

MEETING MINUTES
COALITION BOARD

SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION

August 23, 2022

In attendance: Commissioner Justin Jones, Chair, Clark County
Councilman Scott Black, City of North Las Vegas
Councilman Richard Cherchio, City of North Las Vegas
Councilwoman Claudia Bridges, City of Boulder City (Via Zoom)
Councilwoman Olivia Diaz, City of Las Vegas
Trustee Katie Williams, Clark County School District

Absent: Councilman Brian Knudsen, Vice Chair, Cit of Las Vegas
Councilman Dan Shaw, City of Henderson
Councilman Dan H. Stewart, City of Henderson
Commissioner Tick Segerblom, Clark County

Agenda Item 1. Call to Order; notice of agenda conformance with Nevada Open Meeting Law Requirements

The meeting of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition Board was called to order by Commissioner Jones of Clark County at 4:02 P.M., on Tuesday, August 23, 2022, in the Clark County Commission Chambers at 500 South Grand Central Parkway, 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 Councilman Brian Knudsen, Vice Chair, City of Las Vegas, Councilman Dan Shaw, City of Henderson, Councilman Dan H. Stewart, City of Henderson, and Commissioner Tick Segerblom, Clark County.

Agenda Item 3. Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Agenda Item 4. Approval of the Agenda for August 23, 2022

A motion was made by Councilman Black to approve the agenda for the August 23, 2022, meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Diaz and was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 5. Approval of the Minutes for the February 22, 2022, meeting.

A motion was made by Councilwoman Diaz to approve the minutes for the February 22, 2022, meeting. The motion was seconded by Trustee Williams and was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 6. Consent Item(s):

- a. Receive and accept the CBER 2022 Long-Term Population Forecast for Clark County, Nevada 2022-2060.**
- b. Approve the 2023 SNRPC Master Meeting Schedule.**

A motion was made by Councilwoman Bridges to receive and accept the CBER 2022 Long-Term Population Forecast for Clark County, Nevada 2022-2060 and approve the 2023 SNRPC Master Meeting Schedule. The motion was seconded by Councilman Black and was approved unanimously.

Agenda Item 7. Discussion regarding SNRPC Legislative Changes.

Mario Bermudez, with Clark County, stated that over several years the SNRPC Board has discussed several options for reorganization and couldn't come to a consensus on which direction to go. Direction was given to the staff to pursue an amendment to the NRS. The County Government Affairs officials have spoken with the State Government Affairs Committee, and they have agreed to sponsor the BDR to change the mandate of SNRPC to a permissive Regional Planning Coalition or Regional Planning Body. In the agenda packet given to the Board members, there are suggestive changes to the various sections to NRS. The changes are, changing "shall" to "may" and "should," but there are some sections that are being suggested to be deleted.

One section that can be deleted is 278.02549. The provisions of this section have been transferred to the RTC and they are completing these projects as a part of their conformity review for master plans that are being processed by the local jurisdictions.

NRS 278.02556 also delete in its entirety for the same reason since the RTC has taken on these duties.

NRS 278.02577, delete in its entirety since these duties were transferred to RTC. The one difference is that this section has certain mandates related to making recommendations or changes to amendments that are being processed by local agencies. Instead of mandating any language changes, the RTC offers recommendations that can benefit the local jurisdictions.

NRS 278.02584, Subsection 4, delete the requirement for SNRPC to prepare a report or policies related to land use, transportation, and air quality and then submit that report to the County Clerk, the Division of Environmental Protection of the State, Department of Conservation of Natural Resources, the Division of State Lands, and the Department of Transportation.

NRS 278.02591, Subsection 4, delete the requirement that if the government body chooses to conduct an infrastructure analysis, it shall provide a copy of that analysis to SNRPC.

Councilwoman Diaz asked Mr. Bermudez what the thought process was behind the changes to all the “shalls” to “mays” and such. Councilwoman Diaz understands that it makes it permissive and would like to understand, from the SNRPC standpoint, why its beneficial or prudent.

Commissioner Jones stated that he has been on the SNRPC Board for almost four years and, before he joined the Board, there was discussion about what the role of SNRPC should be. Commissioner Jones thinks SNRPC has the potential for being something more than it is currently. The SNRPC Board hired a consultant to create a master plan to brainstorm. They held multiple meetings to come up with ideas for structuring SNRPC, but the ideas, in terms of the structure, did not have the support on the Board from all the jurisdictions. In 2021, the Board tried to identify some issues they would like to prioritize and move forward with in an interlocal agreement. The County and Cities put together an interlocal agreement, but it was not adopted. After the interlocal agreement was not adopted, the Board decided to make a change to the legislature and transfer functions that were feasible to the RTC. This doesn’t eliminate the Coalition, it still can exist, but the mandate from the State was never materialized. Also, one of the biggest issues the Board faced is that there isn’t a dedicated funding source for the SNRPC to accomplish its goals.

Mario Bermudez stated that between 2018 and 2022, there were 18 different meetings discussing options on how to move forward, what to do, and ultimately, therefore, this is where the Board is here today.

Councilwoman Diaz asked for more clarification.

Jeff Rogan with Clark County stated that presuming that this bill was taken up in its past, the interlocal agreement that exist will continue to still exist and the Board can continue to meet or amend the local agreement - however the Board sees fit. With the changes that are made, it gives the Board flexibility. For example, some of the things that were required here that the Board no longer wanted to do because the RTC is handling them or finding it outside the purview, the Board can opt not to do it. The Board would still exist and after the bill passes, the Board can decide on what to do.

Commissioner Jones stated that if the bill passes at the legislature, the SNRPC Board should meet post legislative session and discuss whether the Board wants to pursue any agenda or issues. If not, the Board can vote to let the SNRPC go dormant until otherwise decided.

Jeff Rogan stated that anything is on the table, and it just becomes a regular local agreement and not a mandatory interlocal agreement with mandatory duties. The Board can decide if the jurisdictions agree and organize however the Board sees fit.

Commissioner Jones asked what action they need to take, if any.

Jeff Rogan stated that the motion or direction would be to allow the County staff on behalf of the

SNRPC to work with the legislature and move forward a bill consistent with what is in the backup materials and noting that things will change because it's the legislature and out of the Board and staff's control.

Commissioner Jones stated that he knows there have been discussions between the collective planning directors and the government affairs team for the County and the Cities.

A motion was made by Trustee Williams to ask the County to move forward with the bill draft negotiations. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Bridges and was approved unanimously.

Agenda item 8. Public Comment. 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 citizens participation occurred.

Agenda Item 9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 P.M.