

MEETING MINUTES

COALITION BOARD

SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION

February 25, 2020

In attendance: Commissioner Justin Jones, Clark County
Councilman Brian Knudsen, City of Las Vegas
Councilman Scott Black, City of North Las Vegas (via teleconference)
Councilwoman Claudia Bridges, City of Boulder City
Trustee Lola Brooks, Clark County School District
Councilman Richard Cherchio, Vice Chair, City of North Las Vegas
Councilwoman Victoria Seaman, City of Las Vegas (via teleconference)
Councilman Dan H. Stewart, City of Henderson (Arrived at 4:11 P.M.)

Absent: Councilman Dan Shaw, City of Henderson
Commissioner Tick Segerblom, Clark County

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 Councilman Cherchio City of North Las Vegas, at 4:03 P.M., on Tuesday, February 25, 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 Dan H. Stewart, City of Henderson, who later arrived at 4:11 p.m., Dan Shaw, City of Henderson, and Tick Segerblom, Clark County.

Agenda Item 3. Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Agenda Item 4. Approval of the Agenda for February 25, 2020

A motion was made by Councilman Cherchio and seconded by Councilman Knudsen to approve the agenda for the February 25, 2020 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 5. Approval of the Minutes for the January 28, 2020 meeting

A motion was made Councilman Knudsen to approve the minutes for the January 28, 2020

meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 6. Receive a presentation by the Vegas Chamber and City of Las Vegas on the 2020 Southern Nevada Forum.

Paul Moradkhan with Las Vegas Chamber briefly went over the Southern Nevada Forum's history. The Southern Nevada Forum was founded in January of 2013. It was an effort spearheaded by speaker Marilyn Kirkpatrick, City of Las Vegas, UNLV, Chamber of Commerce, and other local governments present for the meeting that was held at UNLV. There were the members of the community to help identify issues that were not just important for one jurisdiction for the business community, but issues that would help move the entire community forward. The result was that they went to the legislative session as a united front on a variety of issues. The forum was created as a need for Southern Nevada Working United Coalition. The population, of course, is in Southern Nevada and we have the most seats, but previously there was conversation about how they could work together and get bills through. They had their first meeting in 2013, but they never created a solid foundation where there was an effort from stakeholders, elected officials from Southern Nevada and legislators to work together to fill the forum. Over time and every session since then, they have ran 15 different bills that emerge from the forum that resulted in community engagement, input, elected officials of Southern Nevada, and legislators. A couple of the highlights from over the years includes several bills; for example, in 2013 there was the Fuel Revenue Indexing Bill that was created and we now benefit from as a community, UNLV School of Medicine in 2015, and the Nevada States Grants Counsel that many have engaged on which was created in 2015. Because of the forum, in 2017 for example, Regional Mental Health Board, 2019, there was support to push the K – 12 funding forum, and a lot of other efforts have emerged from the forum. The forum's purpose has been a community initiative for everyone to work together, to move all the parties together as a united front. The great thing about the forum is it has had Republican and Democrat support, they have legislatures on both sides of the isle at the assembly and senate working together, and they have seen these issues not just move our community forward, but the entire state. A lot of these efforts have not just benefited Clark County, but have helped our rural communities, and including Reno. These have helped transform our community.

Kelly Crompton with the City of Las Vegas stated that the format of the Southern Nevada forum is made of five counties that Paul Moradkhan from the Las Vegas Chamber and herself are a part of. They meet with legislature leadership, and they talk through how they want to make up the committees. For a while they had six counties, and now they have five counties. They ask them for their input and their leadership in appointing members to each subcommittee. Each member of each chamber of the legislature, the assembly Democrats, Republican assembly members, the senate Democrats, and Senate Republicans each appoint a member from their caucuses to be the co-chairs of each committee. From there they staff them through conference calls, and they figure out how they want to work through the next seven months of the off year of the legislature interim session. They have a meeting in January that includes every single committee, any community stakeholder, any member of the business community, and local government elected officials. They get together, they talk about their previous achievements, what they look at as a format for the year, and then they break them out to brainstorm in three different sessions. The community members get to say what they want to talk about FRI, K-12 spending, higher education board structure. They can throw out any idea to be placed up on the board, the staff takes the information, and they break

out into subcommittees. The committees will be meeting in the next couple of months, and they have an August deadline where they will bring the committee back together and hash out what the priorities are for each committee. After redefining those ideas from each committee, they'll talk to the legislative leaders and help spearhead a bill because the Southern Nevada Forum doesn't have any bills allocated from them to the legislature. Elected officials at the state level take some of their allocated BDRs and they run the Southern Nevada Forum priorities through that process. Then, they meet again in January so that everyone knows what their priorities are, and they head to the legislature in February.

