

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.