

MEETING MINUTES

COALITION BOARD

SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION

January 22, 2019

In attendance: Councilman Dan H. Stewart, CHAIR, City of Henderson
Councilman Steve Seroka, City of Las Vegas
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 Tick Segerblom, Clark County
Commissioner Justin Jones, Clark County

Absent: Councilwoman Michele Fiore, Vice Chair, City of Las Vegas
Trustee Linda E. Young, 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 Councilman Stewart, City of Henderson, at 4:00 P.M., on Tuesday, January 22, 2019, in the Clark County Commission Chambers at 500 Grand Central South, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89155.

Agenda Item 2. Roll Call

Members of the SNRPC Board, as listed above, were present with the exception of Councilwoman Michele Fiore, City of Las Vegas, Vice Chair and Trustee Linda E. Young, Clark County School District.

It was confirmed by Jennifer Penney that a super majority was present and that the January 22, 2019 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 January 22, 2019

A motion was made by Councilman Shaw to approve the agenda for the January 22, 2019 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 5. Approval of the Minutes for the November 27, 2018 meeting

A motion was made by Councilman Shaw to approve the minutes of the November 27, 2018 meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 6. Consent Agenda Item(s):

- a. 2018 Southern Nevada Consensus Population Estimate

A motion was made by Councilman Black to approve the 2018 Southern Nevada Consensus Population Estimate. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 7. Strategic Planning Workshop Report

Bill Marion with Purdue Marion & Associates, summarized what was discussed at the November 27, 2018 Coalition Board meeting. He gave a brief background on how they got to where they are today. The Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan, sponsored by the SNRPC, was a three year process to complete. It was then determined that Southern Nevada Strong would be turned over to the RTC. SNRPC doesn't have the dedicated staff or capacity to implement it; therefore, it was turned over to the RTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization. The required legislation was heard two years ago at the state legislature. Many of the prescriptions on how the SNRPC would operate were repealed. This allowed SNRPC the latitude it needed in terms of determining what it wants to be, but it needs to adopt a regional plan with certain elements that are associated with that regional plan.

Interviews were held with each member of the Coalition Board and Planning Directors. They went over the concerns, ideas, and opportunities for SNRPC. Two workshops were held on October 23, 2018 and November 27, 2018. Those workshops included discussions and interaction with the Coalition members to look more specifically into the opportunities or challenges there would be, leading up to today in order to give a report on the findings and recommended solutions for the SNRPC moving forward. The interviews were very educational.

Summary from Interviews

- Delegation of Southern Nevada Strong
 - Important factor, it's running in coordination with all of the regional agencies and partners. SNRPC does not need to be an implementer of Southern Nevada Strong.
- Lack of dedicated funding sources and strained in-kind participation
 - Challenges for SNRPC is that it does not have dedicated staffing. Meaning it relies on the staff of the member agency from whom the chair is from. The staff is already overwhelmed by duties from their own agency. Without dedicated staff, the organization is limited in what it can do as an entity, and it is also limited by the lack of independence.

- Importance of local autonomy over land use
 - Most regional agencies that are also MPO's have a much more prescriptive relationship in terms of planning, such as the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency, which is not an MPO. They have an agreement with the three members which includes Sparks, Reno, and Washoe County. They abide by planning uses and planning issues that go before the TRPC. We don't have that example here. The member agencies, such as Clark County, City of Las Vegas, and North Las Vegas like to have the autonomy over their own planning decisions and are not interested in relegating that authority over to the Regional Planning Coalition.

- High value for regional collaboration among staff and Board, but other structures currently address transportation, economic development, flood control, health, housing, and other topics.
 - The issues that SNRPC could take into consideration are already limited because of regional boards that cover those.

- Regional Open Space & Trails efforts
 - Praise for some initiatives that SNRPC has taken on, particularly the Regional Open Space & Trails projects, which may not have occurred if there hadn't been an intent to take that responsibility.

- Consider not requiring regular meetings; only convene if called upon.
 - Given the fact that the State legislature has taken all those prescriptions out.

Summary of 11/27 Workshop

Potential clarified roles:

- Regional Forum/Advocacy organization – an opportunity for the exchange of ideas and information and the ability to achieve a consensus and a shared action plan on identified issues of regional significance;
- Dissolution – there is no critical role for the SNRPC at this time, and there is little interest in providing financial and human resources to keep the entity going;
- Maintain the status quo, but with a reduced meeting schedule and activity.

