



NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

Coalition Board

SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a meeting of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition Board has been called and will be held at 4:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 22, 2019, in the Clark County Commission Chambers at 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada to consider the following:

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call;** notice of agenda conformance with Nevada Open Meeting Law requirements.
3. **Public Comment.** *(No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Comments will be limited to three minutes.)*
4. **Approval of the Agenda** for January 22, 2019. (For possible action) *Recommended Action – Approve the Agenda.*
5. **Approval of the Minutes** of the November 27, 2018 meeting. (For possible action) *Recommended Action – Approve the Minutes.*
6. Consent Agenda Item(s): (For possible action – Items on the Consent Agenda may be taken in one motion unless removed for discussion or other reason.)
 - a. **2018 Southern Nevada Consensus Population Estimate** SNRPC member entities have produced a local population estimate which will be forwarded to the state demographer and incorporated into the formula for the statewide estimate.
Recommended action – Approve all consent agenda
7. **Strategic Planning Workshop Report** (For possible action) Staff and the Board’s strategic planning consultant will provide a report of their work since the last Board workshop and will present a proposed guiding strategy for the SNRPC’s role and structure

for the Board to consider. *Recommended Action – Accept the report and direct staff to begin implementation of the desired strategy.*

8. **Elect the SNRPC Board Chair and Vice Chair** for the 2019 Calendar Year. (For possible action) *Recommended action – Elect City of Las Vegas as Chair and City of North Las Vegas as Vice Chair.*
9. **The next date and location for a regular meeting of the SNRPC Board** is tentatively scheduled for February 26, 2019 at 4:00 p.m., in the Clark County Commission Chambers (For possible action) *Recommended Action – Set the date and location for the next SNRPC Board meeting.*
10. **Member Comment:** Consisting of general comments, announcements and proposals for future agenda items. *(No action may be taken upon a matter raised during a period devoted to member comment until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.)*
11. **Public Comment.** *(No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Comments will be limited to three minutes.)*
12. **Adjournment.**

Please be aware of the following: that items on the agenda may be taken out of order; the SNRPC Board may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; the SNRPC Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time; and the SNRPC Board may impose a time limit for speaking on an item on the agenda where public comment or testimony is allowed.

Notice to persons with special needs: For those requiring special assistance or accommodation at the meeting, please contact Jenny Penney at (702) 455-5019 at least 72 hours in advance. “Relay Nevada”, a service provider for hearing or speech impaired persons, may be contacted by dialing 7-1-1.

AGENDA POSTING

Notice/Agenda was posted per Nevada Open Meeting Law requirements at the following locations:

Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, NV

City of Las Vegas, 495 S. Main Street, Las Vegas, NV

City of North Las Vegas, 2250 Las Vegas Boulevard N., North Las Vegas, NV

City of Henderson, 240 S. Water Street, Henderson, NV

City of Boulder City, 401 California Avenue, Boulder City, NV

Clark County School District, 5100 W. Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas, NV

www.SNRPC.org

Agenda and back up materials can be found on the SNRPC.org website or obtained upon request. Contact Jenny Penney at (702) 455-5019 or Jennifer.Penney@clarkcountynv.gov upon request.

MEETING MINUTES

COALITION BOARD

SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION

November 27, 2018

In attendance: Councilman Dan H. Stewart, CHAIR, City of Henderson
Councilman Steve Seroka, City of Las Vegas (arrived at 4:16 p.m.)
Councilman Kiernan McManus, City of Boulder City
Councilman Dan Shaw, City of Henderson
Councilman Richard Cherchio, City of North Las Vegas
Councilman Scott Black, City of North Las Vegas
Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani, Clark County
Trustee Kevin L. Child, Clark County School District

Absent: Councilwoman Michele Fiore, Vice-Chair, City of Las Vegas
Commissioner Steve Sisolak, 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 Stewart, City of Henderson, Chair, at 4:00 p.m., on Tuesday, November 27, 2018, in the City of North Las Vegas, 2250 Las Vegas Blvd. North, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Agenda Item 2. Roll Call

Members of the SNRPC Board, as listed above, were present with the exception of Councilwoman Michele Fiore, Vice-Chair and Commissioner Steve Sisolak, Clark County.

