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From July to October 2013, the Southern Nevada Strong project team conducted a variety of outreach activities to inform stakeholders and the public about the project, and to solicit input. The outreach effort was part of Phase 2 of the Southern Nevada Strong Public Engagement Plan, Vision and Goal Setting. The outreach goals were as follows:

- Gather stakeholder and community input on:
  - The Vision for the region
  - Development types needed to better integrate housing, transportation and jobs
  - Priority areas for developing identified “opportunity site analysis”—areas to be considered for redevelopment and reinvestment
- Offer capacity building events to raise awareness about key issues and policy recommendations.
- Present to professional and community-based stakeholder groups and organizations to elevate awareness of the project and role of planning to strengthen economic competitiveness.

The outreach activities conducted included the Summer 2013 e-newsletter; Open Houses and public outreach events; an online community outreach tool available at these events and also online; a land use and development visual preference survey administered at Open Houses; and an urban ethnographic research and capacity building project in partnership with UNLV.

**Key Findings**

The following themes emerged most frequently across input gathered through all outreach methods.

**A. Overall Findings**

Based on the Phase 2 outreach, community members expressed the following:

- A desire to diversify the economy to ensure a wide variety of jobs are available for future generations.
- A variety of housing types and neighborhoods are available that appeal to a talented workforce.
- The need to improve educational attainment in the region and to better collaborate with all educational institutions.
- General support for the development types needed to better integrate housing, transportation and jobs.
- Support for streetscape improvements including bike lanes and pedestrian improvements.
- Support for open spaces and community gathering areas.
- Support for light rail.
• Demand for significant improvements to transit services and pedestrian safety improvements.

B. Opportunity Sites

Participants also weighed in on which local Opportunity Sites they would like to see further analyzed. The Opportunity Sites were ranked in the following order of priority:

• Maryland Parkway
• Downtown North Las Vegas
• Fremont Street
• Las Vegas Medical District
• Boulder Highway
• Flamingo Road
• Historic West Las Vegas
• Henderson’s College District
• Stewart Avenue and Eastern Avenue
• Buena Vista Springs
• Pittman Neighborhood
• Pennwood Avenue

C. Visual Preferences

A visual preference survey is a common method for assessing public feedback on physical design alternatives. Participants were given dots to indicate whether they liked certain land use and development types based on their visual attributes. A full summary of images and preferences is provided starting on page 18 of this document.

Participants supported almost all visual examples, except the mixed income housing selection, public art, the streetscape picture with the mural and the streetcar option. The feedback provided during voting indicated that participants felt the examples of public art were too specific to a particular cultural theme. It is possible that respondents reacted more to the specific example of public art than the concept itself, which will be pursued and assessed with additional prompts in the subsequent phase of outreach. As for the mural option, participants felt that murals would be vandalized with graffiti and not well-maintained. The negative reaction to the streetcar was characterized by participants in that it “did not look sophisticated enough” and “it looks like a tourist attraction.” Mixed income housing input was interpreted to mean a low income housing project would be placed in stable suburban neighborhoods. Participants felt that introducing vulnerable populations would cause disruption to stable neighborhoods. This feedback will be used to inform the subsequent phase of outreach and has also lead to a shifting in messaging for mixed income housing.

These findings will drive Phase 3 outreach questions to delve deeper into attitudes and preferences toward different housing, streetscape, transit and community space types.
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I. Introduction
From July to October 2013, the Southern Nevada Strong project team conducted a variety of outreach activities to inform stakeholders and the public about the project, and to solicit input. The outreach effort was part of Phase 2 of the Southern Nevada Strong Public Engagement Plan, Vision and Goal Setting. The outreach goals were as follows:

- Gather stakeholder and community input on:
  - The Vision for the region
  - Development types needed to better integrate housing, transportation and jobs
  - Priority areas for developing identified “opportunity site analysis”—areas to be considered for redevelopment and reinvestment
- Offer capacity building events to raise awareness about key issues and policy recommendations.
- Present to professional and community-based stakeholder groups and organizations to elevate awareness of the project and role of planning to strengthen economic competitiveness.