This year, they have five committees and in the past, they had six. Over the last two sessions they have brought together higher education and K-12 education which were separate committees. There was a lot of cross over and they were talking about the same things, so they brought the two committees together and now they have five committees. The Economic Development and Work Force Committee. The co-chairs of that committee are Senator Nicole Cannizzaro, Senator Keith Pickard, Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, and Assemblyman Tom Roberts. They will meet every second Wednesday of the month at 2:00 p.m. at the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce. They will talk about economic development, workforce areas, and anyone can join the committee's conversations. The community can bring up any ideas that they may have and register their opinions on what they want to see for the legislative agenda.

The Education Committee. The co-chairs are Senator Joyce Woodhouse, Senator Scott Hammond, Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, and Assemblywoman Melissa Hardy. This committee meets every second Tuesday of the month at 4:00 p.m. at the City of Las Vegas. They will be handling higher education and K-12 education ideas. Each committee works in tandem with the interims standing committees from the legislature.

Healthcare Committee's co-chairs are Senator Yvanna Cancela, Senator Joe Hardy, Assemblywoman Connie Munk, and Assemblyman Glen Leavitt, they meet every fourth Friday of the month at the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce.

Ms. Crompton stated that she feels the board members would be interest in this committee which is the Good Governance Committee. Paul Moradkhan heads this committee, and it handles a lot of things that effect local government and how they operate. The co-chairs of this committee are Senator Mo Dennis, Senator Keith Pickard, Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, and Assemblyman John Hambrick. They are still working through their schedule, but they should have dates for them shortly.

The last committee is Transportation and Infrastructure. The co-chairs for this committee are Senator Chris Brooks, Senator Scott Hammond, Assemblyman Howard Watts, and Assemblyman Gregory Hafen. They meet every fourth Wednesday of the month at 8:30 a.m. at the City of Las Vegas.

Paul Moradkhan stated that the next steps in the timeline for the Chamber, as Ms. Crompton indicated, is the committees currently meet once a month and will meet until the end of July. Most meetings will wrap up in June, but they are given the option to work through some additional topics. Between now and then, as Ms. Crompton had mentioned, there will presentations on a monthly

basis, and those committees will narrow down those topics and at their last meeting either in June or July. They will pick their top three issues, and then in August, when they meet in the City Hall at the City of Las Vegas, the committee will go back together to ratify those 15 topics which will be assigned to different co-chairs who will then use one of their personal BDRs or committee BDRs to run those BDRs through Carson City. The forum itself does not have BDRs. After August, the staff liaisons will work with the legislature and stakeholders on bill language and submit that to the Council Bureau who attend all these meetings, so they are kept in the loop as they work through the process. Then, in January 2021, they will reconvene one final time at City Hall for the kick-off meeting for the session where the legislatures will present the BDR numbers and the general topics and parameters of those particular bills. There will be staff assigned to help present those bills in Carson City. Once they get into session, their two teams, the Chamber, and the City of Las Vegas, will work with their staff on communication on when the bill will be heard, time of the hearing, if they need to activate staff, and part of the responsibility is that the Chamber commits to resources. They have Dylan Keith from the Chamber staff and he handles all the logistical databases and e-mail address notifications, both staffs commit time resources to make sure that community members know what is occurring and they have a new website that is up and available SouthernNevadaForum.org, all the meetings, dates, and chairs of the chamber information is listed on the website. To clarify, you do not need to be a member of the chamber or City of Las Vegas resident, as long as you're in Clark County and you're interested in the ideas to be involved, it is open and free.

Councilman Stewart thanked Mr. Moradkhan and Ms. Crompton for their presentation and mentioned that he didn't know much about the forum. It looks like something that could be very productive. Councilman Stewart asked if this was generated through some legislation of the state or is it more of an informal get together.

Paul Moradkhan replied that it is a community initiative and the forum is very organic on the way it works. It was not created by the Nevada Revised Statutes; it was a result of community engagement. Community stakeholders wanted to get together and that is why the Chamber and the City of Las Vegas have been staffing this. They do not charge anyone, and they underwrite the cost, as a part of their initiative to give back to the community. It has been a very organic approach and has evolved over time.

Kelly Crompton stated that what they noticed, specifically the UNLV Medical School, everyone was supportive of it, and it brought everyone together to unify against one issue. There was a lot of misinformation at one point because they were not having a community conversation in advance of the legislature. This forum allows them to have conversations organically, not being behind closed doors, but in a community format, and then they can go to the legislature as one unified front. Like Paul Moradkhan said earlier most of the legislature comes from Southern Nevada, and we should have some key issue areas that they all agree on.

Councilman Stewart stated that it's a narrow focus as to what the forum is about and getting the collaboration amongst the entities and stakeholders in Southern Nevada to go to the legislature specifically to present as a unified front on certain issues that they agree to do.

Paul Moradkhan stated yes, it is five specific topics. Each one has a topic that will merge, and they

communicate with legislature and the community, but there are some issues that will come up, and they are not for the forum to carry out. If there is an issue that comes up that someone feels passionate about, it may not be perfect for the forum, but the legislature could pick that bill up for a constituent. It is great for the legislature to interact with their constituents on a different level. It is good for the business community to work with the City on a couple of important issues that, historically, they may not have engaged in and vice versa. It has helped to create a collaborative tone overall in Carson City on these issues.