Councilman Seroka was absent at time of roll call but later arrived at 4:16 p.m.

It was confirmed by Katherine Rodriguez-Lopez that a quorum was present and that the November 27, 2018 meeting was duly posted in compliance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law requirements.

Agenda Item 3. Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Agenda Item 4. Approval of the Agenda for November 27, 2018

A motion was made by Commissioner Giunchigliani to approve the agenda for the November 27, 2018 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 5. Approval of the Minutes for the October 23, 2018 meeting

A motion was made by Commissioner Giunchigliani to approve the minutes of the October 23, 2018 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 6. October Summary & Follow up

Lisa Corrado, Assistant Director of Community Development and Services with the City of Henderson, summarized what was discussed at the October 23, 2018 workshop, the questions that were raised and the research and responses that were prepared. She indicated that we are now going into the second workshop based on the Scope & Schedule for the strategic planning process. The first facilitated workshop was held on October 23, 2018. Based on the recommendations from the SNRPC coalition board, we will move on to task 3 and draft a report that will provide more detailed steps to take to address priorities and recommendations.

At the October 23rd workshop, the Board members shared their concerns regarding the SNRPC. One concern was that the Regional Plan went to Southern Nevada Strong (SNS), which was delegated to the RTC Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). This left the SNRPC unsure of its role. Other concerns expressed included a lack of dedicated funding, organizational strain of in-kind participation, the importance of local autonomy over land use, and a desire to not require regular meetings. A high value was placed on regional collaboration, but there are several other organizations in the valley that work regionally on specific topics like transportation, economic development, and flood control. Board members also mentioned that advocacy would be a role that SNRPC could accomplish. It was discussed that the Southern Nevada Forum develops a legislative agenda among the southern Nevada delegation.

Lisa presented the activity boards from the October 23rd workshop, describing the decisions the Board made regarding the role and priorities of the SNRPC. Questions and requests from the October 23rd meeting included what an advocacy role meant, how homelessness is currently handled, the structure and Board make-up of SNRPC and its power/authority, and options for restructuring. To serve an advocacy role, the SNRPC would need to be a collective voice for the region.

An advocacy role is different from a forum. With advocacy, more time is taken to build a consensus on subjects, the body can possibly act as one voice; and focus on State or Federal Legislative policies. The organization can also raise awareness through public outreach and media about key topics. This structure can be grant funded or funded by another source of money.

Lisa proceeded to discuss how homelessness has been handled historically in southern Nevada, from 2002 to present. The question was asked if SNRPC can insert itself into the Continuum of Care (CoC) Board. Each local representative has a staff member representative serving on the Continuum of Care Board. The representative can be an elected official also serving on SNRPC, but there is no way for SNRPC to insert itself as a structure onto the CoC Board as it is required to exist today. Clark County receives funds through the HEARTH ACT as a region and funding from HUD through the Continuum of Care. Many of our jurisdictions receive Community Block Grant funding.

The group then moved on to a discussion of transitioning the duties and disbanding. Lisa stated that moving forward doesn't mean giving up on the SNRPC. When the decision was made to transfer SNS to the RTC, it left the SNRPC's core duty vacant. The other required SNRPC duties aligned

with the regional plan, including Transit Oriented Development and Mixed-Use planning. The SNRPC is required to prepare an annual budget and to cooperate with the Air Pollution Control Board. There are several other optional duties. Transitioning duties could mean to package other outstanding duties that align with the regional plan over to the MPO and supporting existing efforts with other regional organizations (e.g., SNS, SNRHA, SNHD, LVGEA, SNV Forum, COC, and others.)

The inter-local agreement is easier to terminate than to amend. Terminating the agreement would require 4 out of 6 entities to adopt the resolution. The SNRPC does not get a BDR, so a sponsor would need to be identified to amend legislation. Adding or removing members would be an amendment to the inter-local agreement and would need approval from all 6 entities.

Agenda Item 7. Case Study presentation (for possible action)

Lisa Corrado, Assistant Director of Community Development and Services with the City of Henderson, presented the background of SNRPC. Since Purdue Marion and Associates (PMA) was contracted with the SNRPC, they have conducted stakeholder interviews with the board members and staff to review the history of SNRPC and gather input. The workshops were based upon the information gathered, and their goal for the initial workshop was to determine the preferred role and priorities of SNRPC.

