



NOTICE OF MEETING AND AGENDA

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, October 27, 2020, in the Clark County Commission Chambers of the Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy., Las Vegas, NV 89155.

Live streaming of the meeting is available at www.ClarkCountyNV.gov. Under "Residents" Click on Watch CCTV 4 Live, to view the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition Meeting.

1. **Call to Order.**
2. **Roll Call and Compliance with the Open Meeting Law.**
3. **Public Comment.** Comment during this portion of the agenda must be limited to matters on the agenda for action.
4. Approval of the Agenda for October 27, 2020 meeting of the SNRPC. (For possible action)
5. Approve the Minutes of the September 22, 2020 SNRPC meeting. (For possible action)
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. (For possible action)
7. Receive reports from the Southern Nevada Forum and Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada / Southern Nevada Strong on regional issues.
8. Discussion on issues impacting the region and provide staff direction with respect to identified regional issues. (For possible action)
9. Receive the 2021 Master Meeting Schedule. (For possible action)
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.
11. **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

September 22, 2020

In attendance: Commissioner Justin Jones, Chair, Clark County
Councilman Brian Knudsen, Vice Chair, City of Las Vegas
Councilman Richard Cherchio, City of North 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
Councilman Dan Shaw, City of Henderson (via teleconference)

Absent: Trustee Lola Brooks, Clark County School District

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 4:02 P.M., on Thursday, September 22, 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 and Councilman Richard Cherchio, City of North Las Vegas arrived at 4:03 p.m.

Agenda Item 3. Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Agenda Item 4. Approval of the Agenda for September 22, 2020

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

Agenda Item 5. Approval of the Minutes for the August 25, 2020 meeting.

A motion was made by Councilman Knudsen to approve the minutes for the May 26, 2020 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 6. CBER 2020 Long-Term Population Forecast for Clark County, Nevada 2020-2060.

Ayoub Ayoub with the Southern Nevada Water Authority briefly went over CBER, and that it is a population forecast and an annual activity that was completed in June 2020. The forecast shows the continued growth throughout the forecasting horizon which is 2060.

A motion was made by Councilman Stewart to receive the report. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 7. Consideration of an agreement with CBER for the production of a Clark County Population Forecast.

Ayoub Ayoub with the Southern Nevada Water Authority presented an agreement with SNRPC and SNWA to fund CBER annually. The contract gives an option of one year or two year renewal.

A motion was made by Councilman Black to approve the agreement. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 8. Continued discussion for possible action on the purpose, direction, and structure of SNRPC.

Councilman Knudsen briefly went over SNRPC's history in Southern Nevada, and that over the last couple of years there have been questions regarding the purpose of what the SNRPC body entails, the intent, and what can be accomplished by the board. SNRPC was intended to help with the regional planning effort. Over time, a strong relationship was created between each jurisdiction, on how they work together in the long and short range planning of Southern Nevada as a region. Over the last couple of years representatives from each jurisdiction didn't find value of the SNRC Board. Several strategic planning workshops took place to guide the future of SNRPC and one outcome of the workshop was the consideration of disbanding SNRPC. Councilman Knudsen was appointed to SNRPC a year ago. He has been clear and passionate about the organization of the board, and feels as if there is a lot of value in each of the jurisdictions getting together to discuss issues of regional significance. Mr. Knudsen worked with City of Las Vegas team to put together a draft inter-local agreement, and policies and procedures that outline the next phase of the SNRPC. The information that was pushed forward by members of the board were taken into consideration while creating the drafts. The intent was to possibly move away from a regional planning land use perspective and move into planning from a variety of different issues. There have been several conversations between the staff members at each jurisdiction that are relevant. The following are the highlights of some of the issues or challenges with the draft inter-local agreement:

- Changing of the name – Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition to the Southern Nevada Council of Governments.
- Establish the County as the home body. Providing the legal, clerk, and fiscal agent.
- Funding formula to be population based.
- Going towards government affairs type work, lobbyist, or advocate that would work with each member and jurisdiction to help identify issues of regional significance and issues where there is consensus amongst the elected officials and to establish an agenda for the state and federal agencies.

The challenges and questions that came up at the staff level are as follows:

- The inclusion of a business or private member of the public to serve on the board.
- The funding allocation breakdown to make it population based, or a different formula.
- The process for selecting outside firms, whether it be an RFP process or another process.
- The funding with continuing this organization and what that funding would look like from each jurisdiction.
- Staffing of the SNRPC and whether it continues on a rotation basis or stay with the county.
- Questions regarding the policies and rules document.

Councilman Knudsen went over each of the highlighted points. The intention for adding a private sector representative, the Chamber of Commerce for example, to sit in and to be a part of the decision making process as a region.

Commissioner Jones stated that legal counsel for Clark County, Rob Warhola, Esq., weighed in from a legal basis. Commissioner Jones is okay with the idea of including a private member but doesn't want to create statutory issues.

