes, and small population centers in Virginia City and the east Truckee River canyon.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**

Development in Storey county has major implications for the future of the Truckee Meadows. The TRIC is poised to become a primary regional employment generator as well as producer of traffic, water user, and waste generator. Since a majority of the distribution traffic entering the TRIC originates in California, traffic impacts will be realized on the I-80 and US 395 corridors traversing the Truckee Meadows. Additional air traffic at the Reno-Tahoe Airport may result as products are transported to and from the center via air. TRIC will also create the demand for nearby workforce housing. Housing is likely to be distributed between Washoe, Storey, and Lyon Counties.

Demands for potable water and water quality concerns are also of importance when establishing a dialogue with Storey County. The interconnectedness of Storey County and the region is exemplified in the diversion of water from the Lake Tahoe (Marlette Lake) and Washoe Valley (Hobart Reservoir) watersheds to Virginia City. Discussions of growth in the wider region and specifically in Storey County will likely involve an analysis of the vintage Marlette & Hobart Lakes water distribution system.

Similarly, demand for Truckee River water and local groundwater for the TRIC and any other new development in the east Truckee River canyon may fuel disputes with neighboring water right holders such as the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe and beneficiaries of the Newlands Project. Based on a meeting with PLPT water planning staff, the PLPT has no water quality-related issues with the TRIC, but is concerned the development may be tapping into groundwater allocated by right to the PLPT.

Finally, the Truckee Meadows and surrounding jurisdictions are intrinsically linked to and dependent upon Storey County for disposal of solid waste. The regional landfill - Lockwood Landfill - is located in northwestern Storey County. This disposal site is a revenue generator for Storey County, but as the landfill approaches capacity (likely within 20 years), Storey County will need to assess the costs and benefits associated with enlarging the facility. Should the County decide to decommission the landfill, the Truckee Meadows will be forced to look elsewhere for solid waste disposal, at potentially higher economic and environmental costs.

Of note, the Interlocal Agreement between Washoe County and Storey County allowing the Washoe County District Board of Health to serve as Storey County’s solid waste management authority (SWMA) expired on December 31, 2008. The Nevada Department
of Environmental Protection is now Storey County’s SWMA. It is unclear how this transition will affect the relationship between the two counties, disposal activities at the landfill, or the life of the facility itself.

SECTION II: CALIFORNIA LOCAL GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS

OVERVIEW
Stakeholders located in California are generally located west and north of the Truckee Meadows. Geographically, the six counties and one township are directly adjacent to Washoe County or in the case of the Town of Truckee, within 30 miles. Each county abuts Washoe County along the California-Nevada border and extends westward toward the Sacramento Valley. The California stakeholders described below, with the exceptions of Modoc County and the Town of Truckee, are each divided topographically into eastern and western sections by the Sierra Nevada Mountain Range. In large part, only the activity on the eastern slopes influences the Truckee Meadows.

Additionally, like the cities and counties in Nevada, many of the California entities have small populations and emphasize a rural lifestyle. The two largest counties in terms of population, Placer County with nearly 340,000 people and Nevada County with nearly 100,000, are significant stakeholders but the influence associated with such large populations may not be realized since a majority of urbanized areas in these counties are located on the western side of the Sierras. Areas on the east side are generally more rural and typified by similar planning issues as Nevada counties. Again, water may become a focal point as a majority of the Truckee River water flowing through Washoe County either originates in or first passes through California.

LASSEN COUNTY

GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY
Lassen County is located north of Plumas and Sierra Counties, south of Modoc County and is contiguous with Washoe County. Lassen County is primarily rural with a total land area of nearly 4,700 square miles (roughly 3 million acres) and a population of 35,550. Of the total land area in the county, 63 percent is public land while 95 percent of the remaining private land is dedicated to agriculture (See Figure 11, next page). The bulk of Lassen County’s land mass is situated above 40 degrees north latitude (the Truckee Meadows is at 39 degrees), however a small “sliver” of the county extends southward to the Sierra County line near Cold Springs. The US Highway 395 corridor exits Washoe County through Long Valley briefly into Sierra County and then into Lassen County. The primary population center in Lassen County is Susanville with close to 20,000 people. Susanville is roughly 85 miles north of downtown Reno via Highway 395. The key environmental resources in Lassen County include Honey Lake, Eagle Lake, extensive range and farm lands in the eastern portion of the county and large tracts of conifer forests in the western half of the county.
**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**

Government sector employment dominates the Lassen County economy, specifically a pair of correctional facilities near Susanville. Other key employers are mining and agriculture. It is worth noting here that according to the County’s 1999 General Plan, the combined population of the two prisons account for nearly 30 percent of the county’s total population and nearly 60 percent of Susanville’s total population. At the same time, the facilities generate over 2,000 jobs for the county. Agriculture accounts for less than 3 percent of total employment but remains a cornerstone industry terms of economic production and overall aspect of life for county residents. The General Plan identifies other potential future economic drivers as wholesale exportation of water resources, recreation (specifically at Eagle Lake), and expanded mining activities. Economic ills could arise from decommissioning of the Sierra Army Depot in Herlong and reduced agricultural production due to pressure from residential development, soil depletion, or water exportation.

**EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY**

Lassen County’s General Plan was adopted in September 1999 and includes elements related to land use, natural resources,
agriculture, wildlife, transportation and open space. The county has a planning commission and Board of Supervisors. The jurisdiction of the General Plan and the administering bodies extend throughout the entire county with the exception of Susanville, which is the county’s only incorporated city.

**Long-term Planning Summary**

Key long term planning themes from the General Plan center on the preservation of existing agricultural uses and the associated rural agrarian lifestyle. Strategies for maintaining a rural agricultural character include buffer zones around agricultural uses, clustering of urban-style development in existing urbanized areas, and use of area plans to guide planning activities in geographically specific portions of the county. The plan also calls for the preservation of the natural resources necessary to continue supporting agriculture, chiefly soils and water. Most notably, the plan mentions the formation of the Long Valley Ground Water District and Honey Lake Valley Ground Water District both created in the 1980s to provide a mechanism in Lassen County to prevent overpumping or exportation of groundwater from the respective hydrographic basins into Nevada.

In addition to the topics of agriculture and natural resource conservation, the plan dedicates substantial language to wildlife resources, wildlife habitat, and open space preservation. These themes receive particular attention as separate elements within the plan but are also interwoven throughout the other elements.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**

The likely basis for establishing a lasting dialogue with Lassen County is water and particularly the potential impacts to Lassen County associated with water importation to Washoe County. The Lassen County General plan places Honey Lake as a centerpiece of its open space and wildlife elements due to its value as a habitat for waterfowl and an important community open space resource. Accordingly, any discussion of growth in the Truckee Meadows leading to a demand for water resources beyond the county lines will likely produce anxiety for those in Lassen County. As mentioned, efforts to import water to the Truckee Meadows in the 1980s were curtailed by the formation of the Honey Lake Ground Water District. Fears of water exportation projects in the Honey Lake basin and over drafting the Long Valley groundwater basin likely still exist. Recent water importation projects from Fish Springs, located along the Washoe/Lassen County line, should be considered as a topic of discussion.

In addition to water, transportation and housing issues may be salient topics. An unknown percentage of Lassen County residents, especially from Susanville, travel to the Reno/Sparks area each day for work. While Lassen County may be home to a small percentage of employees who work in the Truckee Meadows, it is more likely that the large correctional facility in Susanville attracts proportionately more workers from the wider region, including the Reno/Sparks area.
Growth in Washoe County may also impact Lassen County. The Spring Mountain development at Winnemucca Ranch proposes a new road extending to Highway 395 from the development. This will add vehicle trips to the existing roadway and may increase urban wildland interface issues. This second point may be of special concern due to the presence of wilderness areas along the eastern county boundary with Washoe County. Additional pressure may also be placed on Lassen County’s recreation areas and public lands as these areas become more accessible for urban residents residing in the North Valleys area.

MODOC COUNTY

GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY

Of the entities summarized in this report, Modoc County is one of the most remote geographically, has one of the smallest populations, and as a result has arguably the least interaction with the Truckee Meadows. Modoc County is located in the northeastern corner of California and shares its northern border with Oregon and eastern border with Washoe County. (Figure 12 next page). The federal government owns 66 percent of all land in Modoc County, and of the remaining land, 99 percent is dedicated to agriculture or timber production. Accordingly, only 1 percent of all land in Modoc County is available for urban-style development.

Although Modoc County is contiguous with Washoe County, the Truckee Meadows is roughly 150 miles south of Modoc County’s southern border via Highway 395 and 115 miles via a linear line on a map. Alturas, the county’s primary population center, county seat, and only incorporated city, is another 25 miles north via Highway 395. Nearly 3,000 of the county’s 9,698 total population reside in Alturas. Next to Sierra and Alpine Counties, Modoc County is the third least populated in the State of California.

The key environmental resources in Modoc County include Clear Lake, Goose Lake, the upper reaches of the Pit River, vast forest lands in the western portion of the county, extensive range and farm lands, many small lakes, and a significant groundwater supply originating mostly as surface water in Oregon.

Geographically, Modoc County is divided into two unequal sections by the Warner Mountains. Ninety percent of the county’s land and population is located west of the Warner’s while only a small section is on the eastern slopes. As a result, the majority of the county’s water resources originate on the west side of the Warner’s and flow westward, ultimately in the case of the Pit River, to Lake Shasta north of Redding, California. However, as will be discussed in greater detail below, the small fraction of the county’s water resources in Surprise Valley located just west of the Washoe County line may represent the greatest need for coordination with Modoc County.
Figure 12: Modoc County Vicinity Map
ECONOMIC SUMMARY
Agriculture dominates economic activity in Modoc County. Additional economic drivers include forestry, mining, energy generation (geothermal), government, and services. Modoc County also has a favorable landscape for recreation, especially hunting and fishing. The total labor force in the county amounts to nearly 4,000 people with an unemployment rate in 2006 of roughly 10 percent.

EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY
The Modoc County General Plan dates to 1998 and is administered by the county’s Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Key themes from the General Plan center on preservation of agriculture, specifically protection of water resources and limitations on rural land subdivisions. According to Modoc County planning staff, a commonly held public opinion in Modoc County is that the presence of government should be limited as much as possible. This dynamic seems to contradict to some extent the abundance of federal ownership in the state, and resultant government control over land use decisions on those lands.

LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY
The long term planning goals also focus on preserving the current agriculture-dominated model. Future subdivision of rural land is prohibited and water resources are proposed to be protected to sustain the long-term agricultural demand. The plan also establishes strategies to deal with the large masses of private and public lands.

Future population growth in Modoc County is expected to be minimal or negative. Over the past two decades, the county’s population has grown marginally from 9,678 in 1990 to 9,698 in 2009. According to the county planning staff, the plan calls for any new growth to be located in existing urban areas.

Finally, although not expounded in detail in the plan, county staff indicated that the county is consulting with energy experts to exploit the county’s geothermal energy potential. A prime location for a geothermal plant may be in the Surprise Valley areas near the Washoe County border. Other locations west of the Warner Range also look favorable for future geothermal power generation.

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS
Modoc County is included in this analysis largely due to recent discussions of water importation, which include the potential for physical importation of water from Modoc County to the Truckee Meadows. While there are no proposals currently in place, the Surprise Valley area, just east of the Warner Mountains in eastern Modoc County, might be considered in the future as a source of water for more southerly jurisdictions in the wider region.
The issue of geothermal power production in the Surprise Valley area may also necessitate coordination with Washoe County for the placement of transmission lines through northern Washoe County. This power source may also provide a renewable energy option for the Truckee Meadows. Both issues of water exportation and renewable energy generation should be explored in greater detail.

**Nevada County**

**Geographic Summary**

Nevada County is contiguous with Washoe County and located north of Placer County and South of Sierra County. The county’s jurisdiction extends westward from the California-Nevada border to the foothills of the Sacramento Valley in California. The county is divided geographically by the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The total county population is approximately 98,718 people with a majority of those residents living west of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The Town of Truckee, located along the Truckee River in eastern Nevada County, is by far the largest population and employment center in the eastern portion of the county. West of the Sierras, Grass Valley and Nevada City comprise the largest population areas (See Figure 13).

Like the neighboring counties of Sierra and Placer, Nevada County’s rugged terrain precludes development in many locations throughout the county. As a result, much of the county remains largely undeveloped. Additionally, of the 943 square miles of land area in the

---

Figure 13: Nevada County, California Existing Land Use Map
county, roughly one-third (314 square miles) is held under public ownership, with 265 square miles managed by the US Forest Service.

The primary geographic features in Nevada County include the Truckee River, Donner Lake, Prosser Creek and Boca Reservoirs, the Yuba River, the Sierra Nevadas, and many other lakes and rivers.

**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**
Traditionally, the resource-based sector was most responsible for driving Nevada County’s economy and formed the backbone upon which the county was established. Predominate economic drivers within the resource sector were and continue to be timber and agriculture. While these industries remain fundamental components of the county’s more rural areas, other sectors are emerging throughout the county and specifically in the more developed areas. These industries include tourism, manufacturing, and construction. Locations such as Truckee, Grass Valley, and Nevada City rely heavily on a tourism-based economy.

**EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY**
Nevada County’s fundamental planning strategy is to foster a rural quality of life while directing new population and economic growth to existing incorporated areas - such as Grass Valley, Nevada City, and Truckee, as well as unincorporated Community Regions, Rural Centers and Village Centers such as Lake of the Pines, Alta Sierra, Cedar Ridge, the Town of Washington, and Soda Springs. This strategy includes the preservation of natural resource amenities. Overall, the Nevada County planning strategy promotes well-balanced growth while maintaining the existing rural aspects of the county.

The county planning commission and zoning administrator review land use planning activities in Nevada County, while the Board of Supervisors has ultimate administrative authority. The Nevada County General Plan, adopted in 1996, guides current and future growth throughout the county.

**LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY**
The long-term planning strategy for Nevada County remains little changed from the current framework. The General Plan calls for a focusing of new development to areas where existing infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate new growth. Within the urbanized areas, the County’s long-term planning approach calls for compact development consistent with the existing design and with the ability to promote sustainable walkable urban areas. In this sense, Nevada County benefits greatly from an existing “traditional” development pattern with mixed-use downtown areas and charming streetscapes.

Since most of the developed areas in Nevada County are incorporated cities or towns, the county is continually working with these local governments to ensure coordination of
planning activities. This coordination may be especially important in the eastern portion of the county. Based on TMRPA staff discussions with Nevada County planning staff, the county defers most planning decisions east of the Sierras to the Town of Truckee as there are few developed areas outside Truckee’s sphere of influence. Nevada County does maintain planning jurisdiction over outlying areas in the eastern portion of the county such as Donner Summit, Soda Springs, as well as Boca and Prosser Creek Reservoirs.

Stakeholder Relationship Analysis

Nevada County is located adjacent to Washoe County and contains the longest stretch of the Truckee River outside of Washoe County. The county is also linked to the Truckee Meadows by Interstate 80. These features alone are significant factors prompting the need for developing an understanding of and relationship with Nevada County.

The section of the Truckee River from the point where the river enters Nevada County from Placer County and exists Nevada County to the north and into Sierra County is the longest section of the waterway in any jurisdiction except Washoe County. Moreover, three of the four major upstream flood and drought storage facilities for the Truckee River system - Boca Reservoir, Prosser Creek Reservoir, and Donner Lake - are located wholly in Nevada County. Two additional upstream retention facilities, Martis Creek Lake and Dry Lake are also located in Nevada County and are in place to manage flows into the Truckee originating from the Mt. Rose Wilderness and Martis Valley.

While Nevada county is a signatory of the Truckee River Operating Agreement, the county has limited authority over the water planning operations of these water bodies. However, as the jurisdiction responsible for land-use management surrounding these waterways, decisions made by Nevada County may have implications, positive or negative, for the future of the Truckee River system as a whole. At this time, the planning paradigm in Nevada County, which advocates open space preservation and managed growth, supports the notion of minimal future impact on water resources.

Outside the Truckee River drainage area, the remainder of Nevada County’s watersheds drain westward toward the Sacramento Valley. Therefore, in terms of magnitude, only a fraction of the water precipitating in Nevada County enters the Truckee River. Again, due to the lack of impermeable surfaces associated with urban development in unincorporated Nevada County, water inputs are most likely high quality.

The shear proximity of Nevada County to the Truckee Meadows also increases the need for future interaction. Nevada County and the Reno/Sparks metropolitan area are linked via Interstate 80. This connection allows for the free flow of travelers from Nevada County into the Truckee Meadows and vice versa. The expanse of natural resource amenities in Nevada County also makes it attractive for outdoor recreation. Boca and Prosser Creek Reservoirs as well as Donner and Independence Lakes are prime boating, fishing, and camping locations.
frequented year round by Truckee Meadows residents. The south fork of the Yuba River is one of the closest Wild and Scenic Rivers to the Reno/Sparks area and is popular for river rafting, camping, and hiking.

At this time, the interconnections with Nevada County appear positive. The rural nature of the county coupled with the primary population centers being located west of the Sierras, decrease the potential for heavy automobile movement between the counties or potential negative impacts to the Truckee River ecosystem. As discussed, however, the attractive outdoor recreational opportunities in Nevada County may result in reverse impacts from the Truckee Meadows. Future dialogue between TMRPA and Nevada County should consider this dynamic in greater detail.

**Placer County**

**Geographic Summary**

With a county-wide population of 339,577, Placer County is the most populated regional partner aside from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (a regional organization that includes Placer County). Placer County shares a boundary with Washoe County in the Lake Tahoe Basin and Mt. Rose Wilderness areas and is roughly 30 miles southwest of the Truckee Meadows (*See Figure 14, next page*). The total land area in the county is 1,506 square miles (964,000 acres) including nearly 82 square miles (or nearly 53,000 acres) of water. Like Sierra and Nevada Counties, Placer County is divided geographically on a north-south axis by the Sierra Nevada Mountains. The largest land area lies west of the Sierras. Similarly, the primary population centers in the county are largely on the western side of the Sierras in the communities of Lincoln, Roseville, Rocklin and Auburn. East of the Sierras, the only significant population centers are on the western shores of Lake Tahoe, for example, Tahoe City, Kings Beach, and Homewood. Squaw Valley is also located in eastern Placer County. The large land area between Lake Tahoe and the California Central Valley is relatively unpopulated, rugged, and dominated by conifer forests, deep canyons, and snaking rivers. The key environmental resources include Lake Tahoe, the Sierra Nevada Mountains, conifer woodlands, agricultural lands, portions of the American, Yuba and Truckee Rivers, and several other rivers, lakes and valuable open spaces.

**Economic Summary**

The U.S. Census ranked Placer County the 41st fastest growing county in the United States between the years 2000 and 2006 with a population increase of over 80,000 people. Since 1990, the county’s population has nearly doubled in size from 172,000 in 1990 to nearly 340,000 in 2009. Notably, between 1997 and 2007 the City of Lincoln in western Placer County experienced a 322 percent growth rate.

The trade, transportation, and utility industry sector accounts for the largest share of employment in Placer County with 20% of the total. Government (14%), leisure and hospitality (13%), and construction (11%) are the other major economic drivers in the county.
The construction industry experienced the sharpest increase between 1996 and 2006, but has fallen off since 2006 due to the economic downturn and housing supply saturation. The areas east of the Sierras rely largely on seasonal tourism dollars especially at the major ski resort areas of Northstar, Squaw Valley, Alpine Meadows, and Sugar Bowl. The two largest tourist accommodation facilities in the county are located in Squaw Valley, with a combined capacity of 681 rooms. The third largest is at Northstar with 240 total rooms. Northstar is quickly becoming an equal rival of Squaw Valley with recent expansions and the soon-to-be-completed Ritz Carlton Hotel.

**EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY**

Placer County’s General Plan was adopted in 1994. The plan contains ten sections including land use, natural resources, housing, recreation and transportation. Due to the disparate geographic nature of communities in Placer County, the planning framework also includes eight community plans. These plans provide more community-specific planning guidelines for the largest communities in unincorporated Placer County.

The Placer County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors administer the General Plan and eight community plans. Additionally, there are 13 municipal advisory councils.
These advisory bodies cover areas throughout the county and are designed to provide community-level input into the larger county-wide planning process.

Along with the General Plan, Placer County adopted a Conservation Plan in 2000 as a means of implementing the Placer Legacy Program, a strategic program designed to preserve thousands of acres of open space and animal habitat throughout the county over the next several decades. The program is not a regulatory mechanism, but seeks willing buyers to sell lands determined to be valuable for conservation. The county will work with other land management and conservation agencies to enhance and preserve the acquired land over time.

**LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY**

A key theme from the General Plan for long-range planning in Placer County is the balancing of growth with the objectives of the Legacy program. In order to achieve this balance, the plan advocates concentrating new development into existing urbanized areas. Within the urbanized areas, the plan calls for strong economic development, including incentives such as streamlined permitting. Outside urban areas, the plan calls for preservation of agricultural and open space land, natural resources, and protection of the county’s abundant surface water resources. The Placer Legacy program is also touted as a key component for enhancing cultural and recreational opportunities throughout the county.

**STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS**

Establishing a relationship with Placer County is essential. Paramount is Placer County’s jurisdiction over a large segment of Lake Tahoe and the first section of the Truckee River from its outlet point in Tahoe City to the point where it enters Nevada County and the Town of Truckee. Land use decisions in Lake Tahoe and along the Truckee River will impact downstream water quality and availability. A deeper analysis of TROA will be necessary to assess Placer County’s role in the wider regional water management framework.

Another key component of Placer County’s role in the wider region is its economic resources. Two of the largest resort destinations in the immediate region - Squaw Valley and Northstar - are located in Placer County. In combination with destinations at Lake Tahoe, these resorts are major catalysts for tourism. Due simply to proximity and given that the Reno/Sparks area is usually marketed in conjunction with the Lake Tahoe area, the vitality of these resort areas will influence economic prosperity in the broader region. Reciprocally, as the Truckee Meadows grows, patronage at these resorts by local residents (as opposed to those from California and beyond) will likely expand, potentially driving the demand for increased expansion.

The distance of the major urban areas of Placer County from the Truckee Meadows may minimize the degree of interaction between these areas, however, potential impacts on transportation systems should be considered as part of a stakeholder dialogue. Other issues
may involve the impacts of Indian gaming in Placer County on the Truckee Meadows economy; potential dearth of affordable housing in Placer County leading to increased demand on Truckee Meadows affordable housing resources, and impacts of regional growth on the long term goals of the Placer County conservation program.

Plumas County

Geographic Summary

Plumas County’s eastern border is less than 30 miles west of the Truckee Meadows and is accessible via Interstate 80 and Highway 89 from Truckee or Highway 395 and Highway 70 from Hallelujah Junction north of the Cold Springs area. Plumas County is not contiguous with Washoe County due to a 6-mile wide portion of Lassen County separating Plumas and Washoe Counties. The county-wide population is 20,632 people, which represents a nearly three-quarter percent decline from 2008. The most populated areas are located along the Highway 70 and Highway 89 corridors. These population centers include Quincy, Portola, and Chilcoot along the Highway 70 corridor and Graeagle, Lake Almanor West, and Chester along Highway 89 (See Figure 15). At 2,016 people, Portola is Plumas County’s only incorporated city.

Mountainous terrain, dense conifer forests, and several lakes of varying size mainly within the Lakes Basin Recreation area are the highlights of Plumas County’s natural resources. Of all the lakes in the county, Lake Almanor is the largest and most populated. Other larger lakes include Bucks Lake, Lake Davis, and Frenchman Lake. Each of the four largest lakes is a multi-purpose reservoir including hydroelectric power generation and flood control.

Like most of the California counties included in this report, Plumas county is divided geographically into western and eastern portions by the Sierra Nevada Mountains. Areas west of and along the Sierra Crest receive more moisture and are therefore typified by forests
and more ubiquitous surface water bodies. East of the Sierra Crest, the landscape is drier, flatter and dominated by agriculture, primarily cattle ranching. The majority of Plumas County’s total population and land area is located along or west of the Sierra crest.

ECONOMIC SUMMARY
Timber harvesting, agriculture, and a combination of typical employment sectors such as services, manufacturing, government and professional services dominate Plumas County’s economy. There is little mention of current or forecasted economic conditions in the most recently adopted General Plan, therefore precise knowledge of the county’s economic goals is not currently available. The General Plan does provide land use recommendations to support expansion of industrial, timber, mining, and agricultural activities. Further definition of these goals and specific policies to support implementation is a likely component of the updated General Plan.

EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY
The administration of planning actions in Plumas County follows the typical format of Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors, and Zoning Administrator. As mentioned, the county is in the process of updating its General Plan, the current plan dates to 1981 and is skeletal in nature compared to the other jurisdictions described in this report. According to local media reports, the plan update process is substantially behind schedule. The update process began in 2006 and is still in the development process. The same local media reports indicate frustrations related to the delayed plan update process caused two members of the five-member Planning Commission to leave their posts in December 2007. Prior to its meeting on January 14, 2009, the County Planning Commission had not held a public meeting since November 29, 2007 and only nine meetings since April 2007.

The General Plan update process appears to be back on track after several unproductive years. The County Board of Supervisors recently appointed members to a General Plan Update Subcommittee and the Planning Commission appears to back on a regular meeting schedule. The formation of a local citizens group - Plumas Tomorrow - is also materializing with the aim of facilitating the update process. The Sierra Business Council, described later in this report, is also facilitating with the General Plan update.

LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY
Plumas County staff have held several workshops to solicit public feedback in order to guide development of the General Plan. Unfortunately, the plan update process has been met with challenges and the 1981 Plan is now effectively obsolete. Key themes from the 1981 Plan that may remain in the updated plan are protection of valuable natural resource areas, prioritization of mineral, timber, and agricultural production zones as well as open space, scenic and recreation areas. Strategies to achieve these goals will likely be similar to the other Eastern Sierra Counties and may include concentration of new growth in existing urbanized areas and limitations on subdividing rural parcels.
Similar to Lyon County in Nevada, Plumas County is at a crossroads in time as it seeks direction on moving forward. Input from other regional stakeholders who share similar concerns and planning issues and who may be affected by the decisions made in Plumas County will be important.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**
A direct relationship does not exist between Plumas County and TMRPA on most planning issues. Water basins in Plumas County are discontiguous from those entering the Truckee Meadows and the county’s small population limits direct anthropogenic impacts on natural resources in the Truckee Meadows. Perhaps the most notable relationship is the influx of Washoe County residents into Plumas County for recreation and vacation home ownership. Lake Almanor, Lake Davis, Bucks Lake, Frenchman Lake, and the Feather River are popular destinations for outdoor enthusiasts throughout the region. The popularity of Lake Almanor as a vacation destination propelled an average 140% growth rate around the lake from 1970-2000 (U.S. Census). A similar trend is also occurring in Graeagle and near Lake Davis. This growth, ostensibly fueled in part by growth in the Truckee Meadows, will likely place a greater strain on the County’s natural resources, in particular timber and water resources.

Another potential regional interaction may center on transportation-related impacts from Plumas County residents commuting to the Truckee Meadows, especially from Portola, Chilcoot, Graeagle and other smaller communities in the eastern portion of the county. It is unclear how many Plumas County residents commute to the Truckee Meadows on a daily basis or if the number would cause any concern for long-range transportation planning. The number of new commuters is not envisioned to increase substantially given the historic rate of population growth in the county, and in the eastern portion of the county particularly.

**Sierra County**

**Geographic Summary**
Sierra County is a sparsely populated county located directly west of the Truckee Meadows. At 3,358 people, Sierra is the second least populated county in California behind Alpine County. Since 2000, the US Census estimates a 200 person overall decline in county-wide population. The current population is equivalent to 1990 levels. The county is bordered to the south by Nevada County, to the north by Lassen and Plumas Counties and to the east by Washoe County. The main population centers in the county are Downieville (county seat) and Sierra City, both located in the Feather River Canyon on the western flank of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and Loyalton, located in the Sierra Valley near the county’s northeast boundary with Plumas and Lassen Counties (See Figure 16 next page). Over 70% of Sierra County is held in federal ownership. The lack of private land coupled with the rugged mountainous terrain prevents development throughout most of the county. As a result, the county has a population density less than 4 persons per square mile (US Census).
Figure 16: Sierra County, California Vicinity Map
addition to the key geographic resources associated with the Sierra Nevadas such as the Lakes Basin area, Sierra Buttes, Yuba and Feather Rivers and dense forest lands, the county has an extensive grassy plain - Sierra Valley- on the eastern side of the Sierra crest. This valley is sparsely populated with the exception of a handful of small towns including Sierraville and the county’s only incorporated city, Loyalton (population 842). A majority of the valley is devoted to cattle ranching.

Perhaps the most significant geographic features in Sierra County relative to the Truckee Meadows are the Little Truckee River, Stampede Reservoir, and the Dog Valley watershed (See map above). Each of these features has a direct link to the Truckee River and consequently to the Truckee Meadows.

**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**
Economic activity in Sierra County is largely devoted to ranching, forestry, tourism, and standard government services. The county has limited opportunities for expansive population or employment growth and as a county has agreed to limit future growth to existing population centers while maintaining the rural agrarian economic structure. Moreover, the General Plan identifies the county’s proximity to the Reno area as a major impediment to attracting significant economic development opportunities.

The county is also a popular second-home destination. According to the General Plan, approximately one-third of all housing units in the county are second homes.

**EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY**
Sierra County has a Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors tasked with administering planning activities. The county is operating under the 1996-2012 General Plan, which spells out guidelines for maintaining the county’s long-standing small town and rural character. Leading up the 1996 plan update, planning staff provided citizens with the opportunity to comment on their preferred future land use pattern. The citizens selected a ‘little change’ alternative. The plan estimates the county’s build-out population to be less than 10,000 people.

**LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY**
The long-term planning goals of the county differ little from the existing planning program due to the minimal change approach agreed upon by the citizenry in the mid-1990s. The goals of the general plan seek to channel growth to existing developed areas in order to maintain the existing rural character of the county.

**STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS**
Sierra County, despite its small population, is intrinsically linked to the Truckee Meadows based on shear proximity and through shared watersheds. Stampede Reservoir, which
controls flows from the Little Truckee River is a primary upstream flood control mechanism for the portion of the Truckee River that flows through Washoe County. TROA also recognizes a water diversion from the Little Truckee River to Sierra Valley to support agricultural uses.

Sierra County may also experience growth pressure in the extreme eastern portion of the county adjacent to the Cold Springs area. Here in the Long Valley watershed, developments such as the Evans Ranch project (on the Nevada side) will increase localized populations and therefore demand for water. Groundwater in the Long Valley basin may prove to be a contentious issue in the future.