After reviewing the input from the October 23, 2018 SNRPC Coalition Board Meeting, Purdue Marion and Associates put together a list of Priority Issues and Courses of Action that the SNRPC Board Members felt were important to address. Courses of action could consist of adopting a new role, as a forum, an advocate, a data clearing house, or none of the above, transitioning these duties to other organizations, or even disbanding.

Councilman Steve Seroka raised a concern about how Open Space and Trails as a focus would be transitioned, if that route is taken for the SNRPC. He suggested one option could be to broaden the scope of work to include such topics as golf course closings and regional park siting.

He suggested not focusing on specific topics of homelessness and open space, but using this body as a way for people to talk about region-wide issues as they come up (i.e. Pet issues) perhaps as body without resources or a budget, just an experienced group of people in a room discussing regional issues. It could be a monthly or quarterly meeting where these individuals could take concerns back to the legislative bodies or their individual jurisdictions.

Bill Marion indicated that this might be accomplished as a forum entity, rather than an advocacy entity.

The options of priority issues and structure presented to the Board on the poster boards were:

Homelessness

1. Replace existing Continuum of Care (COC) representative with Elected Official.
2. Create Advocacy Agenda as SNRPC (outside of COC).

3. Do not get involved with this issue at this time.

Open Space and Trails

1. Continue funding third party for implementation items of existing Regional Open Space & Trails Plan.
2. Broaden scope of work to include such topics as golf course closings and Regional Park siting.
3. Transfer responsibilities (to MPO or pursue inter-local as local governments to continue to fund activities).

Transition Plan/Disbanding

1. Transition remaining activities that align with Regional Plan to the MPO (conformity with Regional Plan, population projections, TOD policies, etc.), and transfer other activities as needed.
2. Participate and advocate for priority issues on complementary regional boards (RTC, SNRHA, SNHD, LVGEA, CCRFCD, SNWA, Southern Nevada Forum, etc.).
3. Implement SNS activities as local governments.

Detailed Transition Plan/Disbanding

1. Recommendations for which activities should be transferred to whom and how to approach complementary organizations.
2. Proposed legislative changes as necessary.
3. Proposed inter-local agreement.

Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani, stated she has no problem with whatever happens. She recommended placing emerging issues on the agenda, or that a Commissioner can raise an issue and bring it forward. Topics such as similar ordinances or issues that emerge in one entity and not the other. She agrees with the possibility of looking at creating a forum, rather than change to a Council or Association of Governments, such as Denver, that would still allow conformity and agreement on what we are doing. The Board members could report back to their various councils and commission. In essence, have a forum to raise awareness on issues.

Councilman Dan Shaw is concerned with funding the SNRPC and the burden caused by the donated staff time to help with the organization. He raised the issue of not having adequate funds to allocate. Councilman Dan H. Stewart is concerned about the staff time and how much effort it takes in helping with SNRPC.

Bill Marion suggested transitioning the duties out, maintaining the group as a forum but without the responsibilities. Lisa Corrado confirmed that if a forum-style entity calls itself a “committee,” it would still have to conform with open meeting law.

Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani and Trustee Kevin L. Child recommended keeping others informed and openly communicating with each other to meet the needs of the growing valley, without stepping on each other’s toes.

Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani wondered if the Technical Committee was still in existence. The Technical Committee is still in existence as of now, but if the SNRPC doesn’t move forward or changes its role, it might not be a necessity to keep the Technical Committee. Staff mentioned that there are two levels, the Planning Directors Group and the Technical Committee. The Planning Directors group transitioned into Planning Directors’ appointees, because it’s now the Planning Directors sitting on the Technical Committee. They urged the Board to consider eliminating a level. Originally this was structured with the Planning Departments, but many of the issues that arise are not what planners generally work with on a day to day basis. Lisa Corrado suggested a name change for the body, as well, since the issues discussed are not necessarily planning issues.

To summarize what was discussed, Bill Marion indicated that it sounds like the desire is more of a forum structure and a name change.