Rob Warhola, Esq. with Clark County stated that the statute identifies the voting requirements for elected officials and doesn't grant authorization to allow someone from the private community to be on the SNRPC board. Mr. Warhola said that it is a good idea, and they can be a part of the Technical Committee, other committees, or consult them, but right now there is no authorization to allow a business person from a private community to have voting rights on the SNRPC Board.

Councilman Shaw stated that he would be very reticent to add someone with voting capacity if they are not also paying and he is not sure how that would play out.

Councilman Stewart stated that by possibly inventing an advisory committee, they can supplement or augment the Technical Committee, or replace the Technical Committee in order to get private input and not go against the grain of their bylaws.

Commissioner Segerblom stated that he would be opposed to having the Chamber on the board. Why would they want business interest? They serve on a lot of the boards where there are too many people already on there, and you never get a decision. It means the bureaucracy ends up running everything, and he feels the less people the better. The more elected people the better. If you're going to pick someone who is not elected, why would you pick a business over some other group?

Councilman Cherchio stated that he likes the idea of having input from a private sector but doesn't believe that they should be a part of the board. They are there representing their constituents, making the decisions on all matters concerning their municipalities. Councilman Cherchio would prefer them to be in a committee or advisory form, so they can maintain their form on the board as electives.

Councilwoman Bridges stated that she doesn't mind an advisory committee or outside advisors, but is wondering who will the business representative represent? She believes that the business representative will represent a particular business or perspective that might not benefit the group and jurisdictions.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he would like to strike from the draft inter-local agreement the inclusion of a business or private member of the public to serve on the board and possibly working out a stronger agreement with RTC, Southern Nevada Strong, which is a steering committee, and SNRPC body to help with the business advisory area.

The second issue is allocation breakdown. The conversation from the July 28, 2020, meeting was the opportunity for the population based funding which would put most of the funding on Clark County, and the distribution would be based on population. From the staff level there was a request to make it more equitable at cost restrictions. The caveat there is the School District, which Trustee Brooks has not been participating in, he believes (Clark County School District) does not want to participate going forward.

Commissioner Jones stated that they will assume that the Clark County School District will not be participating under any funding structure. In regards to population base, Commissioner Jones thinks it makes sense that Clark County is almost half the population, unincorporated Clark County, and is asking the other board members for their consideration, in terms of their population, and in other areas like SNPLMA. He feels that it is only fair for the County to put in its fair share of its represented population.

Commissioner Segerblom asked if they have the votes for the amount of money they pay.

Councilman Stewart is wondering if it will be bias about entities paying more. He's concerned about inequity.

Councilman Knudsen stated that there is a longstanding sense amongst many of the previous elected officials that there is a lack of trust amongst the jurisdictions, and there is a resemblance of that in staff discussions, a lack of trust amongst how the jurisdictions will respond and he is hopeful that they can try to move forward trusting each other. Councilman Knudsen understands that at times they may not agree with each other, but they should be able to talk to each other and figure out what is in the best interest of Southern Nevada.

Commissioner Jones stated that regarding funding there is consensus. As to how they move forward and have trust and decide on the issues about a consultant pushing forward, that will have to be consensus. Commissioner Jones doesn't want to be put in a position where all the effort they are putting in doesn't lead to anything because they can't decide on what the two issues will be

and collectively pursue. The board will either agree to what their priorities are going to be going to the legislature, federal funding or not, and if not, then the experiment will have failed. Commissioner Jones believes they can get there and doesn't think the funding structure ought to play into that.

Councilwoman Diaz stated that she is in agreement, and that as a region, there is a lot of collaboration and coordination in areas of improvement that all municipalities need. She believes there is strength in unity and strength in seeing areas that overlap where they have some short comings, and how they can in a coordinated fashion make an ask at the federal level and state level, because here they are seeing that they need to fill in the gaps, and they need to make sure that they are providing for their community. Councilwoman Diaz believes the good outweighs the maybes. There will always be a municipality that might not be facing the severity of other municipalities in the same space, and she believes there is a way they can build consensus on how they can arrive there, and gain in a productive conversation and collaboration with one another.

Councilman Shaw stated that all of the successes, which were great successes, occurred without the SNRPC body's involvement at all. Every member serves on various committees and boards where there is representation from all municipalities. From the funding point of view, the allocation can be worked out, but for him personally, he will be hard-pressed to go back to the city, while they are laying off people due to COVID, and they are trying to re-build. Sales tax is down, property tax revenue is down, and say that they need to fund another board. Most of the things the SNRPC board is talking about are covered by other boards. It will be hard for him to recommend paying for a lobbyist when every municipality has its own lobbyist. How can you go about doing that without a conflict of interest? He also stated that he sees the board duplicating efforts that all of them are already doing and paying more money. Someone would need to convince him that this overrides laying off people and cutting their budgets.