Southern Nevada Strong seeks to build a foundation for long-term economic success and community livelihood by better integrating reliable transportation, housing, and job opportunities throughout Southern Nevada. This collaborative regional planning effort is funded by a $3.5 million dollar Sustainable Communities grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

II. Outreach Activities and Results

A. Summer 2013 E-Newsletter
The Summer E-Newsletter was sent in August 2013 and included information about the online community engagement survey launch and open houses. Links to the Existing Conditions Report, Public Engagement Plan, and other accomplishments, and an article about the UNLV Urban Ethnographic Research Partnership were provided in the newsletter. A full list of E-Newsletter contents follows.

E-Newsletter Contents
- Online Community Engagement Survey Announcement
- Open House Schedule
- A variety of accomplishments and links to products generated by the grant, including:
  - Existing Conditions Report
  - Metrics to Frame the Plan
  - Public Engagement Plan
  - Draft Housing Analysis
- Base Case Land Use Scenario
- Livability Assessment
- Draft Opportunity Sites
- Maps
- Phone Survey Results
- Facts and Figures
- Outreach and Events
- UNLV Urban Ethnographic Research Partnership Overview
- Partner Event Spotlight

### B. Open Houses

Southern Nevada Strong hosted a series of 15 Community Open Houses between July and September 2013. At these events, attendees viewed a presentation on Southern Nevada Strong and the Plan process, and participated in the Online Community Engagement Survey and Visual Preference Surveys.

Each Open House included:

- Vision Statement voting;
- iPad stations to review priorities for the Regional Plan and rank areas throughout the Valley that participants felt were best positioned to better connect transportation, housing, and job opportunities;
- Photo preference surveys of land use and development choices; and
- Activities for children.

Below is the full schedule of Open Houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fifth Street School</strong></td>
<td>July 16, 2013</td>
<td>4:00-6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 S. Fourth St., Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culinary Academy</strong></td>
<td>July 29, 2013</td>
<td>3:00-5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Lake Mead Boulevard, North Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sahara West Library</strong></td>
<td>August 3, 2013</td>
<td>2:30-4:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9600 W. Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desert Breeze Community Center</strong></td>
<td>August 7, 2013</td>
<td>5:30-7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8275 Spring Mountain Road, Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paseo Verde Library</strong></td>
<td>August 13, 2013</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280 S. Green Valley Parkway, Henderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elaine K. Smith Center</strong></td>
<td>August 15, 2013</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 Wyoming, Boulder City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aliante Library</strong></td>
<td>August 31, 2013</td>
<td>12:00-2:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400 Deer Springs Road, North Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mary and Sam Boyd Boys and Girls Club</strong></td>
<td>September 4, 2013</td>
<td>4:00-6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608 Moser Drive, Henderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boulevard Mall-East Wing</strong></td>
<td>September 7 and September 8, 2013</td>
<td>1:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3528 South Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Center</strong></td>
<td>September 4, 2013</td>
<td>4:00-6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1625 W. Carey Ave., North Las Vegas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open House participants came from across the region, as shown in the map below. The results of surveys from these events are detailed in Sections D and E of this summary.

Map 1: Open House Participants by ZIP Code

C. Public Outreach Events

In addition to the Open Houses, Southern Nevada Strong conducted 20 iPad events—five in English and fifteen in Spanish—and continued outreach efforts at more than 50 community events, meetings, speaking engagements and briefings with elected officials, reaching more than 2,500 local residents. Southern Nevada Strong also continues to expand its reach on social media with 225 Facebook friends and nearly 300 Twitter followers.

Highlights from some of the Phase 2 outreach events are described below.

D. Hispanic Outreach

In addition to outreach to the broader community, Southern Nevada Strong conducted targeted outreach to the Hispanic community. Below is a list of events Southern Nevada Strong conducted with bilingual project staff and volunteers to gather input in Spanish and English from primarily Hispanic residents.
Boulevard Mall
September 7, 2013
1:00–4:00 p.m.

Boulevard Mall
September 8, 2013
1:00–4:00 p.m.

Fiesta Las Vegas Latino Parade and Festival
September 14, 2013
10:00 a.m.–6:00 p.m.

Cardenas Market
September 15, 2013
4:00–7:00 p.m.

