

MEETING MINUTES

COALITION BOARD

SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION

September 22, 2020

In attendance: Commissioner Justin Jones, Chair, Clark County
Councilman Brian Knudsen, Vice Chair, City of Las Vegas
Councilman Richard Cherchio, City of North Las Vegas
Councilman Scott Black, City of North Las Vegas
Councilwoman Claudia Bridges, City of Boulder City
Councilwoman Olivia Diaz, City of Las Vegas
Councilman Dan H. Stewart, City of Henderson
Commissioner Tick Segerblom, Clark County
Councilman Dan Shaw, City of Henderson (via teleconference)

Absent: Trustee Lola Brooks, Clark County School District

Agenda Item 1. Call to Order; notice of agenda conformance with Nevada Open Meeting Law Requirements

The meeting of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition Board was called to order by Commissioner Jones of Clark County at 4:02 P.M., on Thursday, September 22, 2020, in the Clark County Commission Chambers at 500 Grand Central South, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89155.

Agenda Item 2. Roll Call

Members of the SNRPC Coalition Board, as listed above, were present at the time of roll call, with the exception of Trustee Lola Brooks, Clark County School District and Councilman Richard Cherchio, City of North Las Vegas arrived at 4:03 p.m.

Agenda Item 3. Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Agenda Item 4. Approval of the Agenda for September 22, 2020

A motion was made by Councilman Knudsen to approve the agenda for the September 22, 2020 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 5. Approval of the Minutes for the August 25, 2020 meeting.

A motion was made by Councilman Knudsen to approve the minutes for the May 26, 2020 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 6. CBER 2020 Long-Term Population Forecast for Clark County, Nevada 2020-2060.

Ayoub Ayoub with the Southern Nevada Water Authority briefly went over CBER, and that it is a population forecast and an annual activity that was completed in June 2020. The forecast shows the continued growth throughout the forecasting horizon which is 2060.

A motion was made by Councilman Stewart to receive the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 7. Consideration of an agreement with CBER for the production of a Clark County Population Forecast.

Ayoub Ayoub with the Southern Nevada Water Authority presented an agreement with SNRPC and SNWA to fund CBER annually. The contract gives an option of one year or two year renewal.

A motion was made by Councilman Black to approve the agreement. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 8. Continued discussion for possible action on the purpose, direction, and structure of SNRPC.

Councilman Knudsen briefly went over SNRPC's history in Southern Nevada, and that over the last couple of years there have been questions regarding the purpose of what the SNRPC body entails, the intent, and what can be accomplished by the board. SNRPC was intended to help with the regional planning effort. Over time, a strong relationship was created between each jurisdiction, on how they work together in the long and short range planning of Southern Nevada as a region. Over the last couple of years representatives from each jurisdiction didn't find value of the SNRC Board. Several strategic planning workshops took place to guide the future of SNRPC and one outcome of the workshop was the consideration of disbanding SNRPC. Councilman Knudsen was appointed to SNRPC a year ago. He has been clear and passionate about the organization of the board, and feels as if there is a lot of value in each of the jurisdictions getting together to discuss issues of regional significance. Mr. Knudsen worked with City of Las Vegas team to put together a draft inter-local agreement, and policies and procedures that outline the next phase of the SNRPC. The information that was pushed forward by members of the board were taken into consideration while creating the drafts. The intent was to possibly move away from a regional planning land use perspective and move into planning from a variety of different issues. There have been several conversations between the staff members at each jurisdiction that are relevant. The following are the highlights of some of the issues or challenges with the draft inter-local agreement:

- Changing of the name – Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition to the Southern Nevada Council of Governments.
- Establish the County as the home body. Providing the legal, clerk, and fiscal agent.
- Funding formula to be population based.
- Going towards government affairs type work, lobbyist, or advocate that would work with each member and jurisdiction to help identify issues of regional significance and issues where there is consensus amongst the elected officials and to establish an agenda for the state and federal agencies.

The challenges and questions that came up at the staff level are as follows:

- The inclusion of a business or private member of the public to serve on the board.
- The funding allocation breakdown to make it population based, or a different formula.
- The process for selecting outside firms, whether it be an RFP process or another process.
- The funding with continuing this organization and what that funding would look like from each jurisdiction.
- Staffing of the SNRPC and whether it continues on a rotation basis or stay with the county.
- Questions regarding the policies and rules document.