Councilman Knudsen stated that there are so many issues and items. They have lobbyist and are all working towards the best interest of each of their respective organizations. There are so many things that fall through the cracks, and there is a reason why Southern Nevada fails to meet the demands of the legislature every session and Northern Nevada doesn't. Northern Nevada is highly organized. There is a series of different municipalities and organizations up there that band together to fight for things that are important and relevant to Northern Nevada. Southern Nevada struggles to do that as a region. Individual organizations are able to lobby individual things, but there are many things in Southern Nevada that fall through the cracks which are evident by the fact that we are at the bottom of every good list and the top of every bad list. There is no one real entity that is responsible for the overall help of Southern Nevada. For example, education, they now see that broadband and access to technology is significantly lacking as a region and there is no one individual organization responsible for that. There are a number of examples that they can point to over the last decade where Southern Nevada has failed to organize, regionalize, and collaborate to bring about a healthier Southern Nevada.

Commissioner Jones stated that there is consensus on the allocation and to move onto the third point. Regarding Councilman Shaw's point, Commissioner Jones understands it, and it is a discussion that they will have amongst their own jurisdictions. There is money currently in the SNRPC account this year, and some in which can be used for these efforts.

Councilman Knudsen stated that assuming the board moves forward and there is an allocation based on population, how they would make selections for a government affairs firm. How do they select that? If the County is the lead agency, they would have to take the lead on what is appropriate with guidance, discussion, and direction from the SNRPC board. Mr. Knudsen's thought would be that the County would go before the SNRPC board with a process and solicit opinions.

Commissioner Jones asked the other board members if they had any feelings or opinions on what process would be used for selecting a consultant.

Councilman Stewart stated they need to identify the issues and gain a consensus on them, and then determine how a consultant or consulting firm will help them solve the problem or issue. Until they know what the body is focused on, it might be premature until they understand collectively where they want to go with this.

Commissioner Jones asked Mario Bermudez and Councilman Stewart how the process for selecting consultants worked in the past.

Mario Bermudez with Clark County stated that in the last couple years when they hired the consultant for the Census Outreach and they were going to use the County process, but found out it was too long; therefore, the City of Las Vegas took over because they could get through the process much quicker.

Lisa Corrado with the City of Henderson stated, the last two Census Outreaches were done by RFP, and CBER is done by sole source. SNRPC is subject to what NRS tells them is the basic, but whoever has the capacity to run the RFP process follows their thresholds for whatever amount of money to compete that. The tradition has been that a representative from each entity sits on that panel.

Mario Bermudez stated that it's up to \$1 million dollars before they would need the County Commission board approval to move forward with an RFP. He's not sure how it can legally play out if they use the County's process, would they go to the County Commission as well as the SNRPC board or is it just the SNRPC board which is a question for the legal staff?

Rob Warhola Esq. stated that he will need to do some research.

Commissioner Jones asked about prior RFP's that SNRPC has done that haven't gone back through the local jurisdiction.

Mario Bermudez stated that they didn't go back to each local jurisdiction for approval of that RFP, but the SNRPC board itself did it.

Lisa Corrado stated that the inter-local would have to go back to each entity, but in regards to spending money, it goes to the SNRPC board. Unless Mr. Warhola researches otherwise.

Rob Warhola, Esq. stated that in regards to the process, he would like some time to do research, whether or not the RFP can come back to this board and make the decision, rather than the County

or the Cities, and possibly something to put in the inter-local agreement. If all the jurisdictions agree through a certain process, they submit to the SNRPC board, that's how they may approach it instead of putting it into the rules.

Councilman Knudsen asked fellow board members if they identify issues before they bring someone on, or do they bring someone on to identify issues. He thinks in this agenda item, that they should talk about the issues that are important to each of them, or it can be a part of the agenda at the next meeting. That will help drive the process moving forward or bring someone on to help identify the issues.

Councilman Stewart stated that Purdue Marion & Associates helped the SNRPC board a year ago through several workshops, trying to identify issues. Mr. Stewart stated that he would suggest the board identify the issues and go forward. If they decide on a firm to identify issues, that would be a different discussion. He believes that the issues need to be identified before going for a government affairs type of firm.

Councilman Knudsen stated that at the next board meeting, each member is to get together with managers from their jurisdictions and figure out what are the issues of regional significance that the cities or county aren't addressing and that need to be addressed, and be prepared to talk about it as an agenda item.

Councilman Knudsen moved on to the next topic. Do policy topics need to require a unanimous vote?

Councilman Shaw stated that he's not sure if it requires a unanimous vote, but he thinks it should be a super majority.

Rob Warhola, Esq. stated that it requires 2/3 votes for budget approval.

All board members agreed to the 2/3 required vote.

Councilman Knudsen went onto the next topic of staffing, and stated that in the previous iterations, it rotates between each of the jurisdictions. Right now, it is setup as the representative who is the chair of the organization. That person represents the staffing body and from Mr. Knudsen's experience, switching staff for an organization every year is confusing, and lack of commitment from any staff to the organization, and if the County is willing to staff SNRPC, take their offer.

