

MEETING MINUTES SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION

MAY 27, 2004

IN ATTENDANCE:

Commissioner Myrna Williams, Chair, Clark County
Mayor Robert Ferraro, Boulder City
Trustee Denise Brodsky, Vice Chair, Clark County School District
Commissioner Lynette Boggs McDonald, Clark County
Mayor Oscar Goodman, City of Las Vegas
Councilman Lawrence Weekly, City of Las Vegas
Councilwoman Stephanie Smith, City of North Las Vegas
Councilman Steve Kirk, City of Henderson
Councilman Amanda Cyphers, City of Henderson

Agenda Item 1. Call to order, notice of agenda conformance with the Open Meeting Law.

Commissioner Myrna Williams, Chair, called the meeting of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition to order at 3:07 p.m., Thursday, May 27, 2004, in Boulder City at the City Hall Council Chambers, 401 California Avenue, Boulder City, Nevada 89005.

The agenda for the May 27, 2004, meeting was duly posted in compliance with the Open Meeting Law.

Agenda Item 2. Approval of the Agenda for May 27, 2004.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 3. Approval of the Minutes of the March 25, 2004, meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the March 29, 2004, meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 4. Receive the SNRPC Organizational Chart; take any necessary action.

Each member received a copy of the SNRPC Organizational Chart (Exhibit A). Edward James, SNRPC Regional Planner, stated that the organizational chart was created for the purpose of outlining how the SNRPC is structured. Referring to the organizational chart, Councilwoman Cyphers suggested that Mr. James should be linked directly to the SNRPC Board. Answering the question, had the Technical Committee discussed the issue? Jon Wardlaw, Clark County, stated

that Patricia Battie and Mr. James who are staffed to the SNRPC should be listed under the Planning Directors, who are under the Technical Committee, who report to the Board. Councilman Kirk stated that functionally that may be accurate; however, Mr. James works directly for the Board and will be reviewed by the Board. Therefore, the organizational chart should reflect a link that places Mr. James equal with the Technical Committee since both report directly to the Board.

A motion was made to link the SNRPC staff, Mr. James and Ms. Battie directly to the Coalition Board on the organizational chart. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 5. Receive the proposed SNRPC Mission Statement; take any necessary action.

Each member received a copy of the proposed SNRPC Mission Statement (Exhibit B). Mr. James stated that the Board, over the last several years, has adopted various plans that contain policies. However, there has never been a precise mission statement adopted. Mr. James stated that he comprised a one-page statement, gleaned from the various directions that the Coalition has approved in the past, to make one precise mission statement. Mayor Goodman stated that item 2, "To be the forum for regional problem solving and consensus in the region" should be adhered to by all agencies. Commissioner Williams stated, for the record, that the Coalition members recognize that the SNRPC can not usurp the powers of agencies such as the Southern Nevada Water Authority, Regional Flood Control District, Clark County School District, Clark County Air Quality, or the Clark County Airport Commission.

After discussion, a motion was made to approve the mission statement. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 6. Receive a status report on expanding the SNRPC Technical Committee membership.

Mr. James stated that at the last Board meeting, the members recommended the expansion of the Technical Committee to include Southern Nevada Water Authority, Regional Transportation Commission, and Clark County Air Quality. Each agency has accepted the invitation and the Technical Committee unanimously approved each agency as full voting members. Christine Robinson, Clark County Air Quality, speaking for Air Quality and Regional Transportation stated that their agencies look forward to working with the SNRPC on regional issues in the Valley.

No motion was recommended for this item.

Agenda Item 7. Approve the Conformity Agreements between the SNRPC and the Clark County Water Reclamation District, Clark County School District, and the Letter of Acknowledgement from the University and Community College System of Nevada; take any necessary action.

Each member received a copy of the Conformity Agreement from the Clark County School District (Exhibit C), Conformity Agreement from Clark County Water Reclamation District

(Exhibit D), and a Letter of Acknowledgement from the University and Community College System of Nevada (Exhibit E). Mr. James stated that these are the last remaining conformity agreements that needed to be completed. Contact was made with each agency, and two completed the agreement; however, U.N.L.V. thought it best not to complete an agreement, but instead completed a letter of acknowledgement, which basically has all of the components of the conformity agreement.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Conformity Agreements and the Letter of Acknowledgement. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 8. Receive an update from Clark County regarding the status of the Yucca Mountain Project; take any necessary action.

