

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**COALITION BOARD**

**SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION**

**September 22, 2015**

**In attendance:** Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani, VICE CHAIR, Clark County  
Councilman Cherchio, City of North Las Vegas  
Councilman Bob Beers, City of Las Vegas  
Councilman Isaac Barron, City of North Las Vegas  
Trustee Patrice Tew, Clark County School District  
Commissioner Steve Sisolak, Clark County  
Councilwoman Gerri Schroder, City of Henderson

**Absent:** Councilman Cam Walker, CHAIR, City of Boulder City  
Councilman Bob Coffin, City of Las Vegas  
Councilman Sam Bateman, 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 Giunchigliani, Clark County, Vice-chair, at 4:05 p.m., on Tuesday, September 22, 2015, in the Clark County Commission Chambers, Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada.

It was confirmed that the agenda for the September 22, 2015, meeting was duly posted in compliance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law requirements.

**Agenda Item 2. Roll Call**

Members of the SNRPC Board, as listed above, were present. Councilman Cam Walker, Councilman Sam Bateman, and Councilman Bob Coffin were not present.

**Agenda Item 3. Public Comment**

No public comment was made.

**Agenda Item 4. Approval of the Agenda for September 22, 2015**

A motion was made by Commissioner Sisolak to approve the agenda for September 22, 2015. The motion was approved unanimously.

**Agenda Item 5. Approval of the Minutes for the March 24, 2015 meeting**

A motion was made by Commissioner Sisolak to approve the minutes of the March 24, 2015 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

**Agenda Item 6. Consent Items: a. 2015 Long-Term Population Forecast**

A motion was made by Councilwoman Schroder to approve all items on the consent list. The motion was approved unanimously.

**Agenda Item 7. Receive a report from Clark County regarding Mobile Food Vendors**

Mario Bermudez with Clark County Comprehensive Planning discussed the issues they have with mobile food vendors who park on-site. He stated mobile food vendors are supposed to be mobile and move from site to site however, the County has been receiving complaints regarding the extent of time the mobile food vendors are remaining parked on one site. He mentioned the County does process Land Use Applications that allow the mobile food vendors to be there, which allows the County to check on the parking and circulation while they are on that site. Those mobile food vendors who do not obtain a Land Use Application cause some issues. At the May 6<sup>th</sup> Board of County Commissioner's Meeting earlier this year, this issue was a discussion item on the agenda. He stated that the Board talked about deferring this item to the Business License Workgroup through the SNRPC to possibly make it more of a uniform issue with regard to regulations and definitions throughout the County. Therefore, he requested direction from the SNRPC about getting involved with this.

Councilwoman Schroder asked if this is an issue only within Clark County or if Las Vegas is also having the same issue. Councilwoman Schroder noted the City of Henderson is not having any issues with mobile food vendors.

Mr. Bermudez replied that the City of Las Vegas has some new regulations that were adopted this year but he is not sure if the City of North Las Vegas also has the issue or not. He stated the issue with Clark County is they use certain terms but do not define exactly what they mean. He stated there should be a uniform definition that each jurisdiction uses so that we are all talking the same language.

Commissioner Sisolak believes there is some confusion as to what a mobile food vendor is. For example, there is a mobile food vendor truck that has wheels, on Jones and Tropicana, however it has been there for two years with no movement and there are other trucks that come and go. He said we need to define exactly what a mobile food vendor is and determine if they are circumventing Health District rules when they are a trailer or a truck. He said there is a difference between a truck that drives up and serves lunch and one that is parked for two years.

Mr. Bermudez stated the County regulation for the mobile food trucks is that they only require a license through a Commissary and then can go from site to site. Mr. Bermudez stated the Health District has regulations as to how long they can be on site but in the end the enforcement can be a problem.