**TOWN OF TRUCKEE**

**GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY**
The Town of Truckee is located approximately 25 miles southwest of Reno via Interstate 80. Truckee is an incorporated town (since 1993) within Nevada County and lies near the northeastern boundary with Placer County (See Figure 17). The historic downtown

*Figure 17: Town of Truckee, California Existing Land Use Map*
lies along the Truckee River and is bisected by the original transcontinental railroad route. Truckee’s total year round population is 16,241, but swells seasonally especially during the winter and summer months due to an influx of tourists and part-time residents.

The Town of Truckee sits in a glaciated valley and is punctuated by major geographic features such as the Truckee River, Donner Lake, Sierra Nevada Mountains, Alder Creek, Martis Creek, and Martis Valley. The total land area in the township is slightly less than 21,500 acres. The major arterial roadways within the town are Interstate 80, Highway 267, and Highway 89.

**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**

Truckee has deep economic roots in railroading and logging, but has more recently shifted from these industries to a more tourism-based economy. The Town of Truckee is benefitting from recent investment in neighboring ski areas such as Northstar, Squaw Valley, and Alpine Meadows. These areas are emerging as prominent international year-round destinations for outdoor enthusiasts. Situated only minutes from these attractions, via Highway 267 or Highway 89, Truckee is in an ideal position to attract higher-end real estate development and concurrent commercial investment. According to the Town of Truckee General Plan, 58% of the workforce is employed in either the services or retail trade sectors. Of the remaining 42%, 18% are employed in the government sector and 15% in mining or construction. The seasonal fluctuation of Truckee’s economy becomes evident when reviewing annual retail sales patterns. The summer months account for 48% of all annual retail sales, while the peak winter months add 39% of total sales. Accordingly, fall and spring shoulder season months account for only 13% of all annual sales.

The recent housing boom, which occurred generally between 2002 and early 2007 fueled employment demand in the construction industry. New residential developments were especially prevalent along Highway 267 east of the Truckee River, northwest of central Truckee along Highway 89, and north of central Truckee in the Glenshire area. New commercial and light industrial development occurred mainly near the airport and along Highway 267, near central Truckee along Donner Pass Road, and northwest of central Truckee along Pioneer Trail.

It is unclear how the recent downturn in the global economy is impacting the Town of Truckee. Evidence from recent town council meetings suggests there is a severe shortage of affordable housing, which despite the recent drop in home prices, is still a major concern for area residents. Moreover, three of the hardest hit economic sectors: retail, trade and construction account for 73% of the town’s economy. The economic impacts for employment declines in these sectors could be significant.
EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY

Master planning in Truckee follows the guidelines set forth in the General Plan. Adopted in 1996 and updated in 2005, the plan consists of nine elements including land use, housing, community character, noise, economic development, and circulation. The General Plan has a planning horizon through 2025. Implementation of the General Plan and planning activities in general is carried out by a Planning Commission, Town Council, and Zoning Administrator. The town also has a Historic Preservation Advisory Council to provide input on development activities impacting the historic downtown area.

At the time of the town’s 2005 update process, it was assumed that the area had reached 60% buildout capacity for residential units and 50 percent for non-residential development. Based on population projections available at the time of the update, the town was expected to reach buildout by approximately 2030. The planning horizon for the current plan extends to 2025, whereupon the town is expected to reach nearly 90 percent buildout for residential units. The population at buildout is expected to be approximately 23,300 residents. With these projections in place, the General Plan places a notable emphasis on sustainable development practices, redevelopment, and preservation of community character though context sensitive development.

LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY

The primary long-term planning goals for the Town of Truckee center on the concentration of future population growth in existing developed areas in an effort to curb sprawl, preserve surrounding natural resources, reduce auto dependency, and maintain the existing small town community character.

Several major development projects are either underway or in the planning stages. These include the Old Greenwood Golf Course development, Truckee Railyard development, Joerger Ranch, and the Hilltop area development.

The Old Greenwood development consists mainly of upscale single-family residential development centered on the new Old Greenwood Golf Course with a very limited non-residential component. The development is currently nearing completion.

Combined, the Joerger Ranch, Hilltop and Railyards projects will entail more intense residential development with commercial and industrial components near the downtown area. The Joerger Ranch project is located near the Truckee Airport along Highway 267, the Hilltop area is located roughly one mile east of downtown Truckee, and the Railyard project is located directly adjacent to downtown Truckee.

Of the three, the Railyard project represents the most promising reinvestment opportunity for the downtown core area. The project Master Plan conveys a vision of a vibrant, bicycle and pedestrian-friendly, high density, mixed-use urban center with live-work units, retail, and
multi-family housing. The development is also expected to preserve the historic character of the downtown area while promoting an enhanced sense of place. This development proposal is consistent with the Town of Truckee General Plan’s vision for compact urban form and reinvestment in the downtown area.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**

In terms of a stakeholder relationship, the Town of Truckee is one of the most important entities with which the Truckee Meadows should consider establishing a working alliance. Truckee is the most significant population center located east of the Truckee Meadows and within a 30 mile radius. Truckee is also the most proximate population center upstream on the Truckee River. Moreover, preliminary analysis reveals a notable jobs/housing balance situation between the Town of Truckee and the Truckee Meadows.

Foremost, the Town of Truckee is the largest population center between the Truckee Meadows and the headwaters of the Lower Truckee River in Tahoe City. Concerns for future water quality and availability surround future development in Truckee. Historically, much of Truckee’s industrial development straddled the Truckee River, thus amplifying the potential for pollutants entering the river. Recent industrial development is located east of the river near the airport, although several heavy industries remain along the river corridor.

In conjunction with future residential growth comes the concern for water availability both for Truckee and for downstream dependents of the Truckee River. Currently, Truckee relies on groundwater sources in the Martis Valley for drinking water. The Tahoe-Donner Public Utility District adopted an Urban Water Management Plan in 2005 and is the primary water purveyor for the town. The 2005 water plan provides detailed water demand information through the project buildout timeframe identified in the General Plan. While the water plan provides no indication of existing water supplies, it is assumed that the existing system will be able to sustain growth through 2030. Future dialogue with the Town of Truckee should include discussions related to water supply and future demand projections.

Housing affordability in Truckee coupled with expanded employment opportunities in the Truckee Meadows and Town of Truckee has created a potentially troublesome dynamic. Despite the increase in employment options in Truckee, some workers are forced to live in the Reno/Sparks area and commute to Truckee via I-80 each day for work. Conversely, some Truckee residents with higher paying jobs in the Truckee Meadows may commute from Truckee to the Reno/Sparks area. These commuting patterns may have long-term consequences on regional air quality and transportation infrastructure especially for the I-80 corridor.

Furthermore, for those unable to afford the cost of living in Truckee and unable to find adequate employment, one attractive option would likely be relocation to the Truckee Meadows. Such a trend played out during the 2002-2006 housing boom, during which
Truckee no longer offered an affordable lifestyle for some residents or the attractiveness of accumulated equity prompted some to sell and relocate to Reno/Sparks.

Although not within the scope of the Regional Plan, there are likely significant economic interconnections between Truckee and the Truckee Meadows. Perhaps most importantly, Truckee is situated along I-80, a major transportation route for travelers entering the region from California. Significant tourist-oriented development in Truckee may divert travelers from I-80 to Truckee and surrounding resort destinations, including Lake Tahoe, leaving fewer travelers continuing on to Reno/Sparks. Future growth and capacity at the Truckee airport may amplify this dynamic as fewer resort-bound travelers enter the Reno-Tahoe region via the Reno-Tahoe Airport in Reno.

Conversely, economic development in the Truckee area could benefit the regional economy by attracting large events and increasing tourist dollars for the wider region. Of particular interest is the potential for the Winter Olympics to return to the area. As was seen nearly 50 years ago as part of the 1960 Squaw Valley Olympics, such a massive attraction would generate substantial investment throughout the region, including the Truckee Meadows.

**SECTION III: REGIONAL GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS**

**OVERVIEW**

The two regional government stakeholders discussed in detail below are included in this research each for different reasons. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) could not be excluded since it is the primary planning and regulatory organization within the Lake Tahoe Basin - the source of the Truckee River and the location often paired with the Reno-Sparks area in external marketing campaigns. In short, TRPA’s actions have great potential to influence the Truckee Meadows and staff believes a future dialogue is necessary between the two agencies.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is one of the more geographically remote stakeholders selected. The Sacramento area is located over 100 miles from the Truckee Meadows. However, SACOG’s influence over transportation and land use planning extends far beyond the Sacramento core. While influences from SACOG actions may prove indirect, establishing a relationship with this organization may be beneficial both to identify interactions between the two regions and learn from SACOG’s regional planning model.

**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

**GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY**

The Sacramento metropolitan area, the focal point of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), is approximately 120 miles west of the Truckee Meadows via Interstate 80. SACOG’s planning jurisdiction includes six counties and 22 cities (See Figure 18 next page). One of the six counties included in SACOG’s jurisdiction is Placer County,
Figure 18: SACOG Planning Area
described above as one of the more important California county stakeholders in the wider region. Further justification for the inclusion of SACOG is the influence of the Sacramento area on the Truckee Meadows and other wider region stakeholders.

SACOG’s planning area covers 234 square miles and includes a population of approximately 2.3 million. Primary population centers are the Cities of Sacramento (481,000), Elk Grove (141,430), Roseville (112,340), Folsom (71,000), and Davis (66,000).

Key environmental features include the Sacramento, American, and Yuba Rivers, Folsom Lake, expansive agricultural lands, large deciduous and conifer forests, the western slopes of the Sierra Nevada Mountains, and many smaller lakes, rivers, and wetlands throughout the planning area.

**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**
Due to the expansive nature of SACOG’s jurisdiction, economic activities vary greatly across the planning region. The presence of extensive agricultural lands in El Dorado, Yuba, Yolo, and Sutter Counties contrasts with urbanized areas in Sacramento County and western Placer County. The degree to which each area is urbanized dictates the type of industries present in those areas.

Additionally, the mountainous terrain in most of Placer and El Dorado Counties contrasts with the low-lying topography of the other four counties. This dynamic affects the movement and distributions of goods and services while shaping the seasonality of economic activity.

**EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY**
SACOG is foremost a transportation planning agency. The agency is the regional metropolitan transportation planning organization (MPO) and is therefore responsible for developing the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The current regional transportation planning document is considered a model for integrating transportation and land use planning. Initiated in 2002, the Blueprint Project implored area citizens and planners to develop a regional plan that would reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), promote a jobs/housing balance, improve air quality, combat climate change, and manage regional population growth through 2035 without promoting additional sprawl. Implementation of the Blueprint Plan by member entities is optional, however, the primary contributors to the document were members from the local jurisdictions.

SACOG has a Board of Directors comprised of county supervisors and city council members from each of the counties and cities in the SACOG region. In addition to the Board, SACOG also has five standing committees consisting of board members as well as 13 advisory committees composed of regional experts from various professions.
LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY
In December 2004, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted the preferred Blueprint for the Sacramento Region. The document provides a regional planning vision through 2050. The Blueprint is an ambitious plan to preserve the region’s natural resources and quality of life through land use planning techniques such as compact urban growth, increased alternative transportation infrastructure, and implementation of smart growth principles. None of the six counties or twenty-plus cities in the Sacramento council of governments is required to implement the Blueprint; however, development of the plan required extensive input from the local level planning staffs. According to SACOG publications, member governments are openly adopting the blueprint objectives.

One major component of the Blueprint vision is the 2035 MTP, approved by the Board in March 2008. The MTP seeks to balance the existing regional land use pattern, projected growth and associated travel demands with a region-wide public desire for maintaining the small-town feel of the region’s many communities. This tricky balance is compounded by California’s recent legislation (SB 375 and AB 32) which require steep cuts in carbon emissions in the coming years. Specific strategies proposed in the 2035 plan include a tripling of transit services, approval of land uses to support a more efficient jobs/housing balance, and consideration of road expansion projects that support added bus and bicycle/pedestrian access.

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS
Distance alone decreases the likelihood for substantial interaction between the SACOG region and the Truckee Meadows. Nonetheless, the importance of SACOG, and the Sacramento region in general, as a wider region stakeholder should not be discounted purely on distance. Sacramento is the largest metropolitan area within 150 miles of the Truckee Meadows, and as a region has a population three times larger than the Truckee Meadows. Accordingly, just as the Truckee Meadows’ environmental and economic influence radiates outward, so too is the case for Sacramento, only Sacramento’s radius of influence is larger.

Whether the 2050 Blueprint vision is realized or not, SACOG stands as a model of progressive regional government. The agency is producing remarkable planning documents calling for sweeping changes to the current land use/transportation relationship. Scenario planning efforts have enabled SACOG planners to present realistic growth options to the public and local governments. To this end, SACOG is also a nearby regional planning resource.

Finally, while SACOG’s actions may not be felt directly in the Truckee Meadows, its influence is perceptible in the stakeholder community as a whole. As mentioned, Placer County is a member government of SACOG. Future planning actions in Placer County, identified as a significant stakeholder in the wider region, will likely have SACOG’s fingerprints all over them. These activities may have ripple effects throughout the wider region.
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY
The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has regional land use planning jurisdiction over all but a sliver of the Lake Tahoe basin. The basin consists of lands within the States of Nevada and California. Local jurisdictions represented in the TRPA Compact include Placer County, El Dorado County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe in California and Washoe County, Douglas County and Carson City in Nevada (See Figure 19). Although Alpine County, California shares a small portion of the Lake Tahoe watershed, it was not included in the Compact.

The key geographic feature in the Tahoe basin is Lake Tahoe, 72 miles in circumference, 22 miles long north to south and 11 miles across east to west. Additional natural resources in the basin include conifer forests, the Sierra and Carson Mountain Ranges, as well as 63 smaller tributaries to the lake. Land area in the basin totals 312 square miles and the lake’s surface area covers 191 square miles (UC Davis State of the Lake Report 2008). Three quarters of all land area in the basin is under federal ownership, mostly the US Forest Service.

Lake Tahoe is accessible via a number of routes including State Route 431 (Mt. Rose Highway), Highway 267 and Highway 89 from Truckee, US Highway 50 west from Carson City and east from El Dorado County, and State Route 207 from the Carson Valley. The most direct route from the Truckee Meadows, SR 431, establishes a 25 mile long link between the south Truckee Meadows and North Lake Tahoe.

Population within the basin is difficult to estimate due to the seasonal variability of home occupancy. The likely year-round population is approximately 66,000, however, this number is said to swell to as high as 200,000 during the months of July and August. Throughout the course of a typical year, three million visitors are likely to enter the Tahoe basin.
ECONOMIC SUMMARY
Although the TRPA is not directly associated with economic development within the basin, the agency is impacted by fluctuations in economic activity. The primary economic drivers in the Tahoe economy are seasonal tourism - gaming, outdoor recreation, sightseeing - and the many services that rely on the tourism industry such as retail, lodging, and recreational services. Other primary economic drivers include construction, real estate, and the government sector.

Housing prices are generally higher in the Tahoe area than in most other locations throughout the wider region. Many shoreline properties maintain real estate values in excess of $10 million, while upland properties in select locations throughout the basin often exceed $5 million. The variability in seasonal population indicates many second homes.

EXISTING PLANNING PROGRAM SUMMARY
TRPA emerged as a regional planning entity in 1969 following the signing of the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact by the governors of California and Nevada, and the ratification of that Compact by the US Congress.

Per the Compact, TRPA’s mission is to cooperatively lead the effort to preserve, restore and enhance the unique natural and human environment of the Lake Tahoe region now and in the future. In order to accomplish this objective, the Compact, as revised in 1980, gave TRPA authority to adopt environmental quality standards, called thresholds, and to enforce ordinances designed to achieve the thresholds. The Compact identified nine environmental thresholds: water, air, soil, fish, wildlife, scenic resources, noise, recreation, and vegetation. Success in meeting benchmarks in each of the nine thresholds is evaluated periodically.

Development, implementation, and revision of the TRPA Regional Plan mirrors achievements in meeting the key thresholds. The current plan was adopted in 1987 and has a planning horizon of 20 years. Agency efforts in updating the Plan began in 2006 with the Pathways 2007 program. The Pathways program entailed numerous public workshops, working group meetings, public comment periods, and third party studies to support new policy language. To date, however, the Plan has yet to be updated. A number of factors hinder publication of an updated plan, one of which is widespread disagreement among property owners and policy makers as to what the basin should look like in 2030. Foremost is the issue of growth, specifically the degree to which new development of all scales should be allowed in the coming years. Until a new plan is adopted, the 1987 plan remains in effect.

TRPA employs a number of professional personnel including environmental and land use planners, scientists, legal personnel, and administrative staff to implement the Regional Plan. Planning policy and development decisions are made at various levels. There are two decision making bodies: the Hearings Officer and TRPA Regional Governing Board, which review and approve planning and development proposals. An Advisory Planning
Commission advises the Governing Board on technical matters for the more substantial items. The 15-member Governing Board is comprised of seven members from California and seven from Nevada with one non-voting presidential appointee.

TRPA’s Regional Plan is inclusive of a number of documents including the Regional Goals and Policies, the regulatory code, plan area statements (165), community plans (16), master plans, design review guidelines, as well as other programs, plans, and reference documents that are adopted as policy. The Regional Plan, in addition to the nine environmental thresholds and TRPA Compact guide planning activities within the basin. The community plans and plan area statements provide detailed planning goals, designations, and considerations, resource management objectives, and context specific land use planning requirements for every portion of the basin.

**Long-Term Planning Summary**

Assuming the updated Plan maintains the same underlying planning principle as the existing Plan, the key long term planning objective for the TRPA will be maintaining the lake’s famed clarity. The Agency will likely carry out this objective by limiting future population growth to existing developed areas, establishing clear and measureable stormwater management policies to prevent sediment loads entering the lake, minimizing impermeable surface areas by limiting development footprints (land coverage) for all development, and regulating boat activity on the lake. Additional core planning policies currently in place that will likely remain as part of the updated plan are regulations that limit shoreline development, forest management standards, excavation limitations, wildlife (including fisheries) habitat preservation requirements, and stream environment zone (SEZ) development restrictions. These planning standards reflect the mandate given the agency as part of the nine environmental thresholds.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**

Lake Tahoe is the cornerstone of the wider region. Consequently, the relationships between Tahoe and each of the many other stakeholders identified in this report are numerous and dynamic. Paramount among the list of issues are water, recreation, and housing. The Lake Tahoe Basin, by virtue of either the lake itself or the Truckee River, is a primary water source for 11 of the 18 local and tribal entities included in this analysis. The Truckee Meadows, the main downstream user, relies on the Truckee River System for 85% of its water.

This heavy burden on water resources prompted negotiations that led to the signing of TROA in September 2008. One of the many aspects of TROA includes strategies for managing releases from Tahoe into the Truckee River. Clearly this arrangement has benefits for the Truckee Meadows and other downstream users in terms of consistent river flows and flood control, but it also entails potential impacts to economic and environmental conditions within the basin. The top six feet of Lake Tahoe is considered a reservoir and subject to the demands of downstream needs as laid out in TROA. As water levels rise and fall between
6223.1 and 6229.1 feet above sea level, economies and habitats that rely on specific water levels may be impacted. Notably, lower water levels often spell closures of boat ramps, boat docks, piers, and even navigable access to Emerald Bay on Tahoe’s south shore.

In addition to water, Lake Tahoe is perhaps the most popular recreation destination for residents throughout the wider region, and specifically within the Reno/Sparks area. Seasonal influxes of visitors into the basin impact air and water quality. At the same time, the local economy depends on the deluge for profit.

Housing and transportation are also likely areas to consider in future discussions between TRPA and TMRPA. Housing is typically less affordable in the Tahoe basin than elsewhere in the wider region. This dynamic prompts many who work in the basin to live elsewhere. Commuting traffic, in turn, adds additional traffic to the basin’s mountainous arterial roadways and may lead to air quality concerns.

Politically, the basin’s overlap across other stakeholders and proximity to the Truckee Meadows is also significant. TMRPA’s jurisdiction is contiguous with the TRPA’s. Planning activities undertaken by the two agencies in the Mt. Rose area on each side of the mountain may impact each other. Moreover, Washoe County and three other county or city stakeholders included in this report maintain jurisdiction within the basin. In the case of Washoe County, regional planning within the county is carried out by both TMRPA and TRPA. The TRPA Governing Board and Truckee Meadows RPGB also have a common member - Washoe County Commissioner John Breternitz - which may further link the two agencies.