Dia de la Mujer Fair
September 20, 2013
9:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m.

Latin Chamber Luncheon
September 20, 2013
11:00 a.m.–1:00 p.m.

Isaac Barron’s Hispanic Student Union Meeting
September 20, 2013
2:00–4:00 p.m.

Broadacres Swap Meet
September 21, 2013
8:00 a.m.–4:00 p.m.

CCSD Latino Town Hall
September 21, 2013
10:00 a.m.–12:00 p.m.

UNLV’s Latino Youth & Leadership Alumna (LYLA) General Meeting
September 21, 2013
12:00–3:00 p.m.

Broadacres Swap Meet
September 22, 2013
10:00 a.m.–1:00 p.m.

Iglesia Amistad Cristiana
September 22, 2013
10:00 a.m.–1:00 p.m.

Cardenas Market
September 22, 2013
3:00–6:00 p.m.

Estela’s Beauty Salon
September 22, 2013
3:00–4:00 p.m.

CSN Latino Student Mixer
September 22, 2013
1:00–4:00 p.m.

The SNS planning process and related community events were advertised to the Hispanic community in the following ways:

- Posts by the project team on Facebook and Twitter
- Posts by Senate Majority Leader Mo Denis on Facebook and Twitter
- A post by Senator Ruben Kihuen on Twitter
- An email blast from Miriam Hickerson, Ombudsman of Consumer Affairs for Minorities, to the Department of Business and Industry contact list
- An email from the project team to a targeted list of 1,371 contacts gathered from previous SNS-hosted Hispanic outreach events
- A radio spot on SNS on Noticias EXE 94.5 FM on September 20, 2013 featuring an interview with Lisa Corrado
- A print feature on SNS published on September 27, 2013 in El Tiempo

E. Online Community Engagement Survey and Results

From July 11 to October 14, 2013, a community survey was made available through the SouthernNevadaStrong.org website, and on iPads at Open Houses and public outreach events. The online tool, called MetroQuest, asked respondents to rank the initial priorities that will become “elements” or chapters of the regional plan, and to give input on opportunity sites within the region that are most ripe for commercial redevelopment, housing and transportation investments. The survey received over 2,500 responses.
**Survey Participation**

Community members from throughout the region participated in the survey. The map below depicts the overall online survey participation by ZIP code. The five areas with the greatest concentration of respondents, listed in descending order, were:

- Downtown Las Vegas (89101 / 89106)
- North Las Vegas (89030 / 89031)
- Sunrise (89110 / 89115)
- Spring Valley/West Flamingo Road (89103)
- Henderson (89011)

**Map 2: Survey Participants by ZIP Code**
The community survey also included optional demographic questions designed to help ensure that the process had broad, representative participation. Participants were asked to identify their age, gender and race or ethnicity. The charts below show the breakdown of respondent demographics by race/ethnicity and age.

Approximately a third (36%) of respondents identified as White (non-Hispanic), while another third (36 percent) identified as Hispanic/Latino. Twelve percent of participants identified as African American/Black. Four percent identified as Asian, 2 percent as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 2 percent as two or more races and 1 percent as Native American. In terms of age, a third of respondents (33 percent) were between the ages of 26 and 38. About 16 percent of participants were age 18 or younger, and 9 percent were between the ages of 19 and 25. Approximately 13 percent were between the ages of 56 and 65, and 5 percent were over 65.

**Figure 1: MetroQuest Demographics: Race/Ethnicity**

**Figure 2: MetroQuest Demographics: Age**
**Priorities**

The survey asked respondents to rank potential priorities for topics that would be addressed in the plan, including: Environment, Housing, Transportation, Public Engagement & Equity, Economic Development & Education and Healthy Communities. Respondents were asked to review the priorities, choose their top priority, least priority and favorite among the options. Respondents could also suggest additional ideas or expand on what was provided. The table below details the results of respondents’ ranking of the priorities.

