

**MEETING MINUTES
SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MAY 13, 2004**

In attendance:

Rick Holmes, Alternate, Clark County
Fred Smith, Vice Chair, Clark County School District
Gregory Rose, City of North Las Vegas
Phil Speight, City of Henderson
Doug Selby, City of Las Vegas
Vicki Mayes, Boulder City

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

Rick Holmes called to order the meeting of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition Technical Committee at 4:05 p.m., on Thursday, May 13, 2004, in the Pueblo Conference Room, 1st Floor, at the Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106.

The Agenda for the May 13, 2004, meeting was duly posted in compliance with the Open Meeting Law.

Agenda Item 2. Approval of the Agenda for May 13, 2004.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda for the May 13, 2004, meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 3. Approval of the Minutes from the March 11, 2004, meeting.

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was approved unanimously.

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

Each member received a copy of the proposed SNRPC Organizational Chart (Exhibit A). Edward James, SNRPC Regional Planner, stated that the organizational chart was created to give a visual picture of the organization of the SNRPC Committees and Boards. The recommended motion is to approve the chart and forward it to the Coalition Board.

A motion was made to approve the SNRPC Organizational Chart and forward this item to the Coalition Board. The motion was 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 informed the members that there have been several statements made concerning the vision of the SNRPC that could be interpreted as the mission of the SNRPC; however, there has never been a precise, stand alone mission statement. The mission statement brings the SNRPC up-to-date and reflects the items that the Coalition Board has approved. Answering a question, Mr. James informed the members that the seven mandated priorities listed on the Mission Statement are not listed by priority. The recommended motion is to approve the chart and forward it to the Coalition Board.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the SNRPC Mission Statement and forward this item to the Coalition Board. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 6. Receive a status report on expanding the SNRPC Technical Committee membership to include the Clark County Health District, Clark County Regional Transportation Commission, and the Southern Nevada Water Authority; direct staff accordingly.

Each member received a copy of the correspondence received from Robert Warhola (Exhibit C), and a copy of S.B. 436 (Exhibit D). Referring to Exhibits C and D, Mr. James stated that in the opinion of in-house counsel, the Technical Committee has full discretion as to whom they want on the committee and in what capacity. Mr. James suggested following the Coalition Board's recommendation to add the three agencies listed. Mr. James explained what he believed to be the motive of the Coalition Board in wanting to add to the Technical Committee's membership. He stated that all three agencies are very much involved in the kinds of programs that the SNRPC are conducting; therefore, their technical expertise would serve as an asset to provide technical assistance. The Coalition Board's recommendation did not include whether the new members would serve as voting members or ex-officio members; this would be up to the Technical Committee members to decide. Mr. Wardlaw, Clark County, stated that the recommendation from the Coalition Board was not to extend an invitation to the Clark County Health District agency, but to the Department of Air Quality as a component of the Health District.

After discussion, a motion was made to forward to the Coalition Board a recommendation to make the Director of Air Quality, the Director of the Clark County Regional Transportation Commission, and the Executive Director for the Southern Nevada Water Authority voting members of the SNRPC Technical Committee.

After further discussion, the motion was amended and seconded that the Technical Committee approve the addition of the Director of Air Quality, the Director of the Clark County Regional Transportation Commission, and the Executive Director for the Southern Nevada Water Authority as full voting members of the SNRPC Technical Committee. The motion was approved unanimously. Mr. James was directed to draft a letter for the Chairman's signature informing the new members of the Technical Committee's action. The members agreed to forward this item to the Coalition Board as an informational item only.

Agenda Item 7. Approve the Conformity Agreements between the SNRPC and the Clark County Water Reclamation District, the 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 after research, it was found that these three entities had not completed conformity agreements. Contact was made with each agency, and two completed the agreement; however, after meeting with U.N.L.V. thought it best not to complete an agreement, but instead completed a letter of acknowledgement. The recommendation is that the Technical Committee accepts the Conformity Agreements and the Letter of Acknowledgement and that this item be forwarded to the Coalition Board's agenda.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the Conformity Agreements and the Letter of Acknowledgement and forward this item to the Coalition Board. 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, stated that as the Planning Manager for the Nuclear Waste Division, she is providing updates regarding the Nuclear Waste issue in Nevada. 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 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. The DOE does not recognize municipalities as affected members 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.

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 intermobile 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. 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. Theses 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 intervener. As an intervener, you are basically in litigation. It is an adjudicatory process in a courtroom

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.

After the presentation, a motion was made and seconded to forward this item to the Coalition Board. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 9. Receive a summary of previous BLM Land Sales and upcoming nominations; take any necessary action.

Each member received a copy of a Summary of previous BLM land sales and the Nomination for the Spring, 2005 Land Sale (Exhibit F). Mr. James informed the members that detailed information from each participating jurisdiction is available; whereas, the Summary is just an overview.

A motion was made and seconded to accept the report and forward it to the Federal Lands Disposal Subcommittee. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 10. Set the agenda for the May 27, 2004, SNRPC Board Meeting.

The members agreed that the agenda for the May 27, 2004, SNRPC Board meeting would include Agenda Items 4, and 5; Item 6 will be informational only; Item 7 and 8.

Mr. Holmes stated that he would like to schedule an item to discuss the Clark County Growth Task Force. The County Commission asked that staff go back and amend the resolution to make it very clear about the intent of the full cooperation and coordination between the County's Growth Task Force process and the SNRPC. Mr. Speight informed the members that the Clark County Growth Task Force item cannot be forwarded to the Coalition's agenda because it is not listed on the Technical Committee's agenda as an action item.

A motion was made to accept items 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 be forwarded to the SNRPC Coalition Board's May 27, 2004, agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 11. The next date and location for the Technical Committee meeting is tentatively scheduled for July 8, 2004, 4:00 p.m., at Clark County.

The Technical Committee meeting date, time, and location was approved accordingly.

Agenda Item 12. Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

Agenda Item 13. Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.