Councilman Knudsen went over each of the highlighted points. The intention for adding a private sector representative, the Chamber of Commerce for example, to sit in and to be a part of the decision making process as a region.

Commissioner Jones stated that legal counsel for Clark County, Rob Warhola, Esq., weighed in from a legal basis. Commissioner Jones is okay with the idea of including a private member but doesn't want to create statutory issues.

Rob Warhola, Esq. with Clark County stated that the statute identifies the voting requirements for elected officials and doesn't grant authorization to allow someone from the private community to be on the SNRPC board. Mr. Warhola said that it is a good idea, and they can be a part of the Technical Committee, other committees, or consult them, but right now there is no authorization to allow a business person from a private community to have voting rights on the SNRPC Board.

Councilman Shaw stated that he would be very reticent to add someone with voting capacity if they are not also paying and he is not sure how that would play out.

Councilman Stewart stated that by possibly inventing an advisory committee, they can supplement or augment the Technical Committee, or replace the Technical Committee in order to get private input and not go against the grain of their bylaws.

Commissioner Segerblom stated that he would be opposed to having the Chamber on the board. Why would they want business interest? They serve on a lot of the boards where there are too many people already on there, and you never get a decision. It means the bureaucracy ends up running everything, and he feels the less people the better. The more elected people the better. If you're going to pick someone who is not elected, why would you pick a business over some other group?

Councilman Cherchio stated that he likes the idea of having input from a private sector but doesn't believe that they should be a part of the board. They are there representing their constituents, making the decisions on all matters concerning their municipalities. Councilman Cherchio would prefer them to be in a committee or advisory form, so they can maintain their form on the board as electives.

Councilwoman Bridges stated that she doesn't mind an advisory committee or outside advisors, but is wondering who will the business representative represent? She believes that the business representative will represent a particular business or perspective that might not benefit the group and jurisdictions.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he would like to strike from the draft inter-local agreement the inclusion of a business or private member of the public to serve on the board and possibly working out a stronger agreement with RTC, Southern Nevada Strong, which is a steering committee, and SNRPC body to help with the business advisory area.

The second issue is allocation breakdown. The conversation from the July 28, 2020, meeting was the opportunity for the population based funding which would put most of the funding on Clark County, and the distribution would be based on population. From the staff level there was a request to make it more equitable at cost restrictions. The caveat there is the School District, which Trustee Brooks has not been participating in, he believes (Clark County School District) does not want to participate going forward.

Commissioner Jones stated that they will assume that the Clark County School District will not be participating under any funding structure. In regards to population base, Commissioner Jones thinks it makes sense that Clark County is almost half the population, unincorporated Clark County, and is asking the other board members for their consideration, in terms of their population, and in other areas like SNPLMA. He feels that it is only fair for the County to put in its fair share of its represented population.

Commissioner Segerblom asked if they have the votes for the amount of money they pay.

Councilman Stewart is wondering if it will be bias about entities paying more. He's concerned about inequity.

Councilman Knudsen stated that there is a longstanding sense amongst many of the previous elected officials that there is a lack of trust amongst the jurisdictions, and there is a resemblance of that in staff discussions, a lack of trust amongst how the jurisdictions will respond and he is hopeful that they can try to move forward trusting each other. Councilman Knudsen understands that at times they may not agree with each other, but they should be able to talk to each other and figure out what is in the best interest of Southern Nevada.

Commissioner Jones stated that regarding funding there is consensus. As to how they move forward and have trust and decide on the issues about a consultant pushing forward, that will have to be consensus. Commissioner Jones doesn't want to be put in a position where all the effort they are putting in doesn't lead to anything because they can't decide on what the two issues will be

and collectively pursue. The board will either agree to what their priorities are going to be going to the legislature, federal funding or not, and if not, then the experiment will have failed. Commissioner Jones believes they can get there and doesn't think the funding structure ought to play into that.

Councilwoman Diaz stated that she is in agreement, and that as a region, there is a lot of collaboration and coordination in areas of improvement that all municipalities need. She believes there is strength in unity and strength in seeing areas that overlap where they have some short comings, and how they can in a coordinated fashion make an ask at the federal level and state level, because here they are seeing that they need to fill in the gaps, and they need to make sure that they are providing for their community. Councilwoman Diaz believes the good outweighs the maybes. There will always be a municipality that might not be facing the severity of other municipalities in the same space, and she believes there is a way they can build consensus on how they can arrive there, and gain in a productive conversation and collaboration with one another.