**Economic Development/Education**

_Diversifying the regional economy will provide a wider range of jobs and make us less vulnerable to booms and busts. Southern Nevada Strong aims to sustain and build on our current strengths and unique economy._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Thumbs Up</th>
<th>Thumbs Down</th>
<th>Favorite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a wider range of quality jobs</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and grow a competitive workforce</td>
<td>2137</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and revitalize struggling small businesses and commercial areas</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify specific places that would benefit from redevelopment and improve economic conditions</td>
<td>2058</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create dynamic communities that educated workers want to live in</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environment**

_Southern Nevada residents appreciate both our urban and natural amenities, including neighborhoods, parks and trails. Southern Nevada Strong will identify, protect and strengthen what we value about our community as it grows and evolves over time._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Thumbs Up</th>
<th>Thumbs Down</th>
<th>Favorite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect, conserve and enhance the region’s water resources</td>
<td>2053</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve regional air quality</td>
<td>2079</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and restore the natural environment, protect open space and promote renewable energy and recycling</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage stewardship of the land by promoting land use policies that promote responsible growth and development patterns</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase public access to parks, trails, and other recreational amenities for all residents and visitors</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Healthy Communities
The Healthy Communities element aims to improve public health by developing guidelines for creating safer, more walkable neighborhoods and increasing safe access for cyclists and pedestrians and increase community access to fresh food and medical care.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Thumbs Up</th>
<th>Thumbs Down</th>
<th>Favorite</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve convenience to access healthcare services by increasing the number of facilities available and locating them where need is greatest</td>
<td>2093</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase convenience to and availability of healthy, affordable food options</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design neighborhoods to encourage walking and biking</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transportation access for low-income people</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase convenience to get to facilities and services that serve youth, families, and seniors</td>
<td>2165</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing
To create healthy and stable neighborhoods, we need to provide many types of housing for residents of all income levels – from apartments to homes on large lots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Thumbs Up</th>
<th>Thumbs Down</th>
<th>Favorite</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct new residential development to existing and proposed mass transit corridors</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize development opportunities that fill in vacant lands in urban areas to reduce the pressure to develop on open space, on the fringe of town, or in rural areas</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locate housing near job centers and other services, such as retail, recreation and other amenities to decrease spending on transportation</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create communities with a mix of uses</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase mixed income and affordable housing options throughout the region</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Public Engagement and Equity**

In order to create a plan that is realistic and can be put into action, Southern Nevada Strong will engage and collaborate with a broad spectrum of people throughout the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Thumbs Up</th>
<th>Thumbs Down</th>
<th>Favorite</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activate residents and businesses to support the implementation of the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan</strong></td>
<td>2073 88.4%</td>
<td>164 7.0%</td>
<td>107 4.6%</td>
<td>2344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensure Southern Nevada remains a welcoming place for people from diverse backgrounds, future generations and with varying degrees of mobility and independence</strong></td>
<td>1963 81.3%</td>
<td>133 5.5%</td>
<td>319 13.2%</td>
<td>2415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovate and improve government-led public engagement efforts to make it easier for people to participate in decision making</strong></td>
<td>2001 84.1%</td>
<td>187 7.9%</td>
<td>190 8.0%</td>
<td>2378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build neighborhood and community-based leaders to represent local communities in regional decision making</strong></td>
<td>1891 79.2%</td>
<td>220 9.2%</td>
<td>277 11.6%</td>
<td>2388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation**

Improving transportation is another essential element to strengthening our regional economy and quality of life. Reducing traffic and keeping us all moving supports the growth of these industries and our job market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Thumbs Up</th>
<th>Thumbs Down</th>
<th>Favorite</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design or retrofit communities and streets to improve safety and ease of movement for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles</strong></td>
<td>2024 83.2%</td>
<td>169 6.9%</td>
<td>241 9.9%</td>
<td>2434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduce both vehicle and pedestrian fatalities by reducing speed limits and designing streets and communities with people in mind</strong></td>
<td>1551 65.8%</td>
<td>693 29.4%</td>
<td>112 4.8%</td>
<td>2356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop a safe, high quality comprehensive transportation system that allows travelers choices including reliable and convenient mass transit, walking, cycling, and driving</strong></td>
<td>2079 83.0%</td>
<td>161 6.4%</td>
<td>266 10.6%</td>
<td>2506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide a transportation system that address the needs of our low-income communities</strong></td>
<td>1915 81.8%</td>
<td>316 13.5%</td>
<td>110 4.7%</td>
<td>2341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pursue a high speed, mass transit system, such as light rail or similar technology, that rivals other metropolitan regions in the nation, beginning along segments with greatest potential for success</strong></td>
<td>1616 66.0%</td>
<td>416 17.0%</td>
<td>415 17.0%</td>
<td>2447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments Regarding Priorities
Surveys submitted to Southern Nevada Strong via MetroQuest included over 700 comments. A little more than half of these were general comments submitted at the end of the survey, and slightly less than half were made in direct response to the Priorities statements, with the remaining comments relating to the suggested Opportunity Sites. The comments are summarized below.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSIT
Transportation or transit options were the subject of nearly a quarter of all comments, most of them in response to the Transportation priorities but also in the context of Healthy Communities, Environment and specific opportunity sites.