Commissioner Jones asked Nancy Amundsen if she was still willing to allow the County to utilize her staff for SNRPC. Commissioner Jones understands that there are somethings that need to be worked out from the District Attorney's perspective, and they will continue to have those discussions in regards to legal representation.

Councilman Shaw asked if staffing was free.

Nancy Amundsen with Clark County stated that Jenny's hours are billed back to SNRPC. She also stated that Jenny is a Comprehensive Planning employee.

Councilman Shaw stated that at some point they will have to look over what the cost is as compared to a staff member.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he thinks that's a valid point, and it is something they need to take into consideration on what impacts it has on the County, and to receive an impact statement from the County saying this is what it is, and that will be in consultation with any consultants the board brings on, and make adjustments as needed.

Commissioner Jones asked how many hours a month is Jenny spending on SNRPC.

Jenny Penney with Clark County stated anywhere from 15- 20 hours depending on what's going on with the board.

Councilman Shaw stated they would need to see if it would be cheaper to hire their own staff and have them focus full time on what SNRPC is doing.

Councilman Stewart believes that it will depend on the issues. If it is a big issues then they might need to hire their own staff.

Nancy Amundsen stated that at one time SNRPC had a fulltime secretary but they found that as the SNRPC business was decreasing, they were paying someone to sit and do nothing. That's why they changed the format, there is still a position available, but it will depend on the board's determination as to what type of position they need.

Councilman Knudsen went over the last topic, that given the conversation at this meeting, he believes they can make adjustments to the inter-local and the rules document, and bring them forward for approval at the next meeting if appropriate. His hope is to bring it to the next legislative session, so SNRPC can be a recognized organization from a legislative perspective.

Commissioner Jones stated that if it is adopted next month, then yes.

Councilman Knudsen stated that his action items will be to take the meetings conversation and make adjustments to the draft inter-local and policies and procedures document. The staff need to have appropriate conversations with other jurisdiction staff members to solicit any other feedback. Taking today's conversation and implement the discussion into the document which will be up for approval at the next board meeting. A discussion about appropriate issues of regional significance which will drive the conversation with the County on funding and potential government affairs consultant in a process the board would undertake given the consideration from legal counsel.

Commissioner Jones stated that they formally need to know if the school board is going to opt out of being a part of the inter-local agreement, and to make an offer to the City of Mesquite to be a participant.

Councilman Knudsen stated that he has made multiple attempts to contact the City of Mesquite, and they have not responded. He also mentioned that there was a conversation amongst the school board staff members as being a member, that wouldn't be required to sign the inter-local, but still

be a part of the board.

Agenda Item 9. 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 10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 P.M.



**SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL
PLANNING COALITION
AGENDA ITEM - #6**

TYPE OF MEETING: COALITION BOARD
MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 27, 2020

SUBJECT	Amendment to SNRPC Interlocal Agreement
SPONSORED BY	Councilman Brian Knudsen
AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION	Discussion for possible action 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.

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:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

At SNRPC Coalition Board meetings in 2020, members discussed the role and structure of the SNRPC, including structural changes, budget, priority topics, staffing, meeting frequency, and other related matters as a result of prior workshops and agreement with Purdue-Marion Associates. This item allows discussion and consideration of a second amended interlocal agreement that renames the organization Southern Nevada Council of Governments and amends the organization’s duties, structure, powers, budget, and other matters related to its function as a regional planning coalition in a county whose population is 700,000 or more. Pursuant to Section 17 of the Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement for the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition, the Agreement may be amended by approval of the governing bodies of all Public Entities.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:

Second Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement for the Southern Nevada Council of Governments

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Approve the Second Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement for the Southern Nevada Council of Governments and direct staff accordingly.

Contact Information: Name: Marco Velotta Phone Number: 702.229.4173

SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT

FOR

THE SOUTHERN NEVADA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS,

FORMERLY KNOWN AS

THE SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION

THIS SECOND AMENDED AND RESTATED INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of _____, 20__, by and between the COUNTY OF CLARK, the CITY OF LAS VEGAS, the CITY OF HENDERSON, the CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS, the CITY OF BOULDER CITY, the BOARD OF SCHOOL TRUSTEES, CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, and the REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA, political subdivisions of the State of Nevada.

WHEREAS, Southern Nevada continues to be one of the nation's fastest growing regions; and

WHEREAS, unprecedented growth creates tremendous challenges for local government to maintain an ongoing equilibrium between demands for public services generated by growth and the supply of revenues to finance those demands; and

WHEREAS, failing to meet these challenges will adversely impact such basic quality of life elements as economic prosperity, public safety, education, transportation, recreation and culture, the natural environment, and health care; and

WHEREAS, these challenges transcend governmental jurisdictional boundaries; and

WHEREAS, it is essential to preserve the unique qualities of individual communities as we continue to grow and develop; and

WHEREAS, intergovernmental collaboration has proven to be an efficient and effective approach to address many of these challenges; and

WHEREAS, it is of utmost importance to preserve and enhance the quality of life for the citizens and the future generations of Southern Nevada; and