Finally, Lake Tahoe is critically important to the economic vitality of the wider region as a whole. Tahoe is a magnet for national and international visitors. Recent marketing efforts by Reno, Sparks, Truckee, Carson City, and others included Tahoe in their campaign as a major attraction. These advertising strategies symbolize the importance of fostering coordination between planning activities in the basin with efforts throughout the wider region.

SECTION IV: NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBAL STAKEHOLDERS

OVERVIEW

The Washoe Tribe, Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, and Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe possess sovereign lands within Washoe County and throughout the wider region. Tribe members are frequently invited to sit on various planning boards and as a result influence public policy making in the region. The Pyramid Lake Paiute tribal lands are located northeast of the Truckee Meadows surrounding Pyramid Lake. Washoe tribal lands are less homogenous, with land dispersed in smaller enclaves mainly south of Washoe County in Carson City and Douglas County. The Reno-Sparks Indian Colony holds sovereign lands throughout Washoe County including a roughly 59-acre portion of land within the City of Reno and a 1,920 acre area of land north of the Reno-Sparks metropolitan area. It is noteworthy to mention
that additional Native American tribes were considered as part of the research leading up to
this report. Among these were the Western Shoshone, Modoc, and other Paiute tribes not
associated with any of the three groups listed below. Only the Washoe, Reno-Sparks Indian
Colony and Pyramid Lake Paiutes were selected due to the most immediate relationship to
planning issues in the Truckee Meadows.

**PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE**

**GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY**

Pyramid Lake is the terminus of the Truckee River. The lake and the land immediately
surrounding the lake is considered the sovereign land of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe. The
total land area governed by the Tribe amounts to roughly 742 square miles, 175 square miles
of which is the surface area of Pyramid Lake (See Figure 20 next page). The on-reservation
population is approximately 1,298 members; an additional 1,147 tribal members reside off
the reservation. The reservation is located roughly 32 miles east of the Truckee Meadows
and is accessible via the Pyramid Lake Highway or Interstate 80. The primary population
centers within the reservation are Sutcliffe, Nixon, and a portion of Wadsworth. The large
majority of the reservation area is within Washoe County with only small segments in
neighboring Pershing and Storey Counties.

Reservation lands are mostly contained within the Pyramid Lake drainage basin with
additional lands extending southward straddling the Truckee River. In addition to Pyramid
Lake, the primary geographic features within the PLPT reservation are the Truckee River, Pah
Rah Mountain Range, Anaho Island Wildlife Refuge, several seeps and drainages, and the
Pyramid Lake fishery. Due to the high salt content of water entering Pyramid Lake from the
Truckee River and surrounding inlets, lake water is brackish. The lake’s typical salt content
is approximately 5,000 parts per million (ppm).

**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**

The Pyramid Lake Paiute tribal economy is supported mostly by tourism and recreation
activities at the lake. Boating, fishing, and camping are the most popular activities at the lake,
which in turn support local stores, RV parks, campgrounds, and smoke shops throughout
the reservation.

Paramount to the future economic and planning success of the Pyramid Lake Tribe is the
Tribe’s reaction to Public Law 101-618, also known as the Fallon Paiute Shoshone Tribal
Settlement Act and the Truckee-Carson-Pyramid Lake Water Rights Settlement Act. The
Nevada State Legislature approved the negotiated settlement at the end of its 1990 session.
The settlement agreement included: provisions for the allocation of water and water rights
from the Truckee and Carson Rivers and resolution of outstanding litigation (now covered
in TROA), the continuance of Truckee River water diversions for the Newlands Project, and
the payment of $40 million to the PLPT for economic development and $25 million for
fisheries restoration.
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Based on meetings with tribal planning staff, a condition of being able to access the $40 million economic development fund is the preparation of a comprehensive economic development plan. The plan must outline how the Tribe intends to spend the $40 million and demonstrate long-term quality of life and economic prosperity for the tribal members. After several false starts over the past two decades to develop an acceptable plan, the Tribe is the process of developing a more robust economic development plan for the reservation in hopes of receiving and putting to use the $40 million (with interest) set aside in 1990.

According to PLPT planning staff, the new economic development plan is anticipated to contain five parts: recreation and fishing; improvements to existing commercial operations; promotion of new or expanded industrial and commercial development; renewable energy development; and agriculture. The plan is expected to contain a policy component to guide overall economic development activities as well as an implementation element to provide time lines and funding allocations for specific projects. Expected to be included in the new plan is the potential for expanding the Tribe’s economic base to add gaming in the southernmost section of the reservation near Interstate 80; however, gaming is not anticipated to be a defining element of the plan.

Within the scope of the plan, the economic drivers being considered by the Tribe include ecotourism, mineral extraction, and geothermal energy production. The Tribe also expressed interest in the potential for wind energy generation on the reservation. There is currently a utility scale wind project consisting of over 40 large wind turbines proposed in the Pah Rah Range west of Pyramid Lake. The project is not on tribal land but is expected to be visible from the reservation. PLPT members are working with the project developers to ensure the proper steps are taken to mitigate the Tribe’s concerns.

**Existing Planning Program Summary**

Land use planning and all other political decisions are reviewed and executed by the Tribal Council. The Council consists of 10 members. The PLPT does not currently have an adopted master planning document. The Tribe anticipates the new economic development model will guide future land use decisions and support a more coordinated planning effort. As mentioned above, existing development on the reservation is limited primarily to three small populated areas. Infrastructure and services are provided by the Tribe.

**Long-Term Planning Summary**

Based on a meeting with tribal planning staff and a review of tribal newsletters and the Tribe’s web page, the key planning and environmental issues facing the Tribe are water quality and quantity, air quality, terrestrial and aquatic species management, and cultural resource protection. Paramount among these topics is the issue of water. As the terminus of the Truckee River, water quality and quantity of river water entering the lake is of the upmost concern to the tribe. A series of court decrees and agreements promulgated throughout the past century ensure adequate river levels to support aquatic life in the Truckee River.
Most recently, TROA marked the culmination of nearly two decades of negotiations between the Tribe, State of Nevada, State of California, the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) and the US Department of the Interior. The agreement sets forth strategies for managing upstream storage facilities (Boca, Prosser Creek, Stampede Reservoirs, etc), to permit adequate river flows that will support the endangered cui-ui and Lahontan Cutthroat Trout fish species.

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS
Despite TROA, a web of litigation and disagreements involving the PLPT and adjacent water users persists. According to a discussion with Tribe members, the PLPT is concerned about the manner of water use being pursued in the Truckee Meadows and the ability of the Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility located in Sparks to maintain an adequate level of downstream water quality. The Tribe relies on studies by UNR, the Desert Research Institute (DRI), and the US Army Corps of Engineers to monitor surface water quality. According to information provided by tribal members, total maximum daily loads (TMDL) and total dissolved solids (TDS) often reach unacceptable levels and result in negative impacts to aquatic habitats.

The Tribe is also concerned with the amount of water being diverted from the Truckee River at Derby Dam to support the Newlands Project. Tribal members are concerned that diverted water is used less as a source of irrigation than in the past and more for industrial uses. The Tribe is considering strategies that will reduce the amount of water being diverted eastward to Churchill County and increase flows into Pyramid Lake.

Along with surface water, the PLPT is also involved with groundwater monitoring, research and litigation. According to the Tribe, there is a fundamental disagreement in the manner in which the Nevada State Engineer allocates groundwater rights within and surrounding the reservation. The Tribe contests it has federal rights to ground and surface water located on the reservation as its rights date to 1859 - prior to the inception of Nevada as a state. The State Engineer, per the Tribe, claims authority to allocate groundwater from basins found within the reservation. Of particular concern to the Tribe is the proliferation of industrial development in the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Park located near the reservation’s southern border. The State Engineer allocated 3,000 acre feet of groundwater rights to the TRIC. As development continues and extraction rates increase, the Tribe is concerned the draw down will result in negative impacts to surface water and subsequently to wildlife dependent on the surface water flows. The Tribe currently has a case pending in the State Supreme Court to curtail TRIC’s groundwater withdrawals.

Aside from water resources, the primary connection between the PLPT and the Truckee Meadows is via recreation at Pyramid Lake. The lake is a popular location for a range of outdoor activities. The tribe maintains concerns regarding desecration of important cultural resources surrounding the lake. As the wider region’s population grows and demand
for outdoor recreation increases, additional strains may be placed on Pyramid Lake and the surrounding shoreline. However, if well managed, the PLPT may stand to benefit economically from the increased tourism while preserving the Tribe’s culturally significant resources.

Ultimately, protection of cultural resources - including Pyramid Lake, the Truckee River, and their fish populations remain the tribe’s central planning focus. Tribal planning staff expressed a clear desire to be more involved in an expanded regional planning process, which would enhance communication between the Tribe and surrounding stakeholders - including TMRPA.

**RENO SPARKS INDIAN COLONY**

**GEOGRAPHIC SUMMARY**

The Reno-Sparks Indian Colony (RSIC) holds the rights to 2,022 acres of sovereign lands within Washoe County including 1,920 acres in Hungry Valley and nearly 60 acres west of Highway 395 between Mill Street and Glendale Avenue. Other lands are located in Spanish Springs, South Reno along South Virginia Street and in Verdi. The roughly 60 acres in the center of Reno is the colony’s core community. Here, there are high density and intensity residential, commercial and industrial land uses. The administrative offices for the colony are also located in this area. The Hungry Valley land holding is significantly larger but less populated. According to RSIC planning staff, there are approximately 180 residential units on one-acre or larger parcels in Hungry Valley with no commercial development. Development on the remaining land holdings consist mainly of commercial activities such as smoke shops, car dealerships, and fast food restaurants.

Collectively, 90 percent of colony land is vacant. Of the remaining 10 percent, nearly half is residential, while the remaining land is split between commercial/industrial uses and community facilities.

Several Native American groups make up the RSIC including Paiutes, Shoshone, Washoe, Cherokee, and Navajo. Collectively, there are approximately 950 colony members and 1,150 residents living on colony land.

**ECONOMIC SUMMARY**

The colony’s primary economic drivers include commercial developments on colony land throughout the Reno/Sparks area and the new Tribal Health Center. Tribe members are active in the Truckee Meadows employment community, holding positions in various economic sectors off the reservation. Federal funding programs in the form of grants, tax incentives, and similar mechanisms supplement tribal incomes.