What kind of roles would SNRPC wants to address. One example would involve becoming an Advocacy agency, a forum, a clearing house, or to just dissolve. Also, looking at a different variety of issues that could be considered, such as economic development, homelessness, affordable housing, and Open Space and Trails. The Coalition Board members also did an exercise to look at which entity would exist or matter to the Coalition Board as a body. Purdue and Marion came back with more specific examples and ideas on how SNRPC could operate. They looked at four different peer entities or regional counsels that are not MPO's, but regional counsels that deal with geographical areas similar to what has been talked about. They were Colorado Counsel of Mayors, Regional Coalition of LANL Communities (New Mexico), Westside Cities Council of Governments (Southern California), and Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency.

Throughout the workshops it was evaluated and almost mutually agreed that if SNRPC would continue that the Colorado Counsel of Mayors provided a model that closely mimicked what the Board would like to see happen. Bill stated that the alternative to that was to dissolve. He then presented the options that SNRPC had.

Option 1: Maintain the Status Quo

The idea of maintaining status quo was relegated to a third tier; there didn't seem to be much interest in maintaining the status quo.

Maintaining the status quo would mean keeping the SNRPC with the name of the SNRPC. It could still transition the planning responsibilities to another entity, meet on whatever basis it needed, and examine issues the SNRPC wants to examine, which may require a change to the inter-local agreement.

Option 2: Restructure based on Model Organization (forum and advocate role)

- Meeting Schedule
 - Every other month
 - Annual retreat
 - Reporting to Member Council
- Administration
 - Change name in NRS
 - Annual Budget \$250,000
 - Outsource Administration
 - Apply for grants or other funding

Option 2: Restructuring Requirements

- Transition existing regional plan responsibilities – requires legislative approval
- Change name to reflect new mission – requires legislative approval
- Create a formal agreement with the MPO on local governments' participation in SNS
- Establish an appropriate budget to achieve desired goals and objectives
- Provide consistent, reliable and appropriate funding mechanism
- Prepare new Interlocal Agreement supported by all member entities.

Option 3: Disband Systematically

- Dissolve and transition existing responsibilities
- Establish Interlocal Agreement with the MPO addressing local governments' role in SNS
- Reduced meeting schedule and activity until 2021 Legislature

Bill Marion turned the time over to the Board to discuss their concerns and present potential actions.

Councilman Shaw stated that in going over what has been accomplished and in seeing the expense that the City of Henderson has gone to, he motioned that SNRPC transfer its duties to RTC and other regional agencies and just dissolve the board.

Councilman Stewart agreed with Councilman Shaw.

Councilman Black would like more information on option 3 of disbanding.

Bill Marion stated that SNRPC would have to create some type of schedule, due to being mandated by statute to exist; SNRPC's duty is to have a regional plan. The board would have to approach the next session of legislature with a plan for recreating SNRPC as a different entity. The implementation of this plan would take time, and it would not appear in front of the legislature this cycle. Dissolving would be easier to do.

Councilman Black inquired to the issue of not being able to put it in front of the legislature during this session, then what would be the bare bone structure for the next two years.

Bill Marion stated it could be once a year or twice a year.

Councilman Stewart stated that the report needed to be accepted. Councilman Shaw motioned to accept the Strategic Planning report. The motion was approved unanimously.

Councilman Seroka supported Shaw's motion. The issues that SNRPC tackles have already been taken on by other organizations. The other organizations are funded and have the manpower which makes SNRPC redundant. He supported the motion to option 3 to disband and transition methodically with the legislature.

Councilman Cherchio stated he was not sold on the idea of disbanding, due to new members on the board being able to form their own opinions, who were not present at the meeting. He would like to hear from other colleagues, and he supported the idea of maintaining status quo and to have a third party entity to take the responsibility.

Councilman Jones felt that SNRPC had a valuable mission in the community, such as addressing concerns and problems that are faced as a community, not just specific issues pertaining to one jurisdiction. He was not willing to vote to disband a commission he just joined until he was able to gather more information.

Councilman McManus shared that there were issues that existed within Clark County that were not being addressed by the other agencies. Each of the other entities within Clark County could bring something up that pertained to regional issues that were not being addressed. The group could change and still serve the community.

Commissioner Segerblom wanted to know what planning duties the RTC didn't already have.

Bill Marion stated that the duty of the regional plan was assigned to the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition. As of now, the RTC is the implementer of this; however, they are not the recognized authorizer of the plan. The statute allows SNRPC to work with others towards the creation of a plan. Once the regional plan has been created, it can be amended or changed from time to time; however, it is still an enumerated responsibility of the SNRPC to be the formal adopter of the plan.

