

MEETING MINUTES

COALITION BOARD

SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION

October 27, 2020

In attendance: Commissioner Justin Jones, Chair, Clark County
Councilman Brian Knudsen, Vice Chair, City of 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

Absent: Trustee Lola Brooks, Clark County School District
Councilman Richard Cherchio, City of North Las Vegas
Councilman Dan Shaw, City of Henderson

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 4:03 P.M., on Thursday, October 27, 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, Councilman Richard Cherchio, City of North Las Vegas, and Councilman Dan Shaw, City of Henderson.

Agenda Item 3. Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Agenda Item 4. Approval of the Agenda for October 27, 2020

A motion was made by Councilman Knudsen to approve the agenda for the October 27, 2020 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 5. Approval of the Minutes for the September 22, 2020 meeting.

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

Agenda Item 6. Discussion to approve the proposed Second Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement for the Southern Nevada Council of Governments pursuant to NRS 278.02514 and direct staff accordingly.

Councilman Knudsen briefly went over the history and how the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition Board got to this point, along with the substantial changes in the agreement moving forward.

A little over a year ago, the Southern Nevada Regional Coalition Board had a conversation regarding the strategic planning process, discussed the potential for disbanding, and the vote was split. There was a lot of effort from the City of Las Vegas to look into what disbanding would look like for the SNRPC, which includes each of the jurisdictions pulling out of the interlocal agreement that has been in place for more than a decade. This requires asking a legislature to sponsor legislation that would ban the role of SNRPC. The Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition is closely tied to Southern Nevada Strong and the planning efforts. There are some legal requirements at the state level for a board such as SNRPC.

When Councilman Knudsen came to the board, his intentions were to focus on issues of regional significance. Over the past 6 months, not including the time off from the pandemic, the Board has discussed opportunities to align the region, each of the jurisdictions on regional significance, and what that would mean for the Board. In regards to changes within the interlocal agreement, staff from each of the jurisdictions have been discussing on how to change the interlocal agreement that would allow for the board to focus on the issues of regional significance. In moving from a planning function to a government affairs focus it would allow the Board to bring on a staff member to identify issues of regional significance.

Some of the substantial changes out of the interlocal agreement include the name change, moving from a regional planning coalition to The Southern Nevada Council of Government. Under NRS, it would be allowed as long as the interlocal is changed and the jurisdictions agree to it. The next change would be staffing. Staff moves based on who the chair person is. In Councilman Knudsen's opinion, it is not conducive to the organization because there is no real staff person that is assigned to the SNRPC. The one substantial change is asking the County to manage the clerk, legal, and financial functions of the Board. The third change is the budgeting component. Commissioner Jones has indicated that there is potential for the County to take on the bulk of the budget based on population. The budget would be based on the population in each jurisdiction with the budget defined by this Board to be provided. The next change would be for those services to be provided, looking to bring professional services, consultants, or lobbyists, to identify what the issues are. Where there is a super majority vote of the board, develop a strategic plan to effectuate change. The plan would be to go to the legislature and lobby on behalf of Southern Nevada from this board's perspective or lobby the federal delegation depending on whatever issue the board comes up with.

Councilman Knudsen sees the process, once processed by the board that it would need to be ratified by each of the jurisdictions. It would bring the SNRPC board back to codifying whatever the issues are and bringing on a contract person to help the board effectuate change.

The issues brought up from the staff level are timing. Is the process being rushed? Is it consistent with Nevada Revised Statute and the expectations that were laid out through the legislature? There has been a request by the RTC to have a non-voting member on the board and a request to make non-voting members to not pay dues, which is an amendment Councilman Knudsen requested. Councilman Knudsen stated that a request came from Trustee Brooks, from the Clark County School District, to take a break from the SNRPC Board, but have an opportunity to come back in the future if there is a need for the School District to be a part of the board, which would make another amendment to the agreement. There have been questions regarding how the Board will pick the issues that are relevant to the Board. The consistency in consensus is important. The Board wants to agree on what the issues are but not take on so many issues that the Coalition will become irrelevant. Picking 1 to 3 issues that are relevant and identifying a super majority vote, would be the best way to move forward. The other issue is regarding power and authority. Councilman Knudsen advocates to push forward and if there are better ideas to level out the playing field, as far as power and authority goes, the board should discuss those. Councilman Knudsen believes there should be healthy conversations that are transparent and honest about the future.