Public Transit
Many of these comments stressed the need for improved public transit options. Some specified that accessibility and affordability of transit must be improved for vulnerable populations such as low-income, students, seniors and the disabled. Others noted that improved transit options are needed for everyone in order to cut down on traffic congestion and travel time and protect the environment.

A number of respondents noted they believe that current transit services and amenities are in need of improvement. They specifically called out the RTC’s lack of courteous and responsive customer service, buses not running on schedule, and routes that are inefficient and/or do not conform to usage patterns. The need for more bus stops with better shade/shelter, location and safety features was also noted. Several would like to see rail (conventional or high-speed), light rail or monorail that serves to connect other transportation modes with the entire region, including downtown, the airport, the medical district and all areas of the city. This would assist both residents and visitors with getting to/from jobs, services, and entertainment and recreation options. A few respondents noted concerns that funding for transit improvements be put to appropriate and effective use, as has not always been the case in the past.

Traffic Improvements
Several respondents also commented on the need for better roadway design to reduce traffic congestion, and noted that they considered aspects of the current design to have miscalculated traffic flows, leading to more congestion. Suggestions for enabling traffic to bypass congestion, particularly on I-15 and the Strip, included locating new popular destinations outside downtown, building an underground highway toll system, and increasing lanes so space can be designated for smaller motorized vehicles. It was also suggested that businesses can also help by staggering shifts and exploring more work-at-home options.

Comments also urged the consideration of cleaner transportation and transit alternatives such as electric vehicles, pedi- or bike-taxis, or rental scooters (with appropriate designated lanes).

Some respondents commented on the need for improving connections to the region and other areas of the country in general, both through public transit and also road improvements.
Traffic Safety
Several respondents commented that reducing speed limits alone will not decrease vehicle and pedestrian fatalities - education and better enforcement of laws regarding speeding, jaywalking, cell phone usage while driving, drunk driving, etc. are also needed. Designing streets and communities for more safety, with features such as crosswalks or pedestrian bridges, better timed traffic lights, safer intersections with greater visibility, wider boulevards and sidewalks, improved lighting, etc., will help as well. Several noted their opinion that reducing speed limits and designing streets/communities with people in mind should be treated as separate issues.

Walkability/Bikeability
The issues of improving walkability and bikeability, as well as designing safe streets and creating accessibility for all including the disabled, were mentioned in response to both the Transportation and Healthy Communities priorities. Comments noted that creating or improving more walking/biking paths would only be useful if services such as stores and professional offices are within walking/biking distance, so the design of the entire community must be taken into account. These paths must also connect to transit.

Concern was expressed regarding pedestrian/bicycle safety on roads. Although a handful of respondents felt that bicycles or motorized cycles do not belong on roads, several others suggested safer, more inclusive street design and safety education would help improve safety. Others also mentioned that the extreme weather presents challenges to pedestrian and bicycle travel, and suggested that appropriate landscaping and water friendly design with shade structures be incorporated.