Commissioner Giunchigliani stated she agreed and that part of what the SNRPC was originally going to look at when the legislation was crafted was to look at land use and zoning issues and, at a minimum, have common definitions and a glossary of terms that all jurisdictions can use. She stated she lives in Las Vegas and she did follow the debate that they had regarding the food trucks, and they did come up with additional regulations and definitions that ended up coming into play. At a minimum she believes we should find out what the Health District regulates and how we define them in the various jurisdictions and what they are allowed to do. She stated we should have a chart to determine if there is a problem within

all jurisdictions or if it's only isolated within Clark County since Las Vegas worked through their issues. Another issue she mentioned was that Regional Planning does not always affect each jurisdiction but if each jurisdiction at least has a template they can use it should an issue arise.

Commissioner Giunchigliani asked Mr. Bermudez if this should go through the Technical Committee or Business License Workgroup.

Mr. Bermudez stated at the May County Commission Meeting it was mentioned that the Business License Workgroup would look at the regulations.

Commissioner Giunchigliani asked the panel of members if they had any objection to having their Business License Departments look at the regulations.

Councilwoman Schroder stated she does not mind taking a look to see what each jurisdiction is doing, however, she believes this issue would be more a business license issue as there are land use regulations in place which state where the mobile food trucks can and cannot go. She agreed to checking in with the local Business License Departments and the Health District.

Commissioner Giunchigliani agreed with Councilwoman Schroder in that we should be following the land use regulations that are in place. She also stated that an issue would be defining what is considered a mobile food vender, food truck and caterer. She stated it would be best to have all jurisdictions use the same definitions and implementations regarding mobile food vendors.

Councilman Barron agreed with Councilwoman Schroder and stated he liked the idea of defining what a mobile food vendor actually is. He asked how difficult it would be to get the Health Department involved on these regulations, to assist with the definitions and make them uniform throughout the County.

Mr. Bermudez stated they have a good working relationship with the Health District and he did not believe there would be an issue getting their assistance.

Councilman Barron stated he would be in favor of defining the terms. However, he believes once in a while you need to look at it differently, especially in downtown Las Vegas. With all the restaurants in the downtown area, you do not want someone coming in and parking their truck right in front of those restaurants.

Commissioner Giunchigliani stated that was a big debate in Las Vegas and does not believe that is the SNRPC's role; each jurisdiction would have to decide how to handle that part of it. However, if they are across the street and come into Clark County and try to get a catering license while they are actually a food truck, that is one of the issues that needs to be resolved. She also noted that she, along with Councilman Cherchio and Councilman Beers, are on the Health District Board.

Councilman Beers stated he would feel more comfortable, when the SNRPC Board is asked to convene a multi-jurisdiction working group, if they had some buy-in from the staff before they got to the point of this Board approving or not approving. He also stated that between the medical marijuana dispensaries and taverns, his Business License staff feels busy enough already. Therefore, he is hesitant to commit them to participate in this effort without talking to them first and without talking to the Health District as well. He requested that the coalition hold this item until the next meeting so that County staff can reach out to the cities and the Health District and figure out if there's an appetite to take this issue on.

Councilman Cherchio of North Las Vegas stated he is not sure how much of a problem this issue is for them, however, he is willing to look at anything that the coalition is considering.

Commissioner Giunchigliani asked if Mr. Bermudez could check with the Business License Workgroup to see if they have the appetite and time to review this issue, as well as with the Health District, and then report back to the SNRPC Technical Committee.

Mr. Bermudez agreed to check in with those entities.

**Agenda Item 8. Receive a final report on the Regional Schools Multimodal Transportation Access Study**

Dan Anderson with CH2M, a consulting firm working with the Regional Transportation Commission on this study, stated that they were tasked with looking at how the access to and around schools can be managed. What can be done from a policy and engineering perspective and to help make that a safer environment? Most of the principles applied came from the Safe Routes to School Program, but this project went beyond that study. What could be done to encourage walking and biking to school? That was a huge component of the study. A working group was created with representatives from Planning and Public Works Departments from each of the cities and the County, the School District—including their Transportation Staff, Planning Staff, the Safe Routes to School Program, Real Property Management Staff—and Law Enforcement. One of the issues is block walls around developments; they just impede children from being able to take a direct route to a school. Providing access in developments with walls so that children can walk and bike in a more direct route to their school is important. Another issue is the conflicts that happen right in front of the school—if the dropping off and picking up of students can be distributed on multiple sides of the school, there won't be too much conflict in one spot. It is important not to vacate rights-of-way around schools, but to be able to place schools on road networks with as much access as possible. Roads can be placed on all four sides that can lead out to other arterials or streets. Those were a few land use policies that were discussed. There were a host of policies and strategies that were looked at regarding the area immediately around the school—engineering concerns such as how to segregate the bikes, cars, and buses by providing designated bike lanes or buffered bike lanes, wider sidewalks, amenities along the way to encourage walking, perhaps for parents to walk to school with their children instead of driving them. A host of ideas were discussed regarding implementation. One of the most important things is adopting these policies in the master plans of the cities and the County and making sure these policies are integrated into the School District's criteria for how future school sites are selected. Also, there is the issue of researching funding options. He opened the discussion for questions.