Kelly Crompton stated that it has also allowed for local government and elected officials to have some say in the process as well. They kind of operate in a bubble once they get to Carson City, and they have seen a lot of county commissioners, city councilmembers, and school board members go to the meetings and voice their opinion ahead of time. For example, a commissioner might not agree on something and they know they will go to Carson City with information. The forum will try to work with the commissioner beforehand to get their concerns addressed before they get to Carson City. It has been an organic opportunity for local elected officials to engage in the process as well.

Councilman Knudsen thanked Mr. Moradkhan and Ms. Crompton for their presentation. He stated that he asked them to do this presentation because he felt the future of SNRPC, and hoped there is one, is a partnership of some form, not sure what the partnership would look like between Southern Nevada Forum and SNRPC could be. The outcomes that they presented impacts not only in the City of Las Vegas but impacts the valley. During the recent months, when they have been going to the state and the cities, there are very common themes that will all be severely or significantly impacted by the Nevada State legislature. The opportunity to participate in a more thoughtful manner in the Southern Nevada Forum, not by one individual or elected official but by a collaboration of elected officials on how southern Nevada is represented at the legislature, Councilman Knudsen hopes as they talk about increase in federal funding and having a consistent voice in southern Nevada, it will make a huge impact to the federal delegation and to the state legislatures.

The question about when Southern Nevada Forum was started, Councilman Knudsen was a city staff person, it was Mayor March with the City of Henderson that originally talked about why everyone doesn't get together and talk about what the future of the legislature. The session after that, Commissioner Kirkpatrick and Senator Mike Roberson got together. As a staff person, Councilman Knudsen remembers working on a Southern Nevada Forum at that time. Since then, they've seen great things happen, and he thinks there is opportunity for local government to engage or not, but it is worthwhile to talk about what a partnership would look like for a presented unified voice on the Nevada State Legislature, in conjunction with the great work they have done.

Councilwoman Bridges asked if there was a website.

Paul Moradkhan, SouthernNevadaForum.org, and it is on the last slide of the PowerPoint. Commissioner Jones thanked them for their presentation.

Agenda Item 7. Receive an update about the regional Nevada Statewide Greenhouse Gas

Emissions Inventory and Projections report.

Greg Lovato, Administrator of the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, along with Jeffrey Kinder who is the Deputy Administrator over the air programs, sustainable material management and environmental clean-up programs, thanked the board and Director Henson for allowing them to speak. He and his boss, Brad Crowell, have plans to start meeting with Marci Henson and her department on this topic in the near future to learn how to collaborate on their understanding and planning in order to meet the challenges the state faces in reducing Green House Gas Emissions.

Mr. Lovato stated, as most know as required by Senate State Bill 422, in the 2007 legislative session, NDEP previously produced the report given to the board, once every four years, starting in 2008. Prior to the most recent report, the last edition was in 2016 that included an inventory of emissions through 2013 and a projection through 2030.

As required from Senate Bill 254, from the 2019 session, they are now required to update the report every year to indicate whether Nevada is on track to meet specific goals of the 28% reduction from 2005 State Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) by 2025, 45% by 2030, and include a statement of policies for achieving reductions in Greenhouse Gas Emissions. It is important to note that these are policies and not recommendations at this point. Another requirement is to include a qualitative assessment of whether those policies will achieve the goal of zero or net zero emissions of carbon “Green House Gases” from the state by 2050.

The focus of the report is entirely on in-state emissions and not on energy that may be consumed that is produced out of state. The NDEP of Air Quality Planning within the Environmental Protection Division, who are known to Marci Henson and the Air Quality team, produced the report in coordination with a number of agencies that are listed in the report. Mr. Lovato acknowledged their good work with limited time and resources. Moving forward as they start to develop and implement new policies; a broader range of agencies will be involved to help complete the report and to map out policies to achieve reductions within the purview of the state and the broader economy. The report projects a future greenhouse gas emission, and by future, they are talking about 2017 through 2039, and includes a number of policy assumptions. The key ones on both the state and federal level, the assumptions that are reasonable and justified, but they may not prove to take place and remains to be seen. They assumed that the Nevada Renewable Portfolio standard requirement that was set in place and updated in this last session will be fully met. Another important policy assumption at the state level is that emissions from wildfires which can be very difficult to predict but can be important. There is a lot of work to be done in order to quantify the contribution of greenhouse gas emissions from wildland fires. There is more known about forest fires, as opposed to range land fires. At the federal level, there is a couple of important policy assumptions, one is that we are getting less and less optimistic about the current federal vehicle emissions standards for light duty vehicles, are that they are not further rolled back. There is a proposed federal regulation for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and National highway and Traffic Administration, that were enacted which would change the assumptions that go into our transportation projections and make it more difficult for Nevada to meet the goals laid out in Senate Bill 254. The second assumption, although not as significant given that Nevada doesn't have significant oil and gas exploration and development footprint, are that existing federal

emission standards remain in effect.