Bill Marion mentioned that with current interlocal agreement this entity has to meet once a month and adhere to the open meeting law. The Technical Advisory Group meets once, informally, but meets a second time subject to open meeting law in order to set an agenda for the Board meeting. Many processes can be eliminated. A forum would have to adhere to open meeting laws, but by bringing in dedicated staff, the open meeting law requirements for the technical advisory group would be eliminated.

Bill Marion’s recommendation was to review the other regional entities that were researched to see how they are structured and how they are of value to their communities. Only contributing \$10,000 an entity wouldn’t be sufficient. An option would be to possibly look at other entities that SNRPC could take over or become involved with. The main decision to be made is the role of the organization, the staff, and the budget.

Councilman Kiernan McManus brought up a possibility of an advocacy role. Go to any organization dealing with a specific issue to take a look at what they are doing. The discussions the board had about homelessness, for example, before the strategic planning process began illustrated that there is a lack of coordination of the efforts which lead to overlap or waste of resources.

Bill Marion moved forward to the exercise and discussed what to do to meet those expectations. There are a wide variety of Regional Councils that can be modeled for the SNRPC. The vast majority of Regional Councils are MPOs, and they are similar to the RTC, with huge budgets and dedicated funding sources. There are others that are not MPOs and are internally funded.

SNRPC Board members were asked to place a dot next to the organization that most closely represented how they envision the SNRPC of the future:

Pier Review Analysis

Vision of SNRPC's future Structure

1. Colorado Council of Mayors

Type of Organization: Advocacy Organization

Dues: Based on 8 cents per capita

Budget: Approximately \$250,000

Priority Issues: Homelessness and Transportation; Annual survey determines other priority issues

Staff: Exec. Director services via non-profit agency

Voted: Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani, Councilman Richard Cherchio, Councilman Scott Black, and Councilman Steve Seroka.

2. Regional Coalition of LANL Communities (New Mexico)

Type of Organization: Advocacy Organization

Dues: \$109,000 from members, \$100,000 DOE funding

Budget: \$209,000 revenue; \$192,274 expenditures

Priority Issues: Regional Economic Development, Environmental Regulation, State and Federal Legislative advocacy

Staff: Exec. Director services via independent contractor

Voted: Trustee Kevin L. Child

3. Westside Cities Council of Governments (Southern California)

Type of Organization: Advocacy organization

Dues: \$23,000 per member plus \$25,000 Regional Homeless Coordination Grant
Budget: \$146,517

Priority Issues: Homelessness and Affordable Housing

Staff: Exec. Director services via independent contractor

Voted: Councilman Kiernan McManus

4. Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

Type of Organization: Advocacy organization

Dues: \$850,000 from municipalities, \$150,000 from other Sources

Budget: Approximately \$1 Million

Priority Issues: Regional Plan, Maps & Data, Housing, Economic Development,

Conformance Review – also, projects of regional significance and land use planning

Staff: 6 Full-time staff

5. Detailed Transition PLAN/Disbanding

Recommendations for which activities should be transferred to whom and how to approach complementary organizations

Proposed legislative changes as necessary

Proposed inter-local agreement amendment

Voted: Councilman Dan H. Stewart and Councilman Dan Shaw

Potential Action

Recommendation Action:

Direct staff and consultant team to prepare a report that describes the preferred structure and necessary actions to implement for presentation at January Board Meeting.

- Continue Transition & Merge Plan

OR

- Pursue advocacy role regarding Homelessness or Open Space and emulate the preferred Case Study structure.

Bill Marion summarized that the consensus is to explore what an advocacy entity might look like, including a projected budget for this structure. Lynn Purdue from Purdue Marion & Associates asked for clarification on the use of advocacy vs. forum, as the latter is more informational in nature and more closely related to the discussion of the board. The members indicated that Forum was their preferred direction, or perhaps a blend of the two.

No central issues would be discussed until a later meeting. Purdue Marion will come back with the

example of a structure and the legislative need to do that. They will also present what disbanding would look like. Motion to direct staff to explore both a structure and budget for a Forum/Advocacy group similar to the Mayors Council of Colorado and to investigate the steps towards disbanding, transitioning existing duties, and an analysis and transition plan.