Commissioner Jones gave a quick update that this was placed on the agenda for the Board of County Commission meeting to receive input from the Board last week. They had a good discussion and strong support for the Coalitions efforts, ensuring that SNRPC still has an important role. Commissioner Jones asked the County to fund more money, provide staffing, and be able to utilize the County D.A.'s office.

Moving forward, Commissioner Jones recommends selecting one or two issues at this meeting, so the board members can focus on those issues, and meet in January or February to decide on adding additional issues.

Councilman Stewart stated that in an effort to make the City of Henderson clear on the issues, he has a list of issues to bring forward that need to be answered. Until there is clear policy briefs on the issues, he can't say that they have any kind of consensus. Until issues are defined, they don't know what professional firm or lobbyist the Board needs, leaving it open until policy is developed, and decide on what is needed to advance those issues. If the Board potentially hires a government affairs firm on behalf of the Council of Government, the items they try to advance on the Board's behalf should be unanimously approved. Councilman Stewart is not convinced that the Board needs a lobbyist at this point. If the Board is shifting away from the land use planning aspect and changes the name to Council of Government, rather than a planning coalition, and works on broader policy issues, he doesn't feel that the Board should take back administration of the regional policy plan, which is still included in the revised version of the interlocal agreement. They should shift the remaining responsibilities of the existing planning coalition, such as Regional Trail Planning, Population Estimate, and Forecasting, to Southern Nevada Strong. Give each organizations a clear separate purpose, instead of having one organization manage the regional plan and then report to another one on how it is going. The RTC has its own board, and each of the entities are a member of the RTC. It seems redundant to tie those two things together.

Given the current budgetary challenges each entity is facing, it will be difficult for each member to go back to their entities and request additional funds. Councilman Stewart's vision is to start simple with a couple of issues and work together, making sure they have a consensus on those and setting up a structure that works through the issues, and if it needs a lobbyist firm, look into one. There's too much on the table to make any sense on where the board is going, and they need to start really simple, and then move forward.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he agrees with Councilman Stewart and that one of the challenges is for them to identify consensus. Someone has to do that, and he doesn't know how a staff person could do it. There is no staff member for the jurisdictions responsible for the board. This makes it impossible, other than Councilman Knudsen, to sit down with each jurisdiction, and it would be a violation of the open meeting law. There has to be a level on how they come up with those issues, and who puts forward policy papers. Councilman Knudsen feels that the board is at a point where they need to bring someone on and discuss if it maintains Open Space and Trail components an obvious tie to the Southern Nevada Strong plan, and the RTC, and how it is functioning which are complicated conversations and the issue is who will delve through them? If no one is delving through those issues, then it remains in statue that the board will stay on in perpetuity, meaning with no real objectives.

Councilman Black stated that he's been through all the workshops and has seen members come and go. At no point in time did he ever feel that disbandment in its entirety was the right thing to do; however, he also felt that continuing to do the same thing with no results or limited results was not a viable option. Councilman Black was excited at redefining this organization, and he is encouraged by the fact the board has this commitment now to move forward in the right direction. The issues can be worked on in the near future. There's a time limit issue and a sense of urgency, and they don't have an open-ended calendar to figure the issues out. Possibly taking a little more time, missing the legislative window, and having a sound MOU with tangible components will enable them to do something.

Councilman Black asked Councilman Knudsen what is staff recommending that they're not on board with for various reasons, and the council votes it down, what impacts does that have?

Councilman Knudsen stated that there's no rush on anything, and he doesn't know what will change in the agreement. If the agreement doesn't get approved, they will be back to the position they are in now.