Mr. Lovato gave a brief overview of the report before Jeffrey Kinder added to the presentation. The report that is required by the Bill divides greenhouse gas emissions in the state into seven sectors, namely transportation, electricity generation, industry, residential and commercial, waste, agriculture, and land use change, and forestry. There are more interesting or instructive ways to divide up sectors or subdivide within each of the sectors to help inform policy discussions. Today, talking about whether an inventory at local levels makes more sense. City of Reno completed a greenhouse gas emissions inventory and NDEP needs to square the assumptions they put into that report, e.g., the methodologies they used with NDEP's. The NDEP's team would like to talk further with the jurisdictions in Southern Nevada on how they can best allocate resources to learn the most about where the emissions are occurring and where the opportunities are for reduction. Mr. Lovato stated that Nevada has a lot to celebrate in terms on what has been done in the renewable energy sector with coal fire unit retirements, but even with that, it's not enough to get Nevada where it needs to be with renewable energy alone. There is clearly a lot of work to do in the other sectors. The ones that will be focused on are transportation and industrial emissions. NDEP is off to a good start, but it needs to engage in multiple levels with multiple agencies and across state lines to understand where the opportunities are for further reduction.

Jeffrey Kinder presented seven slides of the sectors that make up the GHG inventory. On each slide, there is a trend line, and the trend line will tell us what the historical emission profile was from 1990 through 2016, which was the last year full data was available. From 2016 to the beginning of 2017 through 2019, there is a projection on what the emissions will be based on, what we know today, and current policies in place. The trend line is in million metric tons of CO₂ equivalent that are the units on the trend line. In addition, on each slide there is a table that summarizes some important information about what percentage of state GHG emissions come from each sector and year. For example, on the slide for electricity generation, it contributed 47% of the statewide GHG emissions in 2005, with a decrease to 28% by 2025, and then 25% by 2030. The second number here shows that GHG emission reduction or increase from the sector of 2005 to the relevant year. On the slide the green section is good showing a reduction in GHG emissions.

Based on current reasonable projections for electricity generation, they are estimating electrical generating sector from a 54% reduction from 2005 by 2025 and 60% by 2030. The electricity generator sector has historically been Nevada's largest sector of GHG emissions, but that changed recently with the retirement of two coal fired power plants - the Mojave Generating Station in 2005 and Reid Gardner Generating Station last unit retirement in 2017. Coupled with partial replacement with natural gas fired power plants and the adoption of renewable energy, it has led to significant emission reductions in this sector. In 2008, there were 19 fossil fuel fire power plants operating in the State of Nevada, 17 natural gas, and 2 coal fire powered plants. What is generated in Nevada was counted in the inventory. NDEP is assuming that the RPS is fully implemented in the projections, the plant coal fired generating units do retire as proposed by 2025, and natural gas fired electrical generating units also retire.

The residential and commercial from GHG emissions associated with the combustion of fossil fuels by residences and commercial entities from the trend line is estimated to remain stable with emissions, and on the chart, it shows improvement in energy efficiency with balancing population

growth. Building codes will play an important role going forward when it comes to the requirements of energy efficiency in homes and businesses.

The Transportation sector exceeded electricity generation in 2015 becoming the largest sector of GHG emissions in Nevada. It now counts for nearly 35% of the state's total GHG emissions. If they consider only the existing policies, the transportation sector is projected to remain the largest sector of GHG emissions in Nevada through 2039. Transportation sector emissions are projected to peak in 2020 and are expected to follow a very gradual downward trend. The current tier 3 federal passenger car and light duty truck fuel economy standards are not rolled back.

The industry sector includes emissions from stationary combustion fossil fuels utilized by industry, the emissions created as a byproduct of industrial processes, and fugitive emissions from natural gas and oil systems. Through 2030 the report projects GHG emissions from industry will be the most rapidly increased resource of emissions under current policy parameters.

Mr. Lovato stated that the way the report is put together is, with the exception of the electricity generating sector, they have very specific information on how much fuel, coal, other fuel, and transportation is burned in Nevada, and they can convert that directly into GHG emissions. The numbers are pretty accurate statewide. Looking at industry and residential and commercial, these are indexed in Nevada's percentage of the nation's population. Nevada has an approximate .9% of the nation's population. The projections are based on the nationwide use of these HFCs, which are refrigerants. There is a lot of air conditioning units in Nevada and this could be an underestimate of the actual amount of emissions of HFCs, which Jeff mentioned are predicted to have much more global warming potential than carbon dioxide.