Councilwoman Schroder asked a question regarding bus turnouts, pertaining to when parents pull over and drop their child off in the turnout. Would this be something done to retrofit for existing schools, or is this only intended for new schools?

Mr. Anderson said they are hoping these policies would be applicable for new school sites as they are being constructed, but also for retrofits. The challenge regarding retrofits is the funding. What is being proposed is having the policies in place so that if an entity is planning renovations on a roadway in front of a school, there is an opportunity to apply some of these retrofits, and that these policies would be a “tool box” of ideas that could be implemented.

Councilwoman Schroder said she has experience with this traffic—although she is able to go in, pick her daughter up and get out quickly, there is still quite a bit of traffic. This is also experienced by residents and neighbors. Children go to different schools at the same time, and they all leave at the same time. There is going to be traffic for about 15 minutes, maybe a half an hour, and then the traffic is gone. Children are jay-walking but the parents are guilty of this as well, as they will park on the side of the street and have their kids cross the street in the middle. Children also jump over walls, but it is difficult to

train parents to educate their kids. She applauds this study for coming up with some ideas and having everyone think about this issue.

Commissioner Giunchigliani stated there are some things that can be looked at within Comprehensive Planning, such as the access and development walls. If there are to be walls in a development, force homeowners associations to have access points near a school or potentially be located there. Don't vacate the rights-of-way, especially when they are in a surrounding school area. Crosswalk locations make a difference; they should be located and used where the kids and parents are actually crossing. She gave examples of schools where drop-off lanes were marked and some that converted play area to parking. Parents should walk with their kids and there should be water fountains along the way. She is happy that this study was worked through the "Safe Routes to School Program" because a lot of work was done on that. She asked about some of the options related to funding the improvements that were mentioned. If a new street overlay is being done, can there be an area created to carve-out for the buses or school buses; is that what they are referencing?

Mr. Anderson replied yes, and they've identified a number of funding sources that are currently available, although funding is always difficult. He mentioned the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), a Federal source of funding that is currently used for these types of programs. It needs to be ensured that Congress continues to fund that program in the next transportation authorization. Also, the Fuel Revenue Indexing tax program in Clark County will hopefully pass again. Each entity has their own priorities, and there are a host of transportation priorities, it's not just school related. If we are able to pass the next wave of FRI funding, then some of that money should be reserved for each of the cities and the County to use for schools access; this should be used as a selling point to the general public.

Councilman Cherchio referenced three schools near him where cars pile up there at certain times of day and they block traffic. Where Ruby Duncan and Hayden are located, a road was created in between the two schools to get the people off the main thoroughfare there. Was this what was being spoken of, access around a school, or also into the property? He also asked if there was input from the local police departments regarding school site and access design.

Mr. Anderson discussed Councilman Cherchio's example. He also said that one of the recommendations of the study, when there is a new school or one that is proposed for renovation, that a committee be formed that would include law enforcement, engineers, and planners; also, that any necessary major developer be involved.

Trustee Tew commented that this was a daunting study to accomplish and she is very grateful for all of the visuals presented. She then requested to have Linda Perri come forward to address a few questions about what is currently being done.