WHEREAS, there is a need for collaboration and regional recommendations to address the challenges facing Southern Nevada, enumerated above; and

WHEREAS, Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 278.02514 provides that in a county whose population is 700,000 or more, the board of county commissioners and the city council of each of at least the three largest cities in the county shall establish a regional planning coalition by cooperative agreement pursuant to NRS Chapter 277; and

WHEREAS, it was the legislative intent of the 70th Session (1999) of the Nevada Legislature to create a Regional Planning Coalition by Special Act for innovative strategies of planning and development, as well as statutes providing for the establishment of a coalition in certain counties, setting forth its powers and duties, requiring certain plans of public entities to be reviewed, and other matters properly related thereto; and

WHEREAS, the public entities amended and restated an interlocal agreement for the establishment of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC) in 2000; and

WHEREAS, the 79th (2017) Nevada Legislature repealed the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition Act (Chapter 250, Statutes of Nevada, at page 1315); and

WHEREAS, at SNRPC Board meetings and workshops in 2018 and 2019, and pursuant to the Strategic Planning Services scope of work, the SNRPC Board discussed possible roles, priorities, and issues of the SNRPC, including maintaining current functions and duties of SNRPC, restructuring or developing a type of alternative structure of the SNRPC based on other model organizations, or disbanding and transitioning the duties of SNRPC to other organizations; and

WHEREAS, after subsequent meetings and workshops of the SNRPC Board in 2020, the Public Entities desire to amend and restate this Interlocal Agreement that fulfills the requirements of a regional planning coalition pursuant to NRS 278.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE FOLLOWING HAVE BEEN MUTUALLY AGREED UPON BY ALL PARTIES:

1. **Name.** The Southern Nevada Council of Governments (SNCOG) is hereby continued according to the terms of this Agreement and serves as the Regional Planning Coalition established for a County whose population is 700,000 or more pursuant to NRS 278.02507 – NRS 278.02587.
2. **Definitions.**
 - (a) “Fiscal Agent” shall mean Clark County.
 - (b) “Member Entity” shall mean Clark County, the City of Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, the City of North Las Vegas, Boulder City, the Clark County School District, and Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada.
 - (c) The “Comprehensive Regional Policy Plan” shall mean the plan first adopted through the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition and administered by the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada pursuant to NRS 278.02528, and any subsequent amendments or newly created plan. The Comprehensive Regional Policy Plan as adopted at the time of this interlocal is entitled “Southern Nevada Strong.”
 - (d) The “Comprehensive Regional Policy Plan Area” shall mean the incorporated areas of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, and Boulder City, and the unincorporated urban areas of Clark County.
3. **Efficiency Committee Superseded.** Deleted by Amendment
4. **Membership of the Governing Body of the Council (“SNCOG Board”)**
 - (a) The membership of the SNCOG Board shall consist of two (2) elected officials appointed by the governing body of:
 - i. Clark County
 - ii. City of Henderson

- iii. City of Las Vegas
- iv. City of North Las Vegas

- (b) The membership of the SNCOG may include one (1) elected official representative appointed by the governing board from the following entities that are party to this interlocal:
 - i. City of Boulder City
 - ii. Clark County School District
- (c) The membership of the SNCOG may include one (1) official appointed by the chief executive officer or general manager from the following entities or such other public entities formed under NRS that are party to this interlocal to serve as a non-voting, ex-officio member:
 - i. Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
- (d) Each Board member shall have one (1) vote, with the exception of any ex-officio members.
- (e) A majority of the full membership of the SNCOG shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business or duties of the SNCOG.
- (f) The term of each member of the SNCOG Board is coterminous with the member's term of elected office unless the Member Entity that appointed the member rescinds the member's appointment to the SNCOG Board.
- (g) A vacancy on the SNCOG Board must be filled by the Member Entity entitled to appoint the member whose position is vacant. The term of a member appointed by the governing body of each Public Entity to fill a vacancy is the remainder of the term of the member whose position is vacant.

5. Meetings and Notice.

- (a) The SNCOG Board shall establish a calendar of regular meetings at a time and place designated by the Chair, but shall have a minimum of four regular meetings per year. All regular and special meetings of the Council shall be noticed in the manner prescribed by the Nevada Open Meeting Law (NRS Chapter 241).
 - (b) The SNCOG Board may hold special meetings as often as the needs of the Board require, in the manner described by the Rules of Practice and Procedure, upon notice to each member.
6. **Officers.** The officers of the SNCOG Board shall consist of a Chair and Vice-Chair selected from the Board members, elected for a two-year term at the first meeting of each odd numbered calendar year. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall not be from the same Member Entity.

7. **Staff.** The SNCOG Board may appoint and employ such professional, necessary technical and support staff with such duties as required by the Board and enumerated in the Rules of Practice and Procedure:

- (a) An Executive Director, Secretary, Legal counsel, or such other assistant or subordinate staff
- (b) At the direction of a majority vote, the SNCOG Board may request staff support of the Fiscal Agent or other member entity for any such SNCOG staff position, to be compensated in-kind or from the annual budget.
- (c) Through a contract for professional services, pursuant to Section 14.