Jeff Kinder talked about the Waste sector. In this sector, emissions are expected to remain a minor contributor to GHG emissions in Nevada. The emissions are disposable treatment of municipal waste and industrial wastewater, which results in the emissions of methane and N₂O. In the previous sector there was a lot of talk about fuel combustion, and here they are shifting to other contributors to GHGs.

The Agriculture sector, which is much like the waste sector, projecting to be a minor contributor to GHG emissions with a projection period to 2039. For Nevada, they are mainly looking at the information for livestock, which produces methane and direct N₂O emissions from the management of agriculture soils. These are the two main contributors to the emissions in this sector.

The final sector is Land Use, Land Use Change, and Forestry, which are unique to the other six sectors. This sector acts like a net for GHGs. Nevada's forest, urban trees, and at times agricultural lands absorb and store carbon from the atmosphere in an amount that offsets the carbon emissions associated with processes such as decomposition and vegetation respiration.

Jeff Kinder briefly went over key data needs. As this report was put together, the vast majority and a significant amount of the information comes from an EPA state inventory tool. All the states use this tool to do a lot of their projections, and as Greg Lovato had mentioned, it brings all the data in, and aggregates it, and then parses it back out to the states based on things such as

population. There is some data needed to further improve the inventory as they move forward. The three listed are transportation, burning fuels which is a direct admitter of GHGs, and they don't get direct Nevada state data, that goes to the EIA and then to EPA and back to NDEP. Being able to get the information in real time would improve their inventory and also move up the date from which the inventory end. Right now, the last full date is 2016. Now, it is 2020, and going forward they are hoping to produce real numbers faster with less projections. Lastly is better understanding our land use, land use change and forestry in the state and how the state currently and through land use opportunities can further carbon sequestration.

Greg Lovato added additional information to the Transportation sector. It is important to help inform their policy choices moving forward with transportation planning, and they listed fuel sales data and Nevada specific vehicle data. They understand the amount of information from DMV and the number of different types of vehicles on the road. What they don't know as much is the vehicle miles traveled for specific types of vehicles. Investing in transportation products, they know that there is a number of studies that the RTCs have done on reducing vehicle miles traveled or specific projects to reduce specific miles traveled. Being able to track real time will help understand any given investment amongst different fleets, e.g., what is the return on GHG reduction. For example, delivery vehicles that make a lot of trips versus single passenger vehicles and then government fleets. They understand that the past session. The DMV is undergoing a pilot program right now. They are starting to collect vehicle miles data, and they will try to make sure that the data is in a format they can use, so by the time a report comes out in December, it will be an updated report.

Greg Lovato went over what they call the "State GHG Report Card." He didn't give grades, but it presents the big picture of where they are at or are absent on any new changes in policy, compared to the goals presented and Senate Bill 254.

The goals listed in Senate Bill 254, are percent reductions from 2005 emissions that were set out in Senate Bill 254, and those are the ones NDEP is comparing themselves to. NDEP is about 4% short by 2025 s. They are pretty close to meeting the 2025 goal, and that is mainly due to the electricity generation sector changes. In 2030, they are quite a bit off and missing their goal of 45% by 19. Highlighting where some of the western states are currently at with their economy wide goals and how Nevada compares. Colorado's target is 50% by 2030, New Mexico is 45% by 2030, California is targeting 40% by 2025, and Oregon is talking about pushing their 2030 goal of 45% to 2035. Utah recently completed a climate road map in January, and they are trying to lay out their options; however, they haven't set any specific reduction goals.

In the policies that were included, there wasn't a lot of details and there wasn't intended to be. They are illustrative and a starting point for discussions. They got the policies from looking at other states that are a part of U.S. Climate Alliance. Those are states, that since the federal government has signaled its intention to withdraw from the Paris agreement, meet certain degree reduction or reduction goals and equivalent greenhouse gas emissions to meet. Those 26 states have signed up including Nevada to meet those goals. NDEP took a look into what was included in the goals that were put in those states plans and included them as things for further discussion. That is how the statement of policies was created in the current report.

The City of Reno, Sustainability Manager Lynn Barker, met with NDEP and she did a crosswalk of the policies listed in their report and compared those to the Climate Action Plan the City of Reno adopted in July of 2019, and there was a lot of overlap. In terms of the range of policies, Mr. Lovato feels as if they hit most of them, but is now figuring out how these should be implemented, or which one should come first. There are opportunities to be aligned with all of the different jurisdictions. They are charged by the Governor to create a State Climate Strategy by December 1, 2020, and they will be providing a schedule in March for what type of outreach and input they'll be seeking in order to develop that, and this will be headed by The Department of Conservation of Natural Resources and The Governor's Office of Energy.

Commissioner Jones thanked Mr. Kinder and Mr. Lovato for their presentation.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he realizes that the report and recommendations are at the state level, but he asked if there are policy considerations at a local level and steps or actions that will be recommended through their facilitated workgroups that will be implanted at the local level.