Linda Perri, Director of CCSD Property Management Land Acquisition, stated that there are some site criteria already in place. However, this multi-modal study has helped us in trying to get across some of the problems with getting access to and within sites, so when the maps come in or the development comes in, they're not losing access to those sites. CCSD wants to coordinate with every jurisdiction as much as they can, and be a part of their staff development reviews, in order for them to have a say with some new developments. There are so many different departments that are engaged, and CCSD wants to make sure that the stakeholders like the community are involved as well—because people are always wondering when they purchase a home, where the school site is going to go. Even though CCSD might have sites banked in their inventory, some of those sites, especially with BLM sites, are not preserved. They are trying to work with BLM right now to get those back into their inventory. This study is going to help. What they need the jurisdictions to do and what they are really trying to do is reach out to them and have their staff look at those criteria. They also have their Student Tracking Development Form that is sent out

to each and every development and jurisdiction so they can tell how many units are coming in at any given time. They are constantly monitoring that, as well as with Demographics and Zoning, and tracking all the development, as well. When it comes down to the Tentative Map stage, it is too late. CCSD needs to be involved in the early stages of when the development comes in, when they are actually planning to have the residential subdivisions come in. They are not just looking at single-family, they're also looking at apartments, condos, townhomes—anything that creates residential units. Every jurisdiction has been wonderful in working with CCSD, and giving them their time and effort.

Trustee Tew replied that we are in good hands. She made one comment about the engagement that CCSD had with all the various entities, and knows this involved administrators and transportation staff from CCSD. She was curious if CCSD polled any children, parents, or principals, because it is really hard to incentivize these parents to allow their children to walk to school. Perhaps it would be a great idea to have competitions among schools, to see which one has the fewest cars pull up. School crossing guards are something that is now contracted out; it's a money issue, and not every school can have them. Many school principals spend their time out in front of the schools, directing traffic. Getting the parents to cooperate is the issue; she wanted to know if anyone had engaged with any parents regarding this issue.

Mr. Anderson responded that a number of principals were consulted, and field reviews were done. The Safe Routes to School Program the School District has does an outstanding job, and they are always out meeting with parents and principals. The focus of this study was the engineering, and developing policies for this.

Commissioner Giunchigliani referenced the need to look at advance map planning. Government policies need to be looked at to see if a school site is being land-locked. Costs and infrastructure need to be addressed. There are policies and new engineering models that can be used where some of the potential altercations are removed between cars, parents and kids. These are the things that policies must guide us to do. Developers should be told if they are going to build in a certain area, they need to be prepared to do what needs to be accomplished, or the development will not be approved. This means the development has to have access, Safe Routes to School Program, open gates—whatever is needed. There should not be an assumption that developers can put whatever they want in a development and negatively impact a fire station, police station, school or anybody else. In the long run, this would help immensely. She thanked Mr. Anderson for the study.

Councilwoman Schroder mentioned that in Henderson development cannot go forward until there is a neighborhood meeting. This should be considered when retrofitting schools, as some neighborhoods would be impacted. They want to make sure neighbors are involved in the process. Being proactive and working with neighbors helps them to understand the reasons for the policies.

A motion was made by Trustee Tew to accept the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **Agenda Item 9. Receive a presentation of the Regional Schools Policy Guide**

Tracy Murphy from CCSD Real Property Management presented the item. The Regional Schools Policy Guide being presented is a collaborative effort of SNRPC Members, which made up the School's Working Group. This is a result of the SNRPC Regional Plan which indicated the priority and need for school site planning selection and development. As a result of that recommendation of the Regional Plan, a resolution was put forward and approved by the SNRPC Board on April 23, 2013, in support of a Regional Schools Policy Plan. Subsequently, the funding was made available through UPWP funding, and the RTC ultimately hired Dan Anderson to prepare the Regional Schools Multi-Modal Access Study. In addition, since April of 2013, Southern Nevada Strong evolved as the regional plan, and that plan was recently adopted. The School's Working Group reconvened and pulled together the schools-related topics

in order to create this guide, which can be used by local entities as the gold-standard policies of both Southern Nevada Strong as well as the Regional Schools Multi-Modal Access Study. Each of those studies, combined, address a number of site selection, site criteria, and site development issues, specific to school sites, school development, and school policies going forward. This is a culmination of not only the School's Working Group but of the two plans pulled together in one document that the jurisdictions can refer to as a tool, based on these two comprehensive plans and studies, of what is recommended for schools. Therefore, this targets the schools so that we don't need to go from one plan to another plan regarding which school development and planning processes are recommended.