8. **Technical Committee** – Deleted by Amendment.

9. **Powers of the SNCOG.**

- (a) The SNCOG shall comply with all applicable statutory requirements, including those set forth in NRS 278.02507 through 278.02598, and Nevada Administrative Code, as amended from time to time.
- (b) The SNCOG Board shall adopt rules (“Rules of Practice and Procedure”) to govern the affairs of the SNCOG and the meetings of the Board as it deems necessary and shall amend such rules as necessary.
- (c) The SNCOG Board shall hold at one of its regularly scheduled meetings an annual facilitated strategic workshop to identify, consider, and prioritize:
 - i. Significant regional planning and policy issues within the Comprehensive Regional Policy Plan Area
 - ii. A Project of Regional Significance within the Comprehensive Regional Policy Plan Area, as defined in the Rules of Practice and Procedure
 - iii. Specifically enumerated issues from the Comprehensive Regional Policy Plan that may be of importance and expedience to the Member Entities.
 - iv. Issues described within an Annual Report developed for the Board, summarizing the activities and accomplishments of the Annual Work Plan, described below, from the preceding year, as well as new emerging issues to be contemplated at the workshop.
 - v. Recommended activities, planning areas of study, or regional policy changes for the benefit of the Member Entities to be included in an Annual Work Plan
- (d) The SNCOG Board shall approve a budget pursuant to Section 13 that is consistent with the outcomes of the annual facilitated strategic workshop and Annual Work Plan.
- (e) Any Annual Work Plan activities resulting in recommended policy creation, policy directives, policy changes, or require expenditures shall by referred in the following manner to achieve desired regional consensus:
 - i. Regional: The SNCOG Board may consider and approve recommendations for regional policy changes by resolution with an affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the SNCOG Board.
 - a. If approved, it shall refer such matter to the Member Entity or Entities having jurisdiction over the matter for review. The governing body of

the Member Entity or Entities shall consider the recommendation of the SNCOG within sixty (60) days of the recommendation.

- b. If the governing body of the Member Entity or Entities reject or fail to consider the SNCOG recommendation within sixty (60) days, the respective SNCOG Board Member Entity shall report to the SNCOG Board at its next regular meeting the reasons for such rejection or non-consideration.
- ii. State or Federal: The SNCOG Board may consider and approve recommendations for Bill Draft Requests, regulations, or policy changes by resolution with an affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the SNCOG Board.
 - a. If approved, it shall refer such matter to all Member Entities for review and consideration. The governing body of the Member Entity or Entities may consider the recommendation of the SNCOG within sixty (60) days of the SNCOG recommendation.
 - b. If the governing body of the Member Entity or Entities reject or fail to consider the SNCOG recommendation within sixty (60) days, the respective SNCOG Board Member Entity shall report to the SNCOG Board at its next regular meeting the reasons for such rejection or non-consideration.
 - c. If approved by the governing bodies of two-thirds (2/3) of the Member Entities, the SNCOG staff or the Fiscal Agent shall communicate the recommendation of regional consensus to the applicable person(s) / entity or entities, including but not limited to:
 - i. The appropriate legislative committee;
 - ii. Identified members of the Nevada Assembly or Senate;
 - iii. The Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau;
 - iv. The Governor's Office;
 - v. The appropriate State department or agency;
 - vi. The appropriate Federal department or agency;
 - vii. Members of the Congressional delegation.

(f) The SNCOG may, without limitation and upon approval of a majority of its members:

- i. Resume administration of the Comprehensive Regional Policy Plan subject to a minimum six (6) month notice to the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada.
- ii. Coordinate regional and local databases, performance tracking platforms, and technical reports for the region.
- iii. Establish standardized population projections and consensus population estimates.
- iv. Examine issues and problems with respect to Federal Land Disposal Policy and Practice in the Las Vegas Valley and annexations, as well as consult with the affected Public Entities and representatives of the Federal Government, address interjurisdictional issues, and make recommendations with respect thereto.
- v. Identify and recommend appropriate measures to coordinate development regulations and public improvement standards for Member Entities.
- vi. Consider any other issues of regional significance as determined by the SNCOG Board.

10. **Clearinghouse Responsibility** – Deleted by Amendment

11. **Procedures** – Deleted by Amendment

12. **Committees and Subcommittees.**

(a) There shall be a standing working committee comprised of representatives of the Member Entities, other public agencies within Southern Nevada, and members of the business community. The committee shall advise the SNCOG Board on the status of work items and activities as approved by the Annual Work Plan and budget, professional services.

(b) The SNCOG Board may form and appoint other such committees and subcommittees from time to time with such duties as may be designated by the Board. Committees and subcommittees shall have such members and duties as may be determined from time to time by the SNCOG Board.