Mr. Lovato stated yes. The policies they listed try to be respectful of the rules of local government and state government related to land use planning and everything that goes into that, but they are trying to be inclusive and suggestive of the things that should be explored. As the state figures out how they can contribute and what ideas they can suggest, they will be communicating at all levels and understanding what those different roles and responsibilities are. They know that they can't do everything but would focus on what the most critical return on investments are. Some of those might be local or state-wide. Nevada traditionally hasn't adopted California vehicle emissions standards in the past, but they are looking at whether that is something they should pursue and that is an example of something they might review at a state level. There is an opportunity for Nevada to adopt California vehicle emissions standards, but there would be a long discussion that needs to happen, a lot more work to make that decision, but is it something that needs to be evaluated, that is what NDEP is looking at right now.

Commissioner Jones stated that they have a process going forward this year for a State Climate Action Plan. Clark County is going forward with its work to create a Climate Action Plan before the end of the year, and the City of Las Vegas is working on their 2050 Master Plan. There are other jurisdictions that are looking to coordinate. What is the best way to move forward, as everyone is all working in the same direction that we can coordinate together? Commissioner Jones stated that with ten pages of policy options that NDEP has sent out in the report, that there is going to be over the year some identification of which ones will need legislature participation and which ones can be done administratively. What is the best way to all work together towards the same goal?

Mr. Lovato stated that identifying the points of contact for each of the agencies involved and then getting them in touch with NDEP, they hope to have participation in some of the discussions from many different perspectives. The Governor's Office of Energy and NDEP will create a master list. There has been interest from others asking NDEP when they want or need input, and requests to be placed on their list.

Commissioner Jones stated from a timing perspective, bill draft requests have deadlines coming up and administrative deadlines are more fluid than other deadlines, and does NDEP anticipate

before December if there will be decisions made as to what policy priorities will go into the legislature session, so that bill draft requests can be done before the December time frame.

Mr. Lovato stated that he can't tell yet. Last session when Senate Bill 254 was being written, NDEP was asking those types of questions. With Utah creating a road map and NDEP talking about a strategy, Mr. Lovato thinks it's being perceived as a phasing of things, some of which may result in opportunities for other people to take up bill draft requests, probably not the agencies because NDEP's is due soon. There is no promise, but they are hoping to get awareness and early input and try to provide opportunity to the strategy early on.

Commissioner Jones stated that there will be some mile markers along the way. Where it will become clear for some of the policy options that are more viable or better return on investment than others, so everyone can work to make sure those happen.

Mr. Lovato stated that some may require specific analysis, to come up with a recommendation, for anything they do in terms of investing in transportation and infrastructure. There is a big discussion going on right now about sustainable funding for transportation programs NDEP is participating in those discussions and tracking them, so they know that going to the table with more requests is challenging.

Councilwoman Bridges stated that she did not know as much about HFC and PFCs as she has learned today. She knows that for a long time they thought those were great substitutes for the CFCs. Are there other options coming up or being developed that NDEP knows of? It looks like that becomes a significant problem. It becomes a vicious circle as the planet gets warmer and we need more cooling, and the coolant creates more warming.

Mr. Lovato stated that his understanding is that there are a number of discussions happening about what alternatives there may be. There is federal legislation being discussed and drafted related to this, but he's doesn't know the exact prognosis of where it is going to go. In the near term, we can only look to efficiency codes and to reducing demand for use of refrigerants or whether there is reclamation or leak reduction. There might be opportunities to significantly reduce emissions through reclaiming refrigerants and recycling them as opposed to using new ones, but they don't know any of that.

Jeff Kinder stated that there is a lot of discussion on the federal level and fellow states. Their air program is tracking those right now, and everyone is waiting for the best solution; however, as Greg said, we can minimize those emissions through improved handling that is something that can be done today.

Agenda Item 8. Receive an update about the regional planning work program at the Regional Transportation Commission.

Craig Raborn, the Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization Department from the RTC stated, last month they gave a presentation on implementation on the progress across all the agencies for the Southern Nevada Strong program, which they administer on behalf of the SNRPC. During that meeting, Craig Raborn told the coalition board that he would come back with a

presentation about the work program, as to what they are doing as the RTC in administering the Southern Nevada Strong initiative. They are calling it the Regional Planning Program within the MPO, as it is a common structure for MPOs to take this kind of approach. Mr. Raborn gave a quick update on the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) amendment that the RTC recently passed, which formally incorporated these regional planning tasks for the first time into his department's activities. The UPWP is the federally required plan document that describes what an MPO's planning activities will be for the next year or two years, and they are on a two-year plan now. It establishes these core activities and studies and this particular amendment changed the funding for some of the projects.

The amendment made some technical changes. They added funding to their main task of general outreach. This is an example of what is a part of the UPWP. For the first time they put the regional planning tasks into the UPWP. They added two main task areas one that is regional policy planning administration that relates directly to Southern Nevada Strong and the activities the RTC staff will undertake as part of the role of administering that. Its core administration which includes some things relating to the plan that are within NRS that seem to relate to administering the plan by answering questions about the continuity of the plan and working with jurisdictions to collaborate on plan elements addressed in their planning activities.