Commissioner Giunchigliani stated that she hasn't read the entire document, but it does give a comprehensive view of culminating the pieces of each plan into one place. It is her understanding that most of this is policy driven; however, some of it could result in Land Use Plan changes or in some places where waivers are not allowed on certain items. This is the debate as far as local government is concerned. The concern is certain items shouldn't be waived nor should there be arguing with developers over the issue. These seem to be the intent of the policies.

Ms. Murphy responded that the goal of the guide was to bring information forward regarding schools, in terms of school sites and development processes. This is something for the jurisdictions to look over, review, and see what is recommended, and then to proceed from there in terms of what might work on one site, yet not another.

Commissioner Giunchigliani responded that everything has been covered, e.g., utilities, environmental impacts, the multi-modal study. Too often plans are done yet not incorporated into other programs to see their utilization. She relayed that this was a good job.

A motion was made by Trustee Tew to accept the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **Agenda Item 10. Receive a progress report from the Regional Open Space and Trails Workgroup**

Johanna Murphy from the City of North Las Vegas and Mauricia Baca from the Outside Las Vegas Foundation presented this item. Ms. Murphy noted that March of 2015 was the last time ROST came before the Board to give an update and they were excited then to announce that the Neon to Nature App had finally launched. A couple of months after launching this app, they had an estimated 1,200 downloads. At that meeting Councilman Walker had asked that they reach out to see what type of promotional opportunities there were for each jurisdiction to help spread the word now that the app was fully functional. ROST received that message and over the last six months, they worked aggressively in developing standard language for Facebook posts, Tweets, blogs, and messaging for employee newsletters as well as newsletters that go out to the residents. It caught traction because as the individual promoting was being done, the different entities and interested parties helped to promote this also. The Clark County Department of Aviation heard about the app and put it on their Facebook page. The RTC included it in their RTC 360, which is similar to a talk show on YouTube. The Boulder City Chamber of Commerce promoted it to their members as well. Senator Reid included it in one of his newsletters to his constituents. Nevada State Senator Mark Manendo did the same thing and helped to spread the word. In July, it was included in Seven Magazine in an article titled "10 Apps necessary for City Living." With all of this work from the individual jurisdictions in addition to the extra outside parties, the grand total of app downloads is now 4,100. In six months the total tripled. It is now part of their work plan to look at this every six months for refreshing the messaging and to make it easy to hand to the Public Information Officers. This will also be promoted through their upcoming event Get Outdoors Nevada Day. She then turned this item over to Mauricia Baca.

Mauricia Baca explained that Get Outdoors Nevada Day is their new annual event. The first one was held last year at Craig Ranch Regional Park. They are retooling this event from an event that their partners, the City of Henderson, held in the past—Southern Nevada Trails Day. It has now been renamed Get Outdoors Nevada Day. The scope of this is now being expanded to include many different entities. Giving a brief update, they now have 70 exhibitors joining them for the event to be held October 24, 2015, from 9:00 am to 2:00 pm. She listed the numerous sponsors and noted the many activities that will occur at the event. Last year, they had 2,000 attendees, and this year they are hoping to increase this to 3,000 or more attendees. They will be highlighting the Neon to Nature App in the new Trails Map that is going to be renewed next year. This year they are working with their partner Clark County, and next year they are looking forward to working with their partner the City of Las Vegas.

There was further discussion about outreach, including electronic flyers and email newsletters. Ms. Baca stated that they are in the process of updating their poster and flyer, as it relates to their new sponsors joining them. They will also be doing a hashtag of Discover Your Outdoor Story, so that people can Tweet during the event. They are also working on additional social media and morning television appearances and will have further promotion on Facebook.