Commissioner Segerblom inquired if the plan included water, air, and transportation?

Bill Marion stated that water, air, and transportation were all elements within the plan. The regional plan covers everything from healthcare to transportation. The RTC would not take on the homelessness issue, unless there is a transportation element related to that issue; they would contribute if it involved that issue. The homeless issue would be the responsibility of the Continuum of Care. Public housing is in place with the Housing Authority. There are a variety of partnering agencies that are responsible for certain elements of the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan.

Commissioner Segerblom that he would like one more meeting to think through these issues and speak with others before giving his motion.

Lisa Corrado, Assistant Director of Community Development and Services with the City of Henderson, clarified the required duties that are statutory which included the creation of the regional policy plan. At the last legislative session, the plan was delegated to the RTC. The other duties were to create incentives for transit oriented development and conducting the conformity reviews; those few items along with others that were accomplished go hand-in-hand with the Regional Plan. She also stated there were a few outstanding items in the NRS that would make sense to move along with the Regional Plan.

Councilman Shaw stated “the way that this group has historically run, it has gone from municipality to municipality. Henderson would continue the responsibility to run SNRPC, if the Board decides to dissolve.”

Councilman McManus stated that the option which was discussed would no longer place the burden on the staff. Each member of the community would obtain staff. A third party that will do all the work and not place the burden on one member of the staff each year.

Councilman Stewart stated that the City of Henderson can’t continue wasting money and doesn’t support hiring a third party.

Councilman Shaw stated that every issue that has been brought up is handled by a different funded agency and that there is no need for redundancy or to have any of the cities pay additional funds to go after something that is already being handled.

Councilman Seroka stated that the most significant vote has been in support of the trails system. The other meetings have not been of substance. What helped him to decide to go with option three

of disbanding is that our municipalities are represented through the other bodies that have been discussed. If there is something that needs to be added, it can be done as a recommendation to an effective transition plan that we would then take to the legislature. He believed that all the areas are covered.

Councilman Cherchio did not want to rush to judgement just to get it into the current session of the legislature, and he doesn't disagree with his colleagues. He continued to state that what SNRPC does here is not productive and shouldn't be continued for the sake of continuing along with North Las Vegas. There should be no spending of money just for the sake of spending money. Having a quarterly meeting that addresses a few items could make a difference. He would like to look into the third party, and the City of North Las Vegas has the funding for this.

Councilman Stewart requested to go back to Councilman Cherchio's point, and asked if Lisa would go more into detail. He stated that there has been no mention of population estimates, which SNRPC voted to handle. The City of Henderson will probably take over the population estimates, as they are the only ones that have a demographer on staff. He would like more clarification from Lisa.

Lisa Corrado, stated that she understood Councilman Cherchio's concern because the structure is in place and that SNRPC is a good platform to use in order to convene at the Planning Director's level.

SNRPC has three levels to its body as follows: First, The Planning Director's, an informal group not under open meeting law; a group that the staff of the entities supports, convenes, creates the Board agendas, and reviews projects and presentations. Next, The Technical Committee, which in years past was headed by the Cities and County management; currently, it is more for the Planning Director level. The Planning Director's group is staff that meets and presents findings to the third group, which is the Coalition Board. Through those two levels, the agenda items go to the Coalition Board. The staff does benefit from working together through SNRPC, but there are other ways that staff can meet. For example, the members of the staff meet for the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee, the RTC has the Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee as well. There are other committees for regional organizations that address Homelessness, staff committees working on the Continuum of Care and Affordable Housing and the staff get together in other forums.

There are platforms in place in order to work together on issues/concerns; for example, the Population Estimate that can be done through an interlocal, which is done informally at times when a topic doesn't fall in a specific Board purview. Each entity contributed funds to The West Care contract for a provider to provide to specific services, which was done by staff getting together and asking how much each entity could contribute.

Lisa clarified Commissioner Segerblom's point that a motion would be to pursue legislative change. One cannot disband itself, but the motion would be to accept the report as well as to direct staff to implement the desired strategy. If the desired strategy is to disband that would mean pursuing legislation change.

Commissioner Jones asked for Nancy Amundsen, Director of Clark County Comprehensive Planning to give information that would be helpful.