Regional Plan updates, they are working on four of the regional elements of the plan. The opportunity site, sections of the plan right now, they will be proceeding with that in the next couple of years. Indicator tracking and mapping is something they have been doing on an ongoing basis with the Southern Nevada Strong team. Community planning academy was specifically assigned for the administrator of the plan as an outreach activity. They are turning it into a community planning activity, where in alternating years, they will have one for the general public and one intended for the board members on the local boards and advisory committees. Outreach and communication is the core part of what they do in trying to make sure that people understand what Southern Nevada Strong is, what the plan contains, and how they can participate and advance elements of the plan. Development of the annual report they presented last month.

The second element of the plan is the task where they are adding regional planning and research activities. One thing they have heard consistently when going out and talking with planning staff, stakeholders, and others as well, has been the idea of the implementation of Southern Nevada Strong should involve a think-tank type of approach and that is what they are starting to do. The first one is a future housing inventory and needs analysis. They will look at demographic trends, land use projections, and they will develop a projection of what kind of gaps or needs will be developing over the long run. There has been a lot of recent activity as to what the current housing situation is, but they will be looking 10 and 20 years out. There is a significant transportation implication from housing development patterns as well, and that provides this nexus for them to engage on that as well. The second one is extreme heat. The extreme heat response study, developed a coordinated human services plan which is an assessment of all of the individual services needs of some type, all of the human services resources, and all of the transportation resources and identify what the gaps are, so then strategies can be developed to fill those gaps. Most of the local agencies and many of the regional agencies have their own responses, their own plans in place, but we haven't seen it all pulled together to identify if there are still gaps in services that need to be addressed. This study will at least identify those.

The third one is the inventory of regional sustainability planning tools and techniques, which is basically studying how regions do coordinated sustainability planning. There are basically two models that they know are out there. One where all the individual agencies are developing their own plans and then trying to pull them all together, so they are cohesive. The other approach is where they are essentially coordinated as they go sometimes with a regional agency and sometimes with an informal work group type of a structure. That way following the other approach, the end result as different plans are developed by the individual jurisdictions, entities, or stakeholders, they are all regionally consistent. This will assess the different approaches, and it's laying out the different pathways that could be taken. Once it's done, it will be something that they will pass on to the local agencies and to the SNRPC, and everyone will be able to use it however they would like.

The fourth element is on hold at the moment, as the Southern Nevada Water Authority is considering doing a tree canopy study. This summarizes the kinds of activities they have been doing in part of their role of administering Southern Nevada Strong, but also as the MPO who have a relationship to Southern Nevada strong and the MPO.

The interesting thing about this is the decision the RTC made to put the Southern Nevada Strong team within the MPO. This has allowed them to have a lot more of the work that they do on behalf of the administering of the Southern Nevada Strong be funded with federal planning funds. The real take away from this is, they reduced the RTC's budget for Southern Nevada Strong, the non-reimbursable portion of Southern Nevada Strong, by almost or a little over \$300,000 That concludes the summary of work program and Mr. Raborn plans to come back quarterly to provide updates and will be engaging staffs of all the local agencies and stakeholders as well to make sure that they're helping them with the work programs.

Commissioner Jones thanked Mr. Raborn and no questions were asked.

Agenda Item 9. Consider rescinding the August 2019 vote to disband the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition.

Commissioner Jones stated that at the time the board members that were on the board at that time, from what he recalled, there was a vote to disband the SNRPC or to move in that direction and that vote passed. The item for discussion today is to rescind that prior vote which would allow for the next agenda to be discussed.

Councilman Stewart stated that as everyone knows that the City of Henderson was leading the charge in the process of what SNRPC should be, what its roll is, and if it should continue. Since that time, he has spoken with Commissioner Jones and Councilman Knudsen, and the City of Henderson is in support of rescinding the vote to see what can be done in the next year. If SNRPC can do something and what this could be, give it another year and if nothing can come from it, they will need to revisit disbanding. The City of Henderson is for reinventing SNRPC.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he requested to be on this board, and given the previous couple of years, SNRPC not being as productive as it could have been, his intention is to demonstrate that a regional collaboration will be more effective and he hopes that has been very clear to everyone

on the board. He would like to work very hard to make that work, and if they can't, he will be the first one to say he doesn't want to waste time either. His intention is to work very hard to make sure they can demonstrate that regional collaboration can have an impact.

Councilman Cherchio reiterated his position in previous meetings is to continue with the board and he appreciates his colleague with the willingness to move forward and he believes that there is value in the board and they just need to find their direction. Councilman Cherchio is willing to try and hopefully be able to serve their constituents valley-wide moving forward.

Trustee Brooks stated that she supported disbandment because she feels as if the board keeps spinning the wheels and trying to define what they are doing. She is willing to hear them out on what the next steps are, but she would also need an exit strategy for her organization because she doesn't feel as if CCSD naturally belongs within the SNRPC group.