A motion was made by Trustee Tew to accept the progress report. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **Agenda Item 11. Receive an update on the Unified Planning Work Program**

Raymond Hess with the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) presented the item, an update on the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). This is a core document that the RTC has to develop that illustrates all of the planning activities to be carried out in their capacity as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, which uses federal funds for transportation projects. He cited the Multi-Modal Transportation Access Study, funded through the UPWP, as an example. The UPWP was developed along with their regional partners, especially the local jurisdictions. He summarized a list of the forthcoming studies, to include (some of which roll over from previous years) the following: CCSD Walking Audits; Spencer Greenway Transportation Trail and UNLV Campus Bike Plan; the City of Henderson's American's with Disabilities Transition Plan; the Clark County Parking Study Phase II; the Clark County Rural Streets Standards Study; the Northeast Valley Transportation Study; the Transit Oriented Development Study, which stems from the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan; and the Arterial Route Study, of which freight is a large component. The entire Unified Planning Work Program is available online, and he will provide the link for this material.

Commissioner Giunchigliani responded that she likes the issue related to freight because it provides logistics, as it related to goods and services.

A motion was made by Councilman Beers to accept the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **Agenda Item 12. Receive a progress report on Southern Nevada Strong**

Raymond Hess from the RTC presented this item. The Coalition Board approved the SNS Regional Plan in January of 2015 and designated the RTC as the core administrator for this effort and to move forward. A key point is that Southern Nevada Strong is not the sole responsibility of the RTC; it is a coordinated effort between the community, including local officials, educators, non-profit organizations, public community groups, and business leaders. The goal is to develop complete communities, with access to quality education, viable transportation options, employment opportunities, and housing. This plan focuses on economics, improving education, investing in complete communities, and increased transportation choices. The effort in Nevada will not include finger-wagging and going to the different

entities and telling them what they need to do, but instead ask them what they need in terms of empowerment to move forward. They want to find out what kinds of resources are needed in order to move this effort of Southern Nevada Strong forward. They need their regional partners to help implement this effort. Therefore, the four-prong approach is to establish Southern Nevada Strong as a collaborative and efficient leader; to engage, educate, and motivate Southern Nevadans to action; to provide practical tools, training, and expertise; and to increase alignment and availability of resources in order to move this effort forward. They are working with a consultant, James Barrett Company, and they are helping to identify some of these tools and training that can be brought to the community. Recent accomplishments cover many of our jurisdictions: the City of North Las Vegas received a Choice Neighborhoods Grant of \$485,000; Clark County received a \$500,000 Brownfields Grant from the Environmental Protection Agency; the City of Las Vegas is developing a master plan for the Las Vegas Medical District which is one of the opportunity sites for which money was approved by the legislature. Over the next 90 days, they are looking to re-do the SNS website, making it more interactive so that the Regional Partners are able to upload information, add community events to the calendar, and track their specific objectives. They are continuing to do their one-on-one meetings that are leading up to the re-launch of the steering committee. A top-level committee is needed to guide the direction of staff so that decisions are not made in a vacuum. It is their goal to pull together all of the regional partners to discuss what we all are doing to advance these issues moving forward.

Commissioner Giunchigliani responded that all of the activities regarding sustainability issues that are occurring within all the local governments are phenomenal. She is the chair of Green Chips, for example, and the City of Las Vegas is working toward becoming a five-star sustainable community, which it is known that they will at least be able to obtain a four-star status. Once the City of Las Vegas does this, Henderson is looking to be next, and then the County and North Las Vegas, so they are trying to educate the public, customers, and tourists that Southern Nevada is a very sustainable community. This is part of the messaging going forth in increasing tourism.

A motion was made by Councilman Barron to accept the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

**Agenda Item 13. Discuss the Board meeting schedule for the remainder of 2015**

Susan Danielewicz from the City of Boulder City announced that the next scheduled meeting date is set for Thanksgiving week, November 24, 2015. It was unanimously decided that because of the holiday, the meeting would be vacated.

**Agenda Item 14. The next date and location of the SNRPC Board meeting** is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, January 26, 2016 at 4:00 p.m., in the Clark County Commission Chambers at the Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada.

**Agenda Item 15. Member Comment.**

No member comment was made.

**Agenda Item 16. Public Comment.**

No public comment was made.

**Agenda Item 14. Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:27 p.m.