Councilwoman Diaz stated a lot of the entities are hesitant because of the dollars, in reference to Councilman Knudsen's comments that each entity needs to redistribute what each municipality will be contributing, and what is the dollar amount? She thinks every municipality is in a bind financially due to COVID-19, and it will be difficult to contribute. Councilman Diaz requested clarity on what the investment is and that it's clear to everyone what they are signing up for.

Councilman Knudsen stated that each jurisdiction is still obligated to pay their share for the board as it stands as that is the existing interlocal agreement. The change is less money from the City of Henderson and the City of North Las Vegas and little more money from the City of Las Vegas and significantly more from the County.

Commissioner Jones stated the transfer of functions to the RTC and SNS, as the board went through the whole process, was one thing that came up, and what functions made sense to transfer to RTC, and he agrees that they do need to make a decision.

A recommendation was made to hold this until the next meeting, for each member to go back to their jurisdictions with the two issues, and how it shapes the discussion of funding.

Agenda Item 7. Receive reports from the Southern Nevada Forum and Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada/ Southern Nevada Strong on regional issues.

Dylan Keith and Kelly Crompton briefly went over regional issues that are affecting Southern Nevada, including those that have been identified in the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan and the Comprehensive Regional Policy Plan adopted by SNRPC and its members pursuant to NRS 278.02528.

Dylan Keith with the Southern Nevada Forum stated that after all of the committee meetings, they developed around 10 issues and will be reaching out to their regular attendees for each committee to develop three different priorities that they will bring to the final meeting which is on November 16, 2020 at 8:30 a.m. At that meeting, they will take the 3 top priorities from each committee, and then delving into their top priorities. These will become the BDRs carried by one of the co-chairs for the committees.

Commissioner Segerblom asked who the co-chairs are.

Dylan Keith stated each committee has a co-chair from the Senate Democrats and Republicans, as well as the Assembly Democrats and Republicans. All of the legislators are representatives from Southern Nevada.

Commissioner Segerblom asked if they committed to BDRs.

Dylan Keith stated they've been hosting the Nevada Forum since 2013 and have been consistently carrying BDRs for Southern Nevada priorities.

Kelly Crompton stated that the individual doesn't carry a BDR. They will find committee bills to make sure the issues they've identified are carried. In some cases, if it is a fiscal request, they will make sure there is support because it's not a BDR and has to be in the budget.

Councilwoman Diaz asked if potential issues to carry forward to the 2021 legislature were covered, has there been a conversation about what they will be able to afford and realistically drive, given the current situation of the State and economy.

Kelly Crompton stated that those conversations happen between legislatures.

Councilwoman Diaz asked what would be left to improve the system that wouldn't require money that the board could fall back on, or is that another discussion that has to be had.

Kelly Crompton stated that's the process they are working through right now before the November meeting.

Councilman Knudsen inquired as to what are some of the successes of the Southern Nevada Forum and asked how much time does it take them to identify priorities and issue areas.

Kelly Crompton stated that they don't start until the interim year and start in January of the off year. Their timeline is January to August. The priorities are heard at the January meeting and this is about a 2 hour meeting letting the members throughout the committees and throw out their ideas. The co-chairs look at the whole and from a political stand point, what both parties can agree to focus on for the Southern Nevada region, and then hold committee meetings once a month to host presentations and to figure out the priorities. Fuel Revenue Indexing has been a success, as well as the medical school, some early childhood education in the 17th session, and many more that are listed on SouthernNevadaForum.org

Councilman Knudsen asked how Southern Nevada compares to Northern Nevada in their efforts.

Kelly Crompton stated that since the beginning of the Southern Nevada Forum, they have improved since they put the Southern Nevada Forum together. Northern Nevada had a concerted effort when they went up to the legislative session and knew what was going on while Southern Nevada was scattered.

Councilman Black stated that the Southern Nevada Forum has a good system and format, and it seems to be effective. Councilman Black thinks SNRPC could look at the Southern Nevada Forum model and see if there is relevance to what the Board is doing with SNRPC.