Councilman Black stated that he concurred with Councilman Stewart by giving it a try for the next year to see if the board can do something meaningful and has an impact in the community, and he has optimism that the board can, and he supports this effort.

Councilwoman Seaman stated that she agrees with Councilman Black to give it a year.

Commissioner Jones thanked everyone for their comments and promised Councilman Stewart that if it can't be worked out in the next year, he will march up to the legislature with him and make sure that the legislature disbands this organization.

A motion was made by Councilman Knudsen and seconded by Councilman Stewart and approved unanimously.

Commissioner Jones stated to Trustee Brooks that part the discussion will include the continuing role for the Clark County School District.

Agenda Item 10. Discussion for possible action on the future and structure of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition.

Councilman Knudsen stated that at the last meeting there was mention that there was some time left with consultant Bill Marion. If that is the case, he thinks two hours to talk about only the future of SNRPC and with everyone sending their ideas or thoughts to Bill Marion, they could revisit what has been done and hopefully not rehash anything again. Taking ideas, thoughts, concerns, issues, and taking a couple of hours to narrow down what that looks like and talking about the schedule of meetings, the frequency of the meetings, agendas of the meetings, and what staff support is needed at the meetings.

Councilman Stewart asked if it's a workshop type setting and would suggest that. Councilman Knudsen stated if everyone is comfortable with that, it would be easier to have a workshop.

Councilman Stewart stated that he agrees with Councilman Knudsen and doesn't want to rehash anything, but he believes that Bill Marion would need to speak to this. There was a lot of work that has been done and it would be beneficial and productive to have a quick recap during the

workshop to get everyone on the same page/level as to what has been done. From there, they can move forward with ideas. Councilman Stewart thinks it would help them to formulate where they want to go or where they are thinking about trying to go if they had a quick synopsis or recap of where they have been over the last year and a half or so.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he agrees with Councilman Stewart and it would be the best way.

Trustee Brooks stated it would be good to know if they have a different vision because many of the members had the conversation, so if they painted a picture for them that they think would be useful, maybe they can add onto it verses rehashing the conversation.

Commissioner Jones stated that he thinks that's a fair point, and frankly from his perspective, he doesn't think it makes a lot of sense for the school district to participate too much in the continuing process, in terms of what the issues are, if the end result is going to be a vote that allows the school district to step out of the inter-local agreement. Commissioner Jones thinks on the next agenda having a vote to allow CCSD to exit the inter-local at the same time they are having discussions amongst the group on what else they are doing.

Trustee Brooks stated that she understands that there are some educational components in the plan, but there are not many. If the SNRPC plans on expanding that, then CCSD can continue, but if SNRPC doesn't, then it doesn't seem like a huge focus for CCSD.

Councilman Black stated that he thinks the plan to have a two-hour rehash of the workshop with Mr. Marion sounds great and he looks forward to it.

Councilwoman Seaman state that she concurs.

Councilwoman Bridges asked if the whole two hours would be rehashing, and that she has all the materials from Marion and Associates in terms of what was discussed before, such as MPO's and what that involved. Councilwoman Bridges' has some ideas and asked would the best thing be to forward those thoughts and ideas to Bill Marion prior to the meeting.

Commissioner Jones answered Councilwoman Bridges by stating yes, forward them to Bill Marion, but they can't be forwarded around to each other due to violation of the open meeting law. We can forward them to Bill and then spend thirty minutes identifying what the issues are and then go on from there.

Bill Marion with Purdue Marion & Associates stated that the recap won't take much time. The objective of the workshop, or of this session, will be to come up with a concrete proposal for a motion that would then be at the next meeting which would outline a recognized structure, funding plan, and staffing plan, so that they would have something very concrete of what will be. That's the intent of the workshop.

Commissioner Jones asked if they needed to do a formal motion or direct staff on this? Mario Bermudez stated that Commissioner Jones can direct staff.

Commissioner Jones directed staff to work with the schedule for the board members to identify a date and time for a workshop.

Commissioner Jones stated in lieu of the March meeting, a two hour session, same date and time. Plan to be here from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. on that day. Does that work?

Agenda Item 11. Identify emerging issues to be addressed by staff or by the Board at future meetings; receive updates on the activities of the various regional boards and commissions; and direct staff accordingly.

Commissioner Jones asked if there were any issues that anyone wants brought up beyond the workshop that they already discussed for the next board meeting?

No issues were brought up.

Agenda Item 12. Citizens Participation. Public comment during this portion of the agenda must be limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the Coalition Board. No subject may be acted upon by the Commission that subject is on the agenda and is scheduled for action. If you wish to be heard, come forward and give your name. The amount of discussion on any single subject as well as the amount of time any single speaker is allowed, may be limited.

No citizen's participation was made.

Agenda Item 13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:26 P.M.