13. **Budget Authority.**

(a) The SNCOG Board shall approve a prepared annual budget on or before July 1 of each year and apportion recommended costs among the Member Entities proportional to the Member Entities' share determined from the most recent consensus Southern Nevada population estimate.

(b) The recommended apportioned costs shall be submitted to the governing bodies of the Member Entities for approval. Upon approval by each Member Entity, funds to cover that entity's share of costs shall be deposited into a separate account to be maintained by the Fiscal Agent. Each Member Entity agrees to pay its share of annual budget expenses during the term of this Agreement.

(c) The Fiscal Agent shall furnish an independent audit on request of the SNCOG Board. Such an independent audit shall not occur more than one (1) time each year.

(d) The SNCOG may accept grants or donations from other Federal, state, regional, or local governments, private sector donors, or non-profits.

(e) The affirmative vote of 2/3 of the members of the SNCOG Board is necessary to pass an action relating to:

- i. A budgetary matter or a matter which involves an expenditure of public money;
- ii. A contract or other instrument that creates a binding legal obligation on a public entity; or
- iii. The acceptance of grants or donations from other Federal, state, regional, or local governments, private sector donors, or non-profits.

14. **Professional Services.** In the exercise of its powers, the SNCOG may employ professional services with any public or private entities to provide support services for the SNCOG. All outside professional services shall be by contract approved by the SNCOG Board, prepared by SNCOG staff or the Fiscal Agent pursuant to the Rules of Practice and Procedure, and shall conform to the budget except in cases of emergencies as determined by the Board. Support services may include, but are not limited to the following:

- (a) Administrative or legal support
- (b) Regional facilitation, planning, and policy outreach to constituents, elected officials, and other leaders to promote the efforts of the SNCOG Board.
- (c) State and Federal lobbying services to promote the efforts of the SNCOG Board;

- (d) Coordination of efforts on behalf of the SNCOG with all participating jurisdictions;
- (e) Any other professional and technical consultants, as needed.

15. **Term of the Agreement.** This Agreement shall continue until terminated.
16. **Termination.** This Agreement may be terminated by the adoption of a resolution to that effect by 2/3 of the governing bodies. Such termination shall not take effect until all outstanding debts or contractual obligations of the SNCOG have been fulfilled and one hundred and eighty (180) days have passed from the adoption of such resolution by the fourth Member Entity.
17. **Amendments.** This Agreement may be amended by approval of such amendment by the governing bodies of all Member Entities.
18. **Effective Date.** The effective date of this Agreement shall be the date on which the governing body of the last Member Entity approves this Agreement.
19. **Applicable Law.** The laws of the State of Nevada shall govern the validity, construction, performance and effect of this Agreement.
20. **Headings; Cross-References.** The headings and captions used in this Agreement are for convenience and ease of reference only and shall not be used to construe, interpret, expand or limit the terms of this Agreement. All references in this Agreement to sections shall be to sections of this Agreement, unless otherwise specified.
21. **Counterparts; Electronic Delivery.** This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, all such counterparts will constitute the same instrument and the signature of any party to any counterpart will be deemed a signature to, and may be appended to, any other counterpart, each of which shall be an original and all of which shall together constitute one and the same instrument. Executed copies hereof may be delivered by facsimile or e-mail and upon receipt will be deemed originals and binding upon the parties hereto, regardless of whether originals are delivered thereafter.
22. **No Third Party Beneficiaries.** Nothing expressed or implied in this Agreement is intended, or should be construed, to confer upon or give any person or entity not a party to this Agreement any third-party beneficiary rights, interests, or remedies under or by reason of any term, provision, condition, undertaking, warranty, representation, or agreement contained in this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed by their duly authorized representatives on the day and in the year first above written.

Clark County:

Attest: Lynn Marie Goya, County Clerk

Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Chairwoman

Date

City of Henderson:

Attest: Sabrina Mercadante, City Clerk

Debra March, Mayor

Date

City of Las Vegas:

Attest: LuAnn Holmes, City Clerk

Carolyn G. Goodman, Mayor

Date

City of North Las Vegas:

Attest: Catherine Raynor, City Clerk

John Lee, Mayor

Date

City of Boulder City:

Attest: Lorene Krumm, City Clerk

Kiernan McManus, Mayor

Date

Clark County School District:

Attest: Trustee Danielle Ford, Clerk

Lola Brooks, Trustee President

Date

Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada:

Attest

Lawrence L. Brown, Chairman

Date



**SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL
PLANNING COALITION
AGENDA ITEM - #7**

TYPE OF MEETING: COALITION BOARD
MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 27, 2020

SUBJECT	Regional issues presentation from Southern Nevada Forum – Southern Nevada Strong
SPONSORED BY	Councilman Brian Knudsen
AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION	Receive reports from the Southern Nevada Forum and Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada / Southern Nevada Strong on regional issues