Kelly Crompton stated that her full-time day job is the Government Affairs Manager for the City of Las Vegas, and they do a lot of the work pro bono. Ms. Crompton was the education subcommittee person when she worked at the Vegas Chamber. The City of Las Vegas and Vegas Chamber have donated staff time in order for them to do this. They have a lot of interaction from government friends, and there is an opportunity for local government officials to join them and make an impact in the forum.

Craig Raborn, Director of the Metropolitan Planning Organization with RTC, briefly went over what is in the Southern Nevada Strong plan. The four main themes are Invest in Complete Communities, Increase Transportation Choice, Improve Economic Competitiveness and Education, and Build Capacity for Implementation.

There are six direct references to legislative action in the Southern Nevada Strong strategy. Under the Complete Communities strategy, there's a reference to Homeless Housing and ensuring there is an adequate supply of homeless housing, and that it is spread and distributed equally across the region. Another legislative recommendation is to give homeowners the ability to sell power back to the grid. Under Transportation, there are no direct references, but due to the nature of the plan, there are legislative needs to be addressed so that the plan elements can be implemented. Education and Economy is to allow the School District flexibility to use land, particularly land that was provided by BLM leases to be used as neighborhood parks and public access. Building

Capacity for Implementation recommendation is to heighten the awareness of the role of planning in the region and what can be accomplished through planning in the region, keeps legislatures informed about what the Regional Coalition and the implementation of Southern Nevada Strong are doing, and enables legislation that would remove obstacles to promote opportunities for implementation of all the other 300 plus strategies that are identified in Southern Nevada Strong.

Mr. Raborn stated that they go through a 4 to 6 week process every year. They meet with the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee members to talk about what their priorities are and what the key issues are for them. The four priorities that are at the top reflect the work the regional planning team, with the MPO, has been doing in advancing the work program and that was shared with the Coalition Board in February 2020. The Regional Issues first topic is the need to address affordable housing at the regional level. The second topic is Sustainability Planning; they are in the process of completing and inventory of best practices for regional sustainability planning such addressing the impacts of climate change. In talking to SNS Stakeholders and staff with the local entities, there has been a lot of interest approaching this at the regional level.

The Southern Nevada Strong Plan calls for increasing transportation choices. The RTC has completed and will soon approve the On Board Regional Mobility Plan which has 64 different strategies and recommendations for programs and projects that would address these strategies that are identifies in Southern Nevada Strong. It would take additional resources for many of those to happen and finding ways to secure those additional resources to make those investments to advance the regional plan.

The topic or regional collaboration would assess the requirements for regional planning that are in NRS, matching those, and ensuring that it still reflects what the members of the SNRPC Board, as well as the local agencies, want regional planning to accomplish.

Craig Raborn stated that they are not making these recommendations but highlighting things they have heard as issues, as they go through their role administering the Southern Nevada Strong Plan.

Commissioner Segerblom asked how the person who focuses on sustainability factors in to what Mr. Raborn's operation does.

Craig Raborn stated that in their work program, they implemented a work project that specifically intended to look at how other regions have approached regional sustainability planning and the method and tools they used. Essentially, it is a planning study and not the development of a sustainability plan.

Commissioner Jones asked Mr. Raborn to address the history of SNS, verses responding back to SNRPC and RTC etc.

Craig Raborn stated that the Southern Nevada Strong planning process started in 2012, and it continued through 2015. As it was being concluded, the SNRPC and SNS working group asked the RTC to administer the plan on behalf of the SNRPC. The motion SNRPC made after they adopted it was to adopt the plan as the regional policy plan, per NRS and then ask the RTC to administer it. The primary reason for that is that they have staff to dedicate to it, and it is common

for the MPO to handle regional planning issues such as the things that that were addressed in Southern Nevada Strong. It was a logical fit for the region, and RTC has permanent staffing.

Commissioner Jones wanted to clarify that the Regional Open Space and Trails program is not under the MPO or SNS.