According to the RSIC Comprehensive Plan, in 1997, the average household income for Colony residents was approximately $15,000, compared to nearly $39,000 for Washoe
County residents in the same year. In the same time frame, 35 percent of Colony residents received income from a source other than employment, e.g. Welfare, social security, disability, etc. According to RSIC planning staff, the Tribe’s long term economic goal is to become economically self-sufficient by eliminating ties to income assistance programs.

**Existing Planning Program Summary**
Planning staff at the RSIC carry out current and long range planning activities for the Tribe. Recent planning efforts have focused on the Jensen Parcel located along the Truckee River northwest of the Grand Sierra Resort. A long standing development proposal for the property includes a Wal-Mart supercenter. Prior to development, the site required substantial brownfield remediation and flood control enhancements. These improvements are nearing completion.

All planning decisions are ultimately reviewed and decided upon by the RSIC Tribal Council. The Council consists of nine Tribe Members including a chairman and vice chairman.

**Long-Term Planning Summary**
The RSIC Comprehensive Plan, adopted in 2000, is divided into two parts. The first half of the document provides a demographic, economic and geographic profile for the Colony as a whole. The second part offers parcel-level development guidelines and planning objectives. Based on review of this document and a meeting with RSIC planning staff, the Tribe has a strong desire to proliferate commercial development on its various properties, while enhancing quality of life for Colony residents through residential and community facility improvements.

In addition to the Wal-Mart project, the Tribe is considering new development projects on the main Colony Road parcels that will include mixed-use development in the TOD corridor along Mill Street. The Tribe also foresees a continuation of single-family residential development projects on the Hungry Valley properties. Currently, matching federal funding allows for the construction of 2-3 homes per year.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**
RSIC tribal lands interweave with city and county land throughout the Truckee Meadows. In many ways, the RSIC land might be compared to large land holdings by a private developer. However, tribal parcels are considered sovereign lands, with independent government and generally not subject to local or regional government regulations. Nonetheless, as a stakeholder in the Truckee Meadows, and by default the wider region, RSIC has incentive to work with local governments and TMRPA to advance regional interests.

As a stakeholder, RSIC imparts influence on the regional transportation system, water resources, economic base, and social system. For example, the new developments proposed
on the Jensen parcel and along the Mill Street TOD corridor will benefit the Tribe as well as the community as a whole.

Finally, as development in the Truckee Meadows trends northward, development pressures on Hungry Valley land may become an issue of concern. Ongoing coordination between the RSIC, TMRPA, and the local governments in the Truckee Meadows will be important in future planning activities related to Hungry Valley.

**Washoe Tribe**

**Geographic Summary**

The Washoe Tribe is a federally recognized Indian Tribe organized pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, as amended. The Washoe Tribe’s aboriginal territory extended from Honey Lake in present-day Lassen County, California south to Mono Lake in Mono County, California. While the Washoe lived mainly on the eastern slopes of the Sierra, ancestral tribal territory includes Lake Tahoe and portions of the western Sierra as well. According to tribal representatives, many Tribal members continue to use resources within the aboriginal territory in the same manner as did their ancestors.

Presently, the Tribe has four federally recognized communities: Stewart, Carson, and Dresslerville in Nevada and Woodfords in California. The Tribe also has many smaller communities and tribal trust lands distributed throughout the wider region. Tribal headquarters is located in the community of Dresslerville in Douglas County. The Tribe also has communities and tribal land in Douglas County, Carson City, Washoe County, Alpine County, Sierra County, and Placer County (See Figure 21). This distribution of tribal land represents the wide influence of the Washoe Indians throughout the region.

![Figure 21: Washoe Tribal Lands](image-url)
In 2008, the total acreage of Tribal Trust land amounted to 5,237 acres, with an additional 65,420 acres of allotments (public domain land owned by individual Washoe heirs that can be sold out of tribal ownership). According to the 2000 Census, the on-reservation tribal population is 1,016 members. An additional 540 Tribal members live off the reservation.

Key environmental resources in the aboriginal tribal territory include Lake Tahoe, the Carson and Truckee watersheds, the Pine Nut Range in Douglas and Lyon Counties, many smaller lakes and streams, and the conifer forests flanking the Sierra Nevada and Pine Nut Mountains.

**Economic Summary**

According to the 2008 Comprehensive Land Use Plan, nearly 85 percent of the on-reservation population is classified as very low income (i.e. those earning less than 50 percent of the national median income). The Tribe completed a socioeconomic profile of the Washoe membership in 2005-2006. The profile showed that approximately 80% of Washoe household incomes were below the state averages for Nevada and California.

Recent efforts to expand Tribal commercial enterprises, in conjunction with the successful administration of grants and contracts, are producing positive economic results for the Tribe. These revenue sources now account for a majority of the Tribe’s income and, according to tribal staff, will need to continue growing in order to compensate for steadily declining contributions from the federal government.

Tribal enterprises are located throughout its ancestral territory and include smoke shops, convenience stores and similar retail businesses. Examples of these businesses are the Meeks Bay Resort and Marina on the west shore of Lake Tahoe, the Stewart and Dresslerville Ranches in Douglas County, and a gas station and car wash in northern Douglas County. The Washoe Development Group manages these businesses.

**Existing Planning Program Summary**

All tribal decision making is carried out by the 12-member Tribal Council, however, each of the four communities has a separate governing Community Council. The tribal council is comprised of the Tribal Chairman, two members each from the Carson Colony, Dresslerville Community, Stewart Community, and Woodfords Community, one member from the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony, and two members from off the reservation. The chairman is responsible for carrying out the day-to-day administrative functions of the Tribe.

One of the Tribe’s fourteen identified administrative functions is planning. Land use planning is guided by the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which was adopted in 1994 and updated in 2008. The Plan includes an overview of the Tribe’s land use, key natural and cultural resources, economy, and provides specific planning objectives for several individual parcels held by the Tribe.
LONG-TERM PLANNING SUMMARY
Key themes identified in the Comprehensive Plan include self governance, cultural protection, social and human services, land and natural resources, and economic development.

Fundamental strategies discussed in the plan are to participate in the decision-making processes of local governments, seek to minimize negative land uses adjacent to trust lands, ally with those who might advance tribal goals, support new commercial development, and ensure new development on tribal land is consistent with overall tribal values. The Tribe frequently consults with local, state, and federal governments for joint planning and natural and cultural resource protection.

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS
The Tribe’s primary population center and land holdings being located more than 40 miles from the Truckee Meadows may reduce the degree of interaction between the Tribe and the Truckee Meadows. However, the Tribe’s ancestral territory spreads across much of the wider region including the Truckee Meadows, resulting in an important stakeholder relationship. Development projects occurring in the Truckee Meadows and throughout the wider region may impact the Tribe’s current and ancestral ties to the land. Accordingly, the Tribe monitors and provides comments as necessary for development proposals throughout the ancestral territory and on or adjacent to Tribal lands. Further coordination may be needed between the Tribe and other wider region stakeholders to ensure the Tribe is considered as part of any current and long-range planning discussions.

In addition, the Tribe’s plans to continue commercial development throughout the wider region may constitute an ongoing area of interaction between the Tribe and the wider region. TMRPA’s efforts through this wider region project may assist in creating a forum to discuss land use, natural resource, economic, and other related issues important to the Washoe Tribe and other wider region stakeholders.

SECTION V: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STAKEHOLDERS
OVERVIEW
Economic development is not currently a component of the Regional Plan, however, understanding and establishing a relationship with the wider region’s economic development leaders may prove beneficial in achieving the Plan’s policy objectives. The economic development stakeholders summarized below represent a range of economic interests throughout western Nevada and eastern California. Each entity has a geographic extent that covers groups of the local-level jurisdictions detailed above. Some information may overlap, but the objectives of each entity in the area of economic development is clearly distinguishable from the governmental and tribal stakeholders. These organizations typically provide information, data analysis, and support services geared toward private business development. The focus of economic development is usually on a shorter timeline than a local government master or general plan, but not to the point where the two functions are
mutually exclusive. In fact, each relies on the other in order to craft a vision and plan for the future.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF WESTERN NEVADA

AGENCY SUMMARY

The Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada (EDAWN) provides economic data and business development information for the northwestern portion of Nevada including the counties of Washoe, Pershing, Churchill, Lyon, Storey, Douglas, and Mineral. Carson City is also included (See Figure 22). With the exception of Mineral County, all the jurisdictions in EDAWN’s service territory are identified as wider region stakeholders.

EDAWN is a private/public partnership with a mission to recruit and expand positive economic investments that will improve the quality of life in the greater Reno-Tahoe region. EDAWN envisions the region as being a diversified, resilient regional economy comprised of primary businesses that contribute positive economic impact.

EDAWN has a Board of Trustees consisting of over 50 representatives from businesses and local governments throughout the Region. The nine member Board of Trustees Executive Committee is the organization’s primary leadership body.

ECONOMIC SERVICES AND OBJECTIVES

One of EDAWN’s primary functions is to serve as a data portal for regional economic development information. EDAWN collects and maintains data relative to key business sectors such as logistics, manufacturing, clean energy and software development; stores an inventory of area businesses; and offers relevant economic trends data for new and existing business partners.

In 2005, EDAWN began a strategic planning process called Target 2010. The Plan’s key priorities are to encourage entrepreneurship, maintain and enhance the region’s quality of life.
life, build infrastructure to support high tech development, and promote a regional approach to economic development.

**STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS**

EDAWN provides economic support to businesses throughout its regional territory, which includes ten of the stakeholders identified in this wider region analysis. The development authority has lofty objectives to generate an ever increasing amount of new business activity in the region. EDAWN’s success requires support from the many affected wider region stakeholder groups, and vise versa. Maintenance of existing business and introduction of new business increases local revenue streams - leading to a win-win situation for both parties. In these challenging economic times, a strong and experienced economic partner may prove invaluable for the wider region.

**SIERRA BUSINESS COUNCIL**

**AGENCY SUMMARY**

The Sierra Business Council’s service territory is less well defined than the other agencies but generally covers a wide area along the Sierra front including Lake Tahoe, Truckee, Sierra County, Nevada County, Plumas County, Placer County, El Dorado County, Alpine County, and even as far south as Mono and Inyo Counties. For the most part, SBC’s reach does not extend into Nevada.