ENVIRONMENT

Parks and Trails
Respondents also made suggestions for increasing connectivity and walkability/bikeability in the context of public access to parks and trails. Some respondents wanted to see not only more interconnected park trails, but also more parks in general. They would like parks to incorporate amenities such as sustainable landscaping and solar-powered shade structures, recreational facilities or community centers with organized activities, sports areas, workout/activity stations, community centers, family play areas, picnic areas, safe restrooms, and dog-friendly areas. A number of respondents suggested that in addition to traditional parks, disused urban spaces, empty strip malls, etc. could be re-purposed as mini-parks, green-walls or desert gardens. Some would also like to prioritize natural open space areas as well as designed parks, perhaps working in partnership with the BLM. However, just a few respondents expressed their opinion that the area already has enough parks and access to parks/trails, and that they are concerned about providing adequate law enforcement for safety in existing parks. Respondents also noted the need for cleaning, maintenance and sustainable landscape management in all parks.

Water
Several respondents stated their concern regarding protecting, conserving and enhancing the region’s water resources in the context of future development. Some felt this was a more important issue than other improvements, and that the problem must be solved before
promoting additional growth. Ensuring water supply and maximizing the efficiency of water usage through such methods as greywater collection for current users must be considered before the needs of potential future users. They noted that realistic goals must be set, and that past patterns of growth and number of building permits issued are not sustainable. It was also noted that “enhancement” of water supplies cannot include creating pipelines to draw water from other locations.

Recycling and Sustainable Energy Use
A number of respondents urged promotion and support for recycling and the use of sustainable energy sources and technologies. They would like to see increased use of solar power and other sustainable energy sources in new buildings, homes and shade structures, and also for the use of these technologies to be made more affordable, with programs to support energy efficiency assessments and upgrades for current buildings and homes. Several also urged the use of alternative and recycled materials in construction. They suggested measures such as setting specific standards for energy efficiency and LEED square footage in the region, and educating the public on these issues. They also recommended retrofitting and re-purposing available storefronts and buildings to help eliminate sprawl.

Several respondents noted that incentives might be provided to encourage the use of sustainable water and energy practices.

HOUSING
Relatively few respondents commented directly regarding residential housing; they tended instead to address the priorities stated in the Housing element in terms of both residential and business development (see below). Several of those who did expressed the need to build lasting housing that is appropriate for the climate and desert setting, rather than cheap, inefficient housing that will simply serve to create the slums of the future. Comments called for assistance with refinancing at reasonable rates or with renovating the exteriors of older homes in order to help revitalize neighborhoods, and suggested that the county partner with various agencies and CBOs to build homes for first-time or second-chance home buyers. The fact that there are so many in need of homes and/or jobs could be blended with the need to build or rebuild communities. Some noted that new housing should be concentrated near existing services and schools. Alternatively, several suggested that developers (or other interests partnering with developers) should develop schools, community centers, parks, and infrastructure such as flood retention along with housing in order to help create complete, healthy communities. Respondents also expressed that the impact of new housing on traffic and transportation must be considered. Developers must be required to incorporate the best interests of the community in their plans. Some respondents were in favor of mixed income housing to create more dynamic communities; others expressed concern about the effect of mixed income housing on neighborhood quality and property values.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT/EDUCATION
Economic Development and Jobs
Respondents had a wide variety of suggestions regarding diversification of jobs in the region. These included exploring creating incentives to draw new industries such as medical,
manufacturing, high-tech and biotech, but also diversifying with the area’s current strengths and industries, such as tourism, hospitality, construction and mining, in mind. Tax incentives, designated business zones, and an overall economic improvement strategy will help create a better environment for something different to happen. Non-traditional job opportunities such as working online might also be explored. It was also noted that business education for business owners might help small businesses thrive, although a few expressed concern that continuing to support struggling businesses financially is a waste of resources. Both diversifying with new industries and large businesses and supporting struggling small business were mentioned as necessary to create a dynamic economy in both urban and rural areas.

However, several respondents also pointed out that the area will continue to need jobs for those who are already here, especially those who are not highly educated, older residents with experience but lacking degrees, and others who are trying to enter or re-enter the workforce. The current workforce needs to be taken care of along with drawing new workers in.

A number of respondents, in the context of Economic Development, as well as Housing and the Environment, noted the problems caused by past unregulated growth and expressed concerns about unsustainable levels of growth in the region.