Councilman Shaw stated that all of the successes, which were great successes, occurred without the SNRPC body's involvement at all. Every member serves on various committees and boards where there is representation from all municipalities. From the funding point of view, the allocation can be worked out, but for him personally, he will be hard-pressed to go back to the city, while they are laying off people due to COVID, and they are trying to re-build. Sales tax is down, property tax revenue is down, and say that they need to fund another board. Most of the things the SNRPC board is talking about are covered by other boards. It will be hard for him to recommend paying for a lobbyist when every municipality has its own lobbyist. How can you go about doing that without a conflict of interest? He also stated that he sees the board duplicating efforts that all of them are already doing and paying more money. Someone would need to convince him that this overrides laying off people and cutting their budgets.

Councilman Knudsen stated that there are so many issues and items. They have lobbyist and are all working towards the best interest of each of their respective organizations. There are so many things that fall through the cracks, and there is a reason why Southern Nevada fails to meet the demands of the legislature every session and Northern Nevada doesn't. Northern Nevada is highly organized. There is a series of different municipalities and organizations up there that band together to fight for things that are important and relevant to Northern Nevada. Southern Nevada struggles to do that as a region. Individual organizations are able to lobby individual things, but there are many things in Southern Nevada that fall through the cracks which are evident by the fact that we are at the bottom of every good list and the top of every bad list. There is no one real entity that is responsible for the overall help of Southern Nevada. For example, education, they now see that broadband and access to technology is significantly lacking as a region and there is no one individual organization responsible for that. There are a number of examples that they can point to over the last decade where Southern Nevada has failed to organize, regionalize, and collaborate to bring about a healthier Southern Nevada.

Commissioner Jones stated that there is consensus on the allocation and to move onto the third point. Regarding Councilman Shaw's point, Commissioner Jones understands it, and it is a discussion that they will have amongst their own jurisdictions. There is money currently in the SNRPC account this year, and some in which can be used for these efforts.

Councilman Knudsen stated that assuming the board moves forward and there is an allocation based on population, how they would make selections for a government affairs firm. How do they select that? If the County is the lead agency, they would have to take the lead on what is appropriate with guidance, discussion, and direction from the SNRPC board. Mr. Knudsen's thought would be that the County would go before the SNRPC board with a process and solicit opinions.

Commissioner Jones asked the other board members if they had any feelings or opinions on what process would be used for selecting a consultant.

Councilman Stewart stated they need to identify the issues and gain a consensus on them, and then determine how a consultant or consulting firm will help them solve the problem or issue. Until they know what the body is focused on, it might be premature until they understand collectively where they want to go with this.

Commissioner Jones asked Mario Bermudez and Councilman Stewart how the process for selecting consultants worked in the past.

Mario Bermudez with Clark County stated that in the last couple years when they hired the consultant for the Census Outreach and they were going to use the County process, but found out it was too long; therefore, the City of Las Vegas took over because they could get through the process much quicker.

Lisa Corrado with the City of Henderson stated, the last two Census Outreaches were done by RFP, and CBER is done by sole source. SNRPC is subject to what NRS tells them is the basic, but whoever has the capacity to run the RFP process follows their thresholds for whatever amount of money to compete that. The tradition has been that a representative from each entity sits on that panel.

Mario Bermudez stated that it's up to \$1 million dollars before they would need the County Commission board approval to move forward with an RFP. He's not sure how it can legally play out if they use the County's process, would they go to the County Commission as well as the SNRPC board or is it just the SNRPC board which is a question for the legal staff?

Rob Warhola Esq. stated that he will need to do some research.

Commissioner Jones asked about prior RFP's that SNRPC has done that haven't gone back through the local jurisdiction.

Mario Bermudez stated that they didn't go back to each local jurisdiction for approval of that RFP, but the SNRPC board itself did it.

Lisa Corrado stated that the inter-local would have to go back to each entity, but in regards to spending money, it goes to the SNRPC board. Unless Mr. Warhola researches otherwise.

Rob Warhola, Esq. stated that in regards to the process, he would like some time to do research, whether or not the RFP can come back to this board and make the decision, rather than the County

or the Cities, and possibly something to put in the inter-local agreement. If all the jurisdictions agree through a certain process, they submit to the SNRPC board, that's how they may approach it instead of putting it into the rules.