Councilman Stewart asked if all were in favor and then any opposed. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 8. The next date and location of the SNRPC Board meeting is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, January 22, 2019 at 4:00 p.m., at the Clark County Government Center.

Agenda Item 9. Member Comment

No member comment was made.

Agenda Item 10. Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Agenda Item 11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.



SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION AGENDA ITEM

TYPE OF MEETING: COALITION BOARD
MEETING DATE: JANUARY 22, 2018

SUBJECT	Elections for Coalition Board Chair and Vice Chair
SPONSORED BY	Planning Directors
AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION	Elect the Chair and Vice Chair for 2019

VOTE PROCEDURE (if applicable):

- Majority
 Super Majority (2/3, for budgets, expenditures, or contracts that create legal obligations)

FISCAL IMPACT:

- No Impact Impact Estimated total: N/A Per entity cost: No cost

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

In accordance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure adopted by the SNRPC member entities in 1999, the positions of Chair and Vice Chair rotate annually on an alphabetical basis. The City of Las Vegas will serve as Chair for 2019 and the City of North Las Vegas will serve as Vice Chair.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:

N/A

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Elect a City of Las Vegas representative as Chair and a City of North Las Vegas representative as Vice Chair

Contact Information: Name: Sean Robertson Phone Number: 702-267-1537



SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION AGENDA ITEM

TYPE OF MEETING: COALITION BOARD
MEETING DATE: JANUARY 22, 2018

SUBJECT	2018 Consensus Population Estimate
SPONSORED BY	Planning Directors
AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION	Presentation of the annual population estimate to be submitted to the State Demographer

VOTE PROCEDURE (if applicable):

- Majority
- Super Majority (2/3, for budgets, expenditures, or contracts that create legal obligations)

FISCAL IMPACT:

- No Impact Impact Estimated total: N/A Per entity cost: No cost

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Each year the SNRPC member entities produce a population estimate based on housing unit count and additional calculations consistent with the Nevada Administrative Code. The estimate for 2018 is 2,284,616, an increase of 36,226 over last year’s estimate of 2,248,390. This information will be forwarded to the State Demographer for incorporation into the official estimate for the state.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:

2018 Consensus Population Estimate

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Accept the consensus population estimate and direct staff to forward to the State Demographer

Contact Information: Name: Sean Robertson Phone Number: 702-267-1537

Clark County, Nevada 2018 Population Estimates

POPULATION by PLACE

July 30, 2018 (Roll Close)