**Education**

Many respondents noted that the economy cannot be improved and diversified without improving education in the area, including K-12, higher education, and workforce education. A focus on improving education will both help keep current residents here and draw new people in, as well as diversifying the economy by attracting new businesses and increasing jobs that value more education. The perception of poor quality education keeps many businesses away, especially those that rely on a better-educated workforce. Several respondents also urged education at all levels regarding personal financial planning to help improve residents’ economic well-being.

Several respondents noted that this element lacked priorities that pertain specifically to improving education and school districts. They called for increases in funding and emphasis on education which would lead to decreases in class size and dropout rates. It was suggested that the thriving gaming industry might be called upon to help support schools and libraries. Respondents would like to see both workforce education—specifically mentioning the medical field, among others—and improved education for its own sake, particularly in terms of promoting English proficiency, math and science.

Respondents also mentioned the need for general enrichment programs for children, especially low income and at-risk kids. Starting early on, and also engaging and educating parents on how to navigate the educational system, will help build better citizens and a better prepared workforce. Comments suggested programs such as Head Start, arts and athletic activities.

**REVITALIZATION AND REDEVELOPMENT**

Specific priorities for revitalization and redevelopment were mentioned in the survey under both the Housing and Economic Development/Education headings, and many comments on these issues considered the two elements as one.
Cleaning up and revitalizing residential and business areas was mentioned both in the context of specific opportunity areas and the entire region. Several respondents urged the renovation and reuse of existing vacant properties rather than building new; some suggested that infill should occur only after revitalization of existing facilities and businesses is successful. Once again, some echoed the concern that was also mentioned in the context of Environment and Healthy Communities - that there isn’t room for more growth, and instead the focus needs to be on improvements for what is already here. Others stated that there are opportunities for infill and revitalization throughout urban areas, particularly in downtown areas—the revitalization that has taken place so far has been successful and should be continued. They suggested incentivizing infill by setting realistic impact fees for developers. Several also supported revitalization efforts be focused in older areas of the city as well as newer areas, and along commuter corridors where people tend to drive through rather than stop. Many would like to see spending occurring throughout the valley, rather than just in opportunity sites, in order to improve everyone’s environment. However it occurs, revitalization efforts must avoid displacing current businesses and residents.

HEALTHY COMMUNITIES
Respondents commenting on the priorities for Healthy Communities emphasized that accessibility to services and amenities must be improved for everyone, including all income groups, non-English speakers, single parents, those living in rural areas of the county, people of all educational levels, and those facing challenges such as homelessness, mental health issues or domestic violence. This includes suggestions already summarized under the headings of Transportation, Housing and Education. Increased support from the county for organizations that are already involved in providing these services, plus engagement from the public, particularly those who are better off, will also help. Another suggestion was outreach efforts to promote and educate healthy lifestyles. This would include education regarding insurance options, legal and financial counseling and aid to support the accessibility of medical care. Community gardens could be encouraged to promote healthy eating. Some respondents also noted that more skilled health care providers and specialists are needed in the region, and would hopefully be drawn by the economic and other community improvements being proposed.

Comments also called for increased amenities and services, both in the various opportunity sites or wherever they live within the region. Grocery stores, banks, other shopping options including both local businesses and chain stores, community centers and sports facilities, entertainment and cultural options are needed. Better connections to transportation will help, but it was noted that it is better to have these options within walking distance, making the connection to design for increased walkability throughout the region.

Safety
A few respondents commented on the need to consider safety as a part of creating healthy communities, and also in the context of Housing and Transportation. Along with increased security presence and community coordination with law enforcement (such as block watch programs and meetings) they suggested measures such as better lighting, call boxes and video cameras at bus stops. They noted that it will not be possible to revitalize neighborhoods and reuse abandoned properties if safety concerns are not addressed.
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND EQUITY

A large number of respondents expressed their appreciation of the Plan project and goals, their thanks for the opportunity to give their input, and their desire to become further involved. However, many others called out perceived challenges and issues with the Plan process and the outreach being conducted.