Councilman Knudsen asked fellow board members if they identify issues before they bring someone on, or do they bring someone on to identify issues. He thinks in this agenda item, that they should talk about the issues that are important to each of them, or it can be a part of the agenda at the next meeting. That will help drive the process moving forward or bring someone on to help identify the issues.

Councilman Stewart stated that Purdue Marion & Associates helped the SNRPC board a year ago through several workshops, trying to identify issues. Mr. Stewart stated that he would suggest the board identify the issues and go forward. If they decide on a firm to identify issues, that would be a different discussion. He believes that the issues need to be identified before going for a government affairs type of firm.

Councilman Knudsen stated that at the next board meeting, each member is to get together with managers from their jurisdictions and figure out what are the issues of regional significance that the cities or county aren't addressing and that need to be addressed, and be prepared to talk about it as an agenda item.

Councilman Knudsen moved on to the next topic. Do policy topics need to require a unanimous vote?

Councilman Shaw stated that he's not sure if it requires a unanimous vote, but he thinks it should be a super majority.

Rob Warhola, Esq. stated that it requires 2/3 votes for budget approval.

All board members agreed to the 2/3 required vote.

Councilman Knudsen went onto the next topic of staffing, and stated that in the previous iterations, it rotates between each of the jurisdictions. Right now, it is setup as the representative who is the chair of the organization. That person represents the staffing body and from Mr. Knudsen's experience, switching staff for an organization every year is confusing, and lack of commitment from any staff to the organization, and if the County is willing to staff SNRPC, take their offer.

Commissioner Jones asked Nancy Amundsen if she was still willing to allow the County to utilize her staff for SNRPC. Commissioner Jones understands that there are somethings that need to be worked out from the District Attorney's perspective, and they will continue to have those discussions in regards to legal representation.

Councilman Shaw asked if staffing was free.

Nancy Amundsen with Clark County stated that Jenny's hours are billed back to SNRPC. She also stated that Jenny is a Comprehensive Planning employee.

Councilman Shaw stated that at some point they will have to look over what the cost is as compared to a staff member.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he thinks that's a valid point, and it is something they need to take into consideration on what impacts it has on the County, and to receive an impact statement from the County saying this is what it is, and that will be in consultation with any consultants the board brings on, and make adjustments as needed.

Commissioner Jones asked how many hours a month is Jenny spending on SNRPC.

Jenny Penney with Clark County stated anywhere from 15- 20 hours depending on what's going on with the board.

Councilman Shaw stated they would need to see if it would be cheaper to hire their own staff and have them focus full time on what SNRPC is doing.

Councilman Stewart believes that it will depend on the issues. If it is a big issues then they might need to hire their own staff.

Nancy Amundsen stated that at one time SNRPC had a fulltime secretary but they found that as the SNRPC business was decreasing, they were paying someone to sit and do nothing. That's why they changed the format, there is still a position available, but it will depend on the board's determination as to what type of position they need.

Councilman Knudsen went over the last topic, that given the conversation at this meeting, he believes they can make adjustments to the inter-local and the rules document, and bring them forward for approval at the next meeting if appropriate. His hope is to bring it to the next legislative session, so SNRPC can be a recognized organization from a legislative perspective.

Commissioner Jones stated that if it is adopted next month, then yes.

Councilman Knudsen stated that his action items will be to take the meetings conversation and make adjustments to the draft inter-local and policies and procedures document. The staff need to have appropriate conversations with other jurisdiction staff members to solicit any other feedback. Taking today's conversation and implement the discussion into the document which will be up for approval at the next board meeting. A discussion about appropriate issues of regional significance which will drive the conversation with the County on funding and potential government affairs consultant in a process the board would undertake given the consideration from legal counsel.

Commissioner Jones stated that they formally need to know if the school board is going to opt out of being a part of the inter-local agreement, and to make an offer to the City of Mesquite to be a participant.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he has made multiple attempts to contact the City of Mesquite, and they have not responded. He also mentioned that there was a conversation amongst the school board staff members as being a member, that wouldn't be required to sign the inter-local, but still

be a part of the board.

Agenda Item 9. Citizens Participation. Public comment during this portion of the agenda must be limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the Board. No subject may be acted upon by the Commission that subject is on the agenda and is scheduled for action.

No citizen's participation occurred.

Agenda Item 10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 P.M.