The agency is a non-profit organization of more than 500 businesses, agencies, and individuals throughout the region. The agency views environmental quality as the key to economic prosperity and natural resource conservation as being essential to building regional wealth.

The SBC has an eleven member Board of Directors consisting of private business people, elected officials, and agency directors from throughout the Sierras.

**ECONOMIC SERVICES AND OBJECTIVES**

SBC has a distinct mission to promote economic and social development while at the same time preserve and enhance the unique natural environment of the Sierras. The agency works to achieve its mission through a combination of programs, including for example: downtown improvements, energy conservation and renewable energy, “think local first” programs, ecosystem services markets, general plan updates, carbon footprint offset projects, policy research, educational forums, and leadership training.

**STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP ANALYSIS**

As the preceding section demonstrates, SBC is a clearinghouse for regional information, a forum for local leaders to gather and discuss regional issues, and a facilitator for land use and natural resource planning throughout eastern California. SBC has or is in the process
of facilitating general plan development for the Town of Truckee, City of South Lake Tahoe, Placer County, and Plumas County. SBC has also been actively involved in major development projects of regional significance in Truckee, Kings Beach (Placer County), and South Lake Tahoe.

Together, SBC’s input into general plan updates and individual project development is creating a positive environmental impact locally and regionally. SBC-facilitated projects often entail lower environmental footprints via increased water efficiency, reduced energy consumption and resultant lower carbon emissions, more efficient land usage, and incorporation of alternative transportation components.

The Sierra Nevada Mountains are the source of water, recreational opportunities, and the invaluable ecosystem service of air filtration (photosynthetic conversion of CO$_2$ to O$_2$ by vegetative cover) for the wider region, including the Truckee Meadows. Any positive effort such as that advanced by the SBC to maintain the economic, social and environmental quality of the Sierra is sure to transfer positive outcomes to the wider region.

**SIERRA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION**

**AGENCY SUMMARY**
The Sierra Economic Development Corporation (SEDCorp) consists of member governments and businesses throughout the Sierras including Placer, El Dorado, Nevada, and Sierra Counties, Town of Truckee, and City of South Lake Tahoe. The organization advances the vision of economic, social, and environmental wealth across the region. SEDCorp provides financial and technical services to member organizations. The organization also acts as a liaison between business and local government funding sources.

SEDCorp has a Board of Directors consisting of elected representatives from three county members and five city members, six private sector representatives, and two at-large positions for agriculture and chamber of commerce. The Board meets quarterly.

**ECONOMIC SERVICES AND OBJECTIVES**
SEDCorp’s objectives under the umbrella of promoting economic, social and environmental wealth include fostering collaboration and support throughout the region; increasing employment opportunities, especially in rural areas; creating a vibrant tourism industry; ensuring adequate wastewater, water, road, and utility services; promoting environmentally-responsible development and energy self-sufficiency; reducing fire hazards; and encouraging an adequate housing supply to support a range of income levels.

SEDCorp carries out its mission through a variety of projects and activities, a sampling includes: a rural revolving loan program, business development classes, fire safe council training, Small Business Administration (SBA) micro loans, community loans, development of housing needs assessments, and preparation of regional reports. Examples of SEDCorp
reports include a biomass/wood utilization study; fire safe plans; economic indicator reports; and various economic feasibility studies.

**Stakeholder Relationship Analysis**

SEDCorp influences decision making in land use planning activities for several wider region stakeholders. Member governments include Placer, Sierra, and Nevada Counties as well as the Town of Truckee: the four most significant upstream stakeholders on the Truckee River. Effective management of growth and natural resource consumption in this section of the wider region will translate into a positive outcome for the remainder of the stakeholder community.

Moreover, by promoting a healthy, stable, vibrant and environmentally-responsible rural region, SEDCorp will play a role in advancing the same positive qualities in the wider region. SEDCorp may further its objectives by working not only with its member groups but also with SBC and adjacent local governments not included as SEDCorp Board Members.

**Western Nevada Development District**

**Agency Summary**

Western Nevada Development District (WNDD) has a similar geographic scope as EDAWN but does not include Washoe County. WNDD’s seven county region includes the counties of Pershing, Douglas, Storey, Mineral, Lyon and Churchill as well as Carson City (See Figure 22). The agency’s objective is to provide for a diversified economy and tax base for the region. WNDD carries out this mission by providing a forum to address common concerns of a regional nature; providing grant writing and administration services; and being an advocate for intergovernmental cooperation between counties, cities, general improvement districts, and state and federal agencies.

WNDD has a Board of Directors consisting of local government elected officials, and private sector representatives from various industry sectors. Local government members are appointed by county commissions and city councils.
Economic Services and Objectives
In 2007, WNDD’s Board of Directors adopted a series of objectives for fiscal years 2008-2012. In addition to those objectives listed above, the Board included as a priority the implementation of the NorthernNVision strategy. The plan is being developed by an independent contractor to determine the unique assets present in each county within the WNDD region. Through a series of three reports, the consultant will profile each county, propose a set of visions for future economic development, and the final report will list strategies to enhance and market existing assets in order to expand the economic base of the member counties. While the reports will focus on each county’s unique assets, the program is intended to have a regional focus that will promote the economic potential of the WNDD region as a whole.

In addition to NorthernNVision, WNDD provides a range of economic development services. The agency primarily works on behalf of the public sector to develop project applications and secure funding for the implementation of projects such as airports, wastewater, industrial parks, and downtown improvements. WNDD also provides assistance in the development of feasibility studies.

Stakeholder Relationship Analysis
WNDD has a regional focus and appears to value the individual assets of each of its member local governments while recognizing the importance of working at a regional level to enhance the economic well being of the region as a whole. Economic vitality of local governments has a profound impact on the economic, social, and environmental health of the wider region. Struggling local economies have negative ripple effects on the greater region, for instance in the form of higher unemployment rates, declining services and industrial capacities, and reduced ability to promote key social and environmental services. With the exception of Mineral County, each of WNDD’s member county governments is identified as a wider region stakeholder.

Moreover, five of WNDD’s seven county government members are contiguous with Washoe County. The proximity of these stakeholders, as discussed throughout the report, entails a heightened level of interaction with the Truckee Meadows.

A note on the interplay between EDAWN and WNDD: with the exception of Washoe County, the two economic development agencies share the same geographic boundary. It appears each agency relies on the same regional data set for economic information and both used the same consultant - Angelou Economics - in the development of their respective economic visioning plans. Beyond these connections, the extent to which these two seemingly overlapping agencies interact is unclear. This connection should be explored in greater detail as this project moves forward.
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## Appendix A - Stakeholder-Theme Relationship Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>TRANSPORT</th>
<th>URBAN PRESSURE</th>
<th>JOBS/HOUSING</th>
<th>RECREATION/OPEN SPACE</th>
<th>POPULATION GROWTH</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARSON CITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCHILL CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALLON</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERNLEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASSEN CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYON CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODOC CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSHING CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACER CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUMAS CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLPT</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDCORP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUCKEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHOE TRIBE</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart describes the nature of the relationship between a given stakeholder and the Truckee Meadows based on seven key topic areas. Checked boxes indicate the foremost linkage(s) as identified in the research.
APPENDIX B - STAKEHOLDER CONTACT INFORMATION
The following list contains web addresses and phone numbers for each of the stakeholders. The web addresses and phone numbers are for the respective planning or community development departments, if applicable. This list is current as of July 28, 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>WEB ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carson City</td>
<td><a href="http://www.carson-city.nv.us/Index.aspx?page=174">http://www.carson-city.nv.us/Index.aspx?page=174</a></td>
<td>(775) 887-2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.churchillcounty.org/planning/">http://www.churchillcounty.org/planning/</a></td>
<td>(775) 423-7627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fallon</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cityoffallon.com/">http://www.cityoffallon.com/</a></td>
<td>(775) 423-5107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fernley</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cityoffernley.org/index.aspx?NID=74">http://www.cityoffernley.org/index.aspx?NID=74</a></td>
<td>(775) 784-9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.douglascountynv.gov/sites/CDAdmin/index.cfm">http://www.douglascountynv.gov/sites/CDAdmin/index.cfm</a></td>
<td>(775) 782-9005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAWN</td>
<td><a href="http://www.edawn.org">http://www.edawn.org</a></td>
<td>(775) 829-3700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.co.lassen.ca.us/govt/dept/com_dev/default.asp">http://www.co.lassen.ca.us/govt/dept/com_dev/default.asp</a></td>
<td>(530) 251-8269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lyon-county.org/index.asp?nid=166">http://www.lyon-county.org/index.asp?nid=166</a></td>
<td>(775) 246-6140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modoc County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.modoccounty.us/index_files/Page501.html">http://www.modoccounty.us/index_files/Page501.html</a></td>
<td>(530) 233-6406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada County</td>
<td><a href="http://new.mynevadacounty.com/planning/">http://new.mynevadacounty.com/planning/</a></td>
<td>(530) 265-1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pershingcounty.net/planning.htm">http://www.pershingcounty.net/planning.htm</a></td>
<td>(775) 273-2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Community">http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/Community</a> Development.aspx</td>
<td>(530) 745-3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLPT</td>
<td><a href="http://www.plpt.nsn.us/">http://www.plpt.nsn.us/</a></td>
<td>(775) 574-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSIC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rsic.org/services.asp?action=planning">http://www.rsic.org/services.asp?action=planning</a></td>
<td>(775) 785-1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sacog.org/">http://www.sacog.org/</a></td>
<td>(916) 321-9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sbcouncil.org/">http://www.sbcouncil.org/</a></td>
<td>(530) 582-4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sierracounty.ws/">http://www.sierracounty.ws/</a></td>
<td>(530) 289-3251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDCorp</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sedcorp.biz/">http://www.sedcorp.biz/</a></td>
<td>(530) 823-4703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storey County</td>
<td><a href="http://www.storeycounty.org/planning/">http://www.storeycounty.org/planning/</a></td>
<td>(775) 847-0966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.trpa.org/">http://www.trpa.org/</a></td>
<td>(775) 588-4547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe Tribe</td>
<td><a href="http://www.washoetribe.us/">http://www.washoetribe.us/</a></td>
<td>(775) 265-8600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNDD</td>
<td><a href="http://wndd.org/">http://wndd.org/</a></td>
<td>(775) 883-7333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>