Craig Raborn stated that is correct, and RTC participates, and a commitment was made last year that RTC would be willing to host the Regional Open Space and Trails program.

Agenda Item 8. Discussion on issues impacting the region and provide staff direction with respect to identified regional issues.

Councilman Knudsen stated that this board is important to him because of the number of issues presented by the individuals representing Southern Nevada Forum, and Mr. Raborn representing Southern Nevada Strong. There's no advocacy group for those issues. Looking at housing, each of the jurisdictions has a significant role to play in housing, but no authority over it. The Housing Authority has a role to play in housing but not over land use and planning or the role of state funding and how some of the housing developments get developed within Southern Nevada. It is an issue that no one is responsible for, and a significant issue with majority of Southern Nevada's population has to struggle with on a daily basis.

There is a lot of room and support needed in the future for transit planning, from the conversations from the Regional Transportation Commission, on their future funding options and what it looks like.

Councilman Knudsen mentioned the presentation Ms. Crompton gave around some of the issues they talked about, which they haven't prioritized yet, and it take staff and time to do. First issue is childcare. Childcare subsidies each of the jurisdictions participates in allocation of a safe key program, before or after school program that is funded through the state and none of the jurisdictions is responsible for the funding. There is no advocacy on behalf of where funding comes from or where it goes to. The expansion or childcare, and especially during COVID, will be limited or mitigated by their understanding of it and their ability to influence it at the state level.

Each jurisdiction would benefit greatly from the BestWest high speed rail in to Los Angeles, but no jurisdiction is responsible for that.

Federal funding is a big issue, Southern Nevada lacks the capacity to build out the federal funding within Southern Nevada and within Nevada in general. Per capita, Nevada brings in less tax dollars than anywhere else in the country. The Governor and the state have identified three or four people to focus on grants, but as a region and a state, Nevada doesn't think about Federal funding the way it should.

The same goes for Medicaid on the Health Care Committee. It is one thing that no private enterprise will talk about because it is highly competitive but as a region, they can focus on increasing certain Medicaid reimbursement rates. There could be a huge impact on building out the healthcare infrastructure in Southern Nevada. Councilman Knudsen mentioned that those who

sit on the LVGEA focus on building out the sports medicine industry. The conversation needs to come back to what environment is needed in order for sports medicine to build out here. Changes need to be made to graduate medical education and Medicaid reimbursement rates. This will only happen if someone is pushing for it, and no one is there to push for it.

Tax structure is another issue which is highly controversial and political but Councilman Knudsen guarantees in the next two to five years when the economy starts reacting to what we are currently going through and struggling to find dollars to pay for public safety, everyone will be talking about property tax, home rule, and who has control over property tax and investment in the state. This will impact each of the local jurisdictions whether they want it to or not.

The plan that Southern Nevada Strong developed includes 300 goals identified within it. Councilman Knudsen stated that any one of their boards that prioritized issue areas, those aren't discussed because when they hear from the RTC, they hear about transit and transportation funding. All the other issue areas that they spent as a region and years developing, there's no one that is pushing on those issues at the State level, and for each of the jurisdictions, it is directed by the State, given authority by the State, and funded by the State. They as jurisdictions, the local government, are not having comprehensive discussions about what Southern Nevada will look like in 5 – 10 years.

Councilman Knudsen stated the easy issue with no controversy right now is broadband access. The infrastructure for broadband access doesn't exist, and each jurisdiction has a constituent that can't access the internet, and he believes internet is a utility. They have an obligation to provide utilities to their constituents, and without internet at this time, "you are up a creek without a paddle." There are some state legislative changes, and most likely federal funding, to start looking at in order to increase the broadband connectivity for all populations within southern Nevada. Councilman Knudsen believes this is the easiest issue to focus on.