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:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The Southern Nevada Forum consists of state legislators, the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, and other public and private sector stakeholders in Southern Nevada that determine and advocate for regional priorities during legislative sessions. Members of the Southern Nevada Forum will provide a report and update on the Forum’s activities in 2020. In addition, staff from the Regional Transportation Commission / Southern Nevada Strong will provide a brief presentation on regional issues that are affecting Southern Nevada, including those that have been identified in the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan, the Comprehensive Regional Policy Plan adopted by SNRPC and its members pursuant to NRS 278.02528.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:

Presentations.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Contact Information: Name: Marco Velotta Phone Number: 702.229.4173



**SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL
PLANNING COALITION
AGENDA ITEM - #8**

TYPE OF MEETING: COALITION BOARD
MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 27, 2020

SUBJECT	Regional issues and priorities
SPONSORED BY	Councilman Brian Knudsen
AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION	Discussion for possible action on issues impacting the region and provide staff direction with respect to identified regional issues

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:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The Board may discuss and prioritize identified regional issues and direct staff of the member entities accordingly, with respect to implementation according to currently adopted or future Annual Work Plans.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:

Presentation.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Approve the identified regional issues and direct staff accordingly.



SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION AGENDA ITEM - #9

TYPE OF MEETING: COALITION BOARD
MEETING DATE: October 27, 2020

Table with 2 columns: Field Name, Value. Rows include SUBJECT (2021 Master Meeting Schedule), SPONSORED BY (Planning Directors), and AGENDA ITEM DESCRIPTION (Discuss the SNRPC Master Meeting Schedule for 2021).

VOTE PROCEDURE (if applicable):

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

FISCAL IMPACT:

No Impact (checked) Impact Estimated total: Per entity cost:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The SNRPC master meeting schedule for 2021 follows the same pattern as previous years. The Technical Committee will meet on the first Thursday of every month and the Coalition Board will meet on the fourth Tuesday of every month. These meetings may be cancelled by the respective chairs if necessary. The Planning Directors recommend approving the schedule in advance to allow adequate time to prepare for briefings and reserve alternative meeting spaces if necessary.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION:

Draft master meeting schedule.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Approve the master meeting schedule.

Contact Information: Name: Mario Bermudez Phone Number: 702-455-5013

2021 SNRPC MASTER MEETING SCHEDULE

DATE		MEETING	AGENDA		LOCATION		
MONTH	DAY		CUT-OFF DATE	POST/E-MAIL	TIME	PLACE	CHAIR
FEBRUARY	4	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	1/21/2021	1/28/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	8	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 3/7 T.C. agenda)		2/1/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	23	COALITION BOARD	2/9/2021	2/16/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
MARCH	4	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	2/18/2021	2/25/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	8	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 4/4 T.C. agenda)		3/1/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	23	COALITION BOARD	3/9/2021	3/16/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
APRIL	1	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	3/18/2021	3/25/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	12	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 5/2 T.C. agenda)		4/5/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	27	COALITION BOARD	4/13/2021	4/20/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
MAY	6	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	4/22/2021	4/29/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	10	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 6/6 T.C. agenda)		5/3/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	25	COALITION BOARD	5/11/2021	5/18/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
JUNE	3	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	5/20/2021	5/27/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	14	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 7/4 T.C. agenda)		6/7/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	22	COALITION BOARD	6/8/2021	6/15/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
JULY	1	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	6/17/2021	6/24/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	12	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 8/1 T.C. agenda)		7/5/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	27	COALITION BOARD	7/13/2021	7/20/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
AUGUST	5	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	7/22/2021	7/29/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	9	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 9/5 T.C. agenda)		8/2/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	24	COALITION BOARD	8/10/2021	8/17/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
SEPTEMBER	2	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	8/19/2021	8/26/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	13	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 10/3 T.C. agenda)		9/6/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	28	COALITION BOARD	9/14/2021	9/21/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
OCTOBER	7	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	9/23/2021	9/30/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	11	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 11/7 T.C. agenda)		10/4/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	26	COALITION BOARD	10/12/2021	10/19/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
NOVEMBER	4	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	10/21/2021	10/27/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	8	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 12/5 T.C. agenda)		11/1/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	23	COALITION BOARD	11/9/2021	11/16/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
DECEMBER	2	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	11/18/2021	11/25/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	13	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 1/2/20 T.C. agenda)		12/6/2021	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	28	COALITION BOARD	12/14/2021	12/21/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
JANUARY	6	TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	12/23/2021	12/30/2021	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY
	10	PLANNING DIRECTORS (for 2/6/20 T.C. agenda)		1/3/2022	3:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY GOV. CENTER	CLARK COUNTY
	25	COALITION BOARD	1/11/2022	1/18/2022	4:00 PM	CLARK COUNTY COMMISSION CHAMBERS	CLARK COUNTY

Chair -- Clark County

Vice-Chair -- City of Las Vegas

****Any changes in schedule will be reflected on the SNRPC.org website****

Planning Directors (not a public meeting) meet on the 2nd Monday of each month

Technical Committee meets on the 1st Thursday of each month, unless otherwise announced.

Coalition Board meets on the 4th Tuesday of each month, unless otherwise announced.