The complexity and perceived difficulty of making these changes led to many respondents expressing that they were unable to choose between priorities and/or opportunity sites. Some felt that the goals and statements were too broad or lacked specifics regarding potential trade-offs, funding and implementation, making them difficult to approve. Several noted that in-depth discussion within the communities will be necessary to make truly informed decisions. They suggested that this will require broader outreach utilizing cultural competence, and more use of non-traditional, grassroots outreach methods.

Concerns were expressed by several respondents regarding their perception of challenges working with local government. Some respondents noted their opinion that the community, private enterprise and the free market can be better relied upon to make improvements than the government.

Opportunity Sites

Next, survey respondents were asked to rank the opportunity sites important to them and to the region. This input contributed to the selection of sites that will be further considered for analysis of redevelopment and reinvestment potential.

The survey included a map of the region with each potential opportunity site identified, as well as a description of each site. Respondents were able to choose three areas, neighborhoods or corridors identified on the map that they thought should be prioritized for new jobs, housing and transit improvements.

Survey respondents ranked the opportunity sites as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Sites</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th># of Times Ranked (1st, 2nd, 3rd place)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Parkway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown North Las Vegas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Highway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamingo Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic West Las Vegas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson’s College District</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Avenue and Eastern Avenue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Springs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittman Neighborhood</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennwood Avenue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. Visual Preference Survey and Results

At each of the Open Houses, a Visual Preference Survey was conducted to determine community members’ preferences for land use and development options. Participants viewed display boards featuring a series of images illustrating different kinds of development, and asked to provide their opinion of each image by applying colored dots to indicate the following three options:

- Green = I like it!
- Yellow = I’m willing to consider it.
- Red = I don’t like it.

The overall results of the Visual Preference Survey were as follows:

**Mixed Use Option #1: Commercial/Retail**

![Image of Mixed Use Option #1](image1)

**Mixed Use Option #2: Retail/Residential**

![Image of Mixed Use Option #2](image2)
Residential Option #1: Single-Family Home

Residential Option #2: Townhouses
Residential Option #3: Apartment/Condo

Residential Option #4: Apartment/Condo
Residential Option #5: Senior Housing

Residential Option #6: Mixed-Income Housing
Streetscape Option #1: Bike Lane

Streetscape Option #2: Public Art
Streetscape Option #3: Structured/Landscaped

Streetscape Option #4: Landscaped with Pedestrian Amenities
Transit Option #1: Bike Share

Transit Option #2: Streetcar
Transit Option #3: Bus

Transit Option #4: Light Rail
Community Spaces Option #1: Park with Baseball Field

Community Spaces Option #2: Park with Soccer Field
Community Spaces Option #3: Park with Trail

Community Spaces Option #4: Park with Open Space Area
Community Spaces Option #5: Park with Seating

Community Spaces Option #6: Park with Picnic Tables
Community Spaces Option #7: Park with Playground

Community Spaces Option #8: Playground with Public Art
G. UNLV Urban Ethnographic Research Partnership

In June 2013, a sociology research team from Brown University conducted an ethnographic research training with a cross-disciplinary team of University of Las Vegas (UNLV) master- and Ph.D.-level students. The training was led by Gianpaolo Baiocchi of New York University, who also served as a speaker at Southern Nevada Strong’s kick-off event. Ethnographic research is a qualitative research method that emphasizes in-depth stakeholder interviews and careful listening to understand individual lived experiences. This is a common method of research in Sociology and Anthropology, allowing field observation, and the opportunity for students to build rapport with hard-to-reach audiences such as the homeless and other traditionally marginalized groups. Southern Nevada Strong, in partnership with UNLV, asked researchers to interview grassroots community leaders in areas near the project’s preliminary opportunity sites to gain “on-the-ground” insight from community members. The research is meant as a strategy to go directly to the community to gather more detailed input than is typically feasible through formal surveying or public meetings. The students sought to learn what challenges and opportunities people living near the priority sites faced in the realms of transportation, quality and affordable housing, and job opportunities. This research will support the opportunity site analysis by shedding light on each community’s challenges in residents’ own words. The findings will also be important to inform the scoping process for the opportunity site analysis, will support introduction of key policies in the regional plan, and will provide a foundation to direct and support additional outreach to frame a vision that contemplates challenges faced by underrepresented members of the community.