Commissioner Segerblom asked is there something they can do that Southern Nevada Strong wouldn't do.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he wouldn't speak on behalf of SNS, and being on their advisory committee for a couple of years, SNS has done a lot to develop some of the issues and can clearly outline what the issues are in Southern Nevada. There's no advocacy for those issues. That is the disconnect, in his opinion, moving to the RTC. RTC will focus on transit issues and the board should focus on transit issues, and there's a lot of transit issues they need to focus on.

Commissioner Segerblom asked about climate change and if SNRPC can say it is their issue to focus on.

Councilwoman Bridges stated that climate change mitigation and sustainability was the reason she wanted to keep SNRPC alive. Looking at the overarching impacts of global warming and climate change and its effect on a lot of the issues - whether its water, air, transportation, housing, heat, and the effect on homeless population. To Councilwoman Bridges the most important issue is the sustainability issue, and it is important to look at the other issues.

Councilwoman Diaz stated there's a lot of validity in what Councilman Knudsen addressed that is not biannual in nature undertaking issues that need to be resolved in our community. She knows the disconnect from the other side while working for the state legislature. SNRPC could be the body that doesn't "drop the ball", set the issue aside, and wait a year and a half before they retake the conversation. This body can be working on the subject matter and figuring out the inventory, such as affordable housing and how much affordable housing does each jurisdiction have. How can they create a vibrant Southern Nevada with more offers of affordable housing and figure out the funding mechanism and placement? There are so many issues that need continued research, advocacy, and they need to be focused on. There needs to be future planning.

Councilman Black stated there are issues that need to be addressed of regional significance, and it's not easy to be educated on the subject matter and to be an expert in the short period of time that the board has time to allocate to it and committed to the process throughout. Councilman Black would like to take 2 to 5 issues at this meeting, such as homelessness, housing, broadband, climate change, and health care disparities, and then take three to five back to each municipalities to present to the councils to decide on which topic is relevant to them. Councilman Black would like to see the following things to be put in place: what is the board's role; what is their goal; what action steps are required; what measurement tools are in place; what are the desired impacts; and the measurable outcome? Having these components in place, they will be able to take their issue(s), move them down the calendar as the board carries it along, and will have something to show.

Councilman Knudsen agrees with Councilman Black, and the goal is to present to each jurisdiction to identify what the issues are, but the challenge is that there is no one available to do the research or presentations, and possibly postponing another month.

Commissioner Jones stated that he has no problem postponing but worries about the jurisdictions having different priorities. Would it make sense for them to pick an issue or two now? The climate change issues is a huge issue but has to be more specific such as the urban heat island effect. The board needs to move forward and not get tied up with the legislative calendar and focus on the issues that are tied close to the legislative calendar. Commissioner Jones would like to focus on broadband and a narrow focus on climate change.

Commissioner Segerblom asked if this board can apply for grants.

Rob Warhola, Clark County District Attorney, stated that he's not sure but will look into it.

Lisa Corrado stated that the City of Henderson has done it in the past and brought updates to the SNRPC.

Commissioner Jones stated that part of the reason why they went down the path of the SNS plan was to enable Southern Nevada to receive federal grants that wouldn't have been available had they not put a Master Plan in place.

Lisa Corrado stated that is correct and to increase their competitiveness for subsequent funding. Having to federally recognize regional plan that has consensus enabled them and the County to

apply for and receive EPA grant funding, choice grant funding at North Las Vegas, and City of Henderson EPA grant funding for Brownfields grants, along with private funding as well.

Commissioner Jones stated that there may be an opportunity for funding of a regional priority through SNRPC. Broadband access and climate change with the specific goal of addressing the urban heat island effect.

A motion was made by Commissioner Jones to adopt the issues for SNRPC and second by Councilwoman Diaz. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 9. Receive the 2021 Master meeting Schedule

Mario Bermudez, Clark County, asked the board to approve the 2021 Master Calendar and understanding that there is still an issue with the revision of interlocal agreement and how it will change things, but a calendar needs to be approved so the Commissioner Chambers can be reserved.

A motion was made by Commissioner Segerblom to approve and second by Councilman Knudsen. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 10. 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 11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:48 P.M.