PLACE / COMMUNITY	Population by: HOUSING TYPE						Group Quarters	TOTAL POPULATION (Includes Grp Qtrs)
	Single Family	Duplex 3/4-Plex	Mobile Home	Apart-ments	Town-homes	Condo-miniums		
CLARK COUNTY	1,423,122	49,022	60,554	454,356	103,602	171,588	22,372	2,284,616
Cities	844,684	31,384	17,221	221,848	56,866	79,131	7,339	1,258,474
Unincorporated Areas	578,437	17,638	43,332	232,508	46,736	92,457	15,033	1,026,142
LAS VEGAS VALLEY URBAN AREA	1,387,892	48,201	51,644	447,383	97,456	164,732	15,303	2,212,610
Cities	822,474	30,673	13,886	219,143	51,911	74,589	6,828	1,219,505
Unincorporated Areas	565,417	17,528	37,758	228,239	45,545	90,142	8,475	993,105
OUTLYING AREAS	35,230	821	8,910	6,973	6,146	6,856	7,069	72,006
Cities	22,210	711	3,336	2,705	4,955	4,542	511	38,969
Unincorporated Areas	13,020	110	5,574	4,268	1,191	2,315	6,558	33,036
CITIES								
Boulder City	9,575	494	2,772	971	686	1,177	429	16,104
Henderson	217,917	1,355	3,581	53,332	17,836	19,212	1,253	314,486
Las Vegas	412,890	17,677	7,645	135,351	26,351	48,914	4,090	652,918
Mesquite	12,635	217	563	1,734	4,269	3,364	82	22,865
North Las Vegas	191,667	11,641	2,659	30,461	7,725	6,464	1,485	252,101
UNINCORPORATED AREAS IN THE LAS VEGAS VALLEY								
Enterprise	161,299	190	313	27,702	7,493	11,926	161	209,086
Lone Mountain	18,327	12	202	0	0	0	0	18,541
Nellis AFB	0	0	0	0	0	0	6,612	6,612
Paradise	81,226	4,194	5,993	68,805	13,400	24,664	992	199,274
Sloan	27	19	76	0	0	0	0	123
Spring Valley	122,743	2,390	3,733	53,046	10,657	34,043	611	227,222
Summerlin South	25,736	0	0	3,679	1,235	1,680	0	32,330
Sunrise Manor	118,078	9,528	23,356	48,324	6,114	10,837	20	216,258
Whitney	27,346	107	1,446	10,753	3,787	2,601	0	46,040
Winchester	7,077	1,009	2,528	15,917	2,859	4,390	79	33,858
Urban "County Islands"	3,557	80	112	14	0	0	0	3,763
UNINCORPORATED OUTLYING AREAS¹								
Blue Diamond	487	0	68	15	0	0	0	571
Bunkerville	891	15	157	0	0	0	0	1,064
Cal-Nev-Ar	40	0	121	0	0	0	0	162
Corn Creek	18	0	37	0	0	0	0	55
Fort Mojave Reservation	0	0	0	0	0	0	384	384
Goodsprings	123	14	85	0	0	0	0	222
Indian Springs	211	8	922	13	0	0	0	1,153
Jean	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	125
Laughlin	3,262	0	2	3,404	1,191	2,295	0	10,154
Lower Kyle Canyon Road	166	0	55	0	0	0	0	221
Moapa / Moapa Reservation	697	10	376	48	0	0	320	1,452
Moapa Valley - Logandale	3,011	14	530	0	0	0	0	3,554
Moapa Valley - Overton	2,117	31	1,291	251	0	0	0	3,690
Moapa Valley - Remainder	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Mountain Springs	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Mt. Charleston	575	2	0	0	0	20	94	691
Nelson	15	0	19	0	0	0	0	33
Primm	0	0	158	512	0	0	0	670
Red Rock ₂	113	0	8	0	0	0	0	121
Sandy Valley	897	7	990	0	0	0	0	1,894
Searchlight	80	3	264	25	0	0	0	372
Spring Mountains ₃	115	5	9	0	0	0	0	129
Other Outlying Areas ₄	0	0	482	0	0	0	5,635	6,117

Clark County Department of Comprehensive Planning

Source: Southern Nevada Consensus Housing Unit Count, August - Roll Close 2018

report date: 10/25/2018

¹ Figures may be different than previous years due to changes in community boundaries.² Includes all areas served by the Red Rock Citizens Advisory Council (Calico Basin, W. Blue Diamond Road) except the townsite of Blue Diamond.³ Includes Cold Creek, Lee Canyon and other areas in the Spring Mountains, but not Mountain Springs or the town of Mt. Charleston.⁴ Includes: Las Vegas Paiute Tribal Lands, Boulder Basin, Cottonwood Cove, Coyote Springs, Las Vegas Wash, & other outlying areas.



SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION AGENDA ITEM

TYPE OF MEETING: COALITION BOARD
MEETING DATE: JANUARY 22, 2018

SUBJECT	Strategic Planning Workshop Report
SPONSORED BY	Planning Directors
AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION	Presentation of the report from the October 23 and November 27 Strategic Planning Workshops

VOTE PROCEDURE (if applicable):

- Majority
 Super Majority (2/3, for budgets, expenditures, or contracts that create legal obligations)

FISCAL IMPACT:

- No Impact Impact Estimated total: N/A Per entity cost: No cost

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The SNRPC Coalition Board participated in two strategic planning workshops to discuss the preferred role and structure of the organization. Purdue Marion and Associates facilitated the workshops and will present the findings of the discussion as well as a recommended strategy to implement the goals of the Board.

Phase 2 of this effort, to be conducted throughout 2019, will be the implementation of the strategy selected by the Board to pursue either a restructuring or a dissolution of the organization.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:

Strategic Planning Report (Will receive at meeting.)

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Accept the report and direct staff to begin implementation of the desired strategy.

Contact Information: Name: Sean Robertson Phone Number: 702-267-1537