Irene Navis, Clark County, gave the presentation, stating that there are nine key areas of technical concern for the Yucca Mountain Project resulting in approximately 275 agreements between the Nuclear Regulator Commission and the Department of Energy (DOC) that has not yet been resolved. Beginning with the program schedule that was provided to her from the Department of Energy (DOE), Ms. Navis stated that the schedule provides activities happening between now and the year 2010. The year 2010 is the stated deadline when the DOE has designated for the shipping of nuclear waste to begin to Yucca Mountain. The DOE remains optimistic that they will be able to submit a license application to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and receive approval despite many obstacles that they are facing regarding shipping the country's nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain. The major impact areas that Clark County, in conjunction with the cities, has been studying are transportation, public safety, and unfunded mandates aspect of the DOE's programs, property values, and homeland security. Clark County has been studying the Yucca Mountain issue since the mid-1980s with Clark County Commissioners on record as early as 1986 with resolutions in opposition to the Yucca Mountain program. Since that time Clark County has engaged in a variety of different activities related to technical review, public outreach, and transportation studies and also technical and scientific matters at Yucca Mountain and transportation technical matters and impact assessment. In the area of transportation there are a number of things happening. The DOE has been very vocal about their desire to avoid the Las Vegas Valley and Clark County with their transportation plan. The DOE has not ruled out Jean and Apex for an inter-modal transfer station. Staff is working on a grant to study intelligent transportation systems. Staff will study and demonstrate the integration of transportation, emergency management and public safety technologies. Ms. Navis continued, stating that a year ago the National Academy of Science launched a national transportation study to help better understand what the transportation issues are related to Yucca Mountain and also how it relates to social and society issues related to public perception of things nuclear. Staff is very excited about the study because it is believed that it will include a lot of issues related directly to Southern Nevada. Staff is also working on an Impact Assessment and a County Wide Community Indicator Program that focuses on key things that will be monitored over time related to the impacts of Yucca Mountain, such as environmental, public safety, economic, and community well being. In the last three years, in particular, Clark County has made a number of presentations, presenting a number of papers to local, state, and national Boards and Committees that have either decision making abilities or oversight responsibility at the Yucca Mountain site. Clark County has an award winning public outreach program for print and multimedia campaigns. A serious gap has been noticed in the outreach to the African American, Hispanic, and the Asian communities, and the senior population. These groups were highly

underrepresented at the DOE meetings. A lot of what is done requires coordination with other entities. Interlocal agreements are set up to share the oversight funding that is received from the DOE with all of the cities within Clark County and two Native American tribes. Regarding public opinion, opposition to the Yucca Mountain Program has been 70% or higher and it has been that way for the last 15 years. This is consistent across the board, regardless of what stakeholder group was surveyed. The DOE does not recognize municipalities as affected units of government as they do various counties either directly affected by the site or adjacent to the site. Because of this, Clark County made a decision several years ago to start funding the cities so they could participate at whatever their desired level is.

Finally, there are two key issues where County and City officials will have to make some decisions soon. Once decision is made on the six pending consolidated legal actions in the U.S. Court of Appeals, the State of Nevada, the County and the City of Las Vegas will have to decide what the next steps in the litigation might be, if any. These decisions are scheduled to come out sometimes in late June or early July this year. There is some indication from the Attorneys for the State that there will be success in some key areas. The other key issue is upcoming license application process. The DOE plan is to submit their license application in December 2004. This means that sometime between now and August the County and the Cities will have to decide at what level, if at all, they want to participate in the license application process. There are two levels of participation in the process. One is as an interested party and the other is as an intervenor. As an intervenor, you are basically in litigation. It is an adjudicatory process in a courtroom setting. The DOE has indicated that they are not certain if the Counties that receive money for oversight purposes will be allowed to use money from the nuclear waste fund for intervening purposes. The deadline for participating in the license support network which helps set up the electronic courtroom is September of 2004. This would be necessary only if the DOE goes forward with the license application. Staff should know no later than the third week in July when the preliminary draft is required to be submitted. If the DOE misses the deadline to submit the preliminary draft, it is less likely that they will make the December deadline.

Answering the question, how could the SNRPC become an intervenor? Ms. Navis stated that one way is that the SNRPC participate in the process of the license support network, which is the "backbone" of the electronic court room process. The process consists of loading documents onto a web-based program. Clark County has already begun the process and has been accepted into the system. Ms. Navis stated that the SNRPC could actually meet the requirement through Clark County, which would serve as a sponsor. Ms. Navis concluded, stating that Clark County enjoys an excellent relationship with all of the jurisdictional staff and look forward to serving any need that the jurisdictions have related to the program. In response to a question, Ms. Navis informed the members that the State of Nevada is automatically participating as an intervenor because they are a party. Also, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is planning on holding a workshop on different levels of participation for people who are interested. When the meeting does occur, she will make sure the Coalition is informed, as well as their staff.

After discussion, a motion was made directing the Technical Committee to explore the SNRPC participating as an intervenor in the Yucca Mountain Program and to provide the Coalition Board with information regarding policies that can be established at the local level. After further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 12. The next date and location for the SNRPC Board is tentatively scheduled for July 22, 2004, 3:00 p.m. at Clark County.

The members accepted the next date, time and location as stated above.

Agenda Item 13. Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 14. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.