Nancy Amundsen, stated that Clark County was the administrator before the City of Henderson took over. Nancy stated that she and Chris Giunchigliani worked with the legislature. Two changes were made that included the act of 1999 that created the SNRPC and required it to be very prescriptive but wasn't being followed. They were able to table the Act. Prior to that time Clark County gave Southern Nevada Strong to the RTC as the administrator. They needed the Act in the law and that is what needed to be changed. SNRPC decided to go through Strategic Planning before transferring over to the City of Henderson. Before that it was requested they look into their interlocal and create a way so that SNRPC wouldn't go away and not be able to pursue something legislatively. Making SNRPC the body, so that it wouldn't be restrictive in the interlocal agreement, the staff could do a lot of the work and work collaboratively as they are now. Clark County is not looking for a way to eliminate SNRPC and make it so that it was staff driven, with the final results being through this body, but making it into something where the board could meet whenever was necessary to direct staff working together. The law right now does read that the SNRPC can raise money to hire staff, etc. Clark County does administer the budget and has the staff that's reimbursed on a part FT, a very small part. Clark County is very open to working with this body and working with the other agencies. If there is an issue in the interim, Clark County would be more than happy to do the administration that, just as the City of Henderson has been doing.

Commissioner Segerblom stated that from Nancy's information, the Clark County staff feels as if there is a legitimate role to be played by the SNRPC. Not having to meet as regularly or be as active, but to get rid of it might give up an opportunity that we could use later on, if the staff saw something that was a regional matter.

Nancy Amundsen stated that not only would the NRS have to change to eliminate SNRPC, NRS would also have to change so that if Southern Nevada Strong were to be a full blown regional plan it would have to change to allow the RTC to be the MPO because right now the way that NRS is written, even though they are the Regional Planning Association for transportation, they have to focus on transportation, there would be a little bit of a conflict. RTC's codes would have to change and Clark County's codes would have to change. We're just looking for a way to make it so that the members wouldn't have to meet all the time, but also have regional bodies so that we as municipalities and the staff could get together and give you presentations and to have a collaborative working relationship.

Lisa Corrado stated that the motion would be to direct staff to pursue legislative change in the matter of disbanding.

Councilman Stewart restated the motion and asked for a roll call vote

Councilman McManus, City of Boulder	Nay
Commissioner Segerblom, Clark County	Nay
Commissioner Jones, Clark County	Nay
Councilman Shaw, City of Henderson	Yes
Councilman Stewart, City of Henderson	Yes
Councilman Seroka, City of Las Vegas	Yes
Councilman Chercio, City of North Las Vegas	Nay
Councilman Black, City of North Las Vegas	Nay

Councilman Stewart stated 3 to 5. The motion was denied.

Commissioner Jones made a motion to table the issue to the next meeting in the interim the County can take over the responsibilities of admin.

Councilman Stewart stated that the next entity to lead, going in order, is the City of Las Vegas.

Lisa Corrado stated that the process has been alphabetically ordered, but if someone forgoes their turn and someone else can offer to do it.

Nancy Amundsen stated that the County has done it twice, due to the Clark County School District not having the staff to do it. The chair is the one who has the administrative staff.

Commissioner Segerblom asked if it would be possible to amend the motion for the staff of City of Las Vegas and the staff of Clark County to work together to bring something forward to the next meeting in regards to how this can be arranged differently in conjunction with the work that Marion and Purdue has done.

Commissioner Jones amended his motion to only table the issue until the next meeting.

Councilman Stewart asked is anyone had a motion in regards to Item number 7 since the motion was denied.

A motion was made by Councilman Stewart to take no action with tabling on the three choices that Bill Marion brought forward. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 8. Elect the SNRPC Board Chair and Vice Chair for 2019 Calendar Year. McManus, nominated Steve Seroka for Chair.

According to the Rules of Practice and Procedure dated August of 1999, it states, “The Chair shall rotate alphabetically by participating entity name on an annual basis.”

A motion was made by Councilman Stewart to accept the recommendation of Councilman Seroka, City of Las Vegas as Chair and Councilman Chercio, City of North Las Vegas as Vice Chair for the 2019 calendar year. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 9. The next date and location for a regular meeting of the SNRPC Board

Is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, February 26, 2019 at 4:00 P.M., in the Clark County Commission Chambers.

Robert Summerfield, Director of Planning for City of Las Vegas, recommended to hold the February meeting to allow the new board members 30 days to meet with the consultant and be properly informed of SNRPC. He stated it would allow to revisit the vote of disbanding and be able to make a decision before this next legislature.

A motion was made by Councilman Seroka to hold the February 26, 2019 meeting at 4:00 P.M. in the Clark County Commission Chambers. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 10. Member Comment

No member comment was made.

Agenda Item 11. Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Agenda Item 13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 P.M.