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Executive Summary

From November to June 2014, 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 3 of the Southern Nevada Strong Public Engagement Plan. The outreach goals were as follows:

- Continue to educate the public about the Southern Nevada Strong regional planning process and solicit input for the draft plan
- Gather stakeholder and community input including:
  - Preferred development types that will support the region’s ability to better connect housing, jobs and transportation;
  - Factors that influence people’s ability to find desirable housing in the region;
  - Improvements needed within four opportunity sites (areas to be considered for redevelopment and reinvestment);
  - Review comments on the draft regional plan; and
  - General comments on concerns that might be addressed through this process

The outreach activities conducted included: a web-based visual preference survey and mapping exercise available online, at community events and at public kiosks; community workshops; a Telephone Town Hall; and focus groups.

Throughout all three phases of the outreach process, the project team received over 16,500 individual inputs from participants through the various outreach methods. The process also yielded substantial input on the draft regional plan.

Key Findings

The outreach findings continue to validate the plan’s vision and goals and provide more fine-grained detail regarding community preferences, issues and concerns. The following themes emerged most frequently across input gathered through all outreach methods.

A. Overall Findings

Based on the Phase 3 outreach activities, through the results of various outreach methods, community members expressed the following:

- Support for a variety of housing types and job centers that are not too dense or resource-intensive
- Desire for more options for traveling within the region, including walkable neighborhoods and improved public transit
- Support for streetscape improvements including bike lanes and pedestrian improvements
- Support for open spaces and community gathering areas, particularly those that provide shade for visitors
• Support for light rail, bus rapid transit and the modern streetcar
• Desire for improved safety, including reduced crime and fewer vehicle conflicts

B. Visual Preferences

To achieve the goals outlined in the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan, communities will need to plan and design neighborhoods differently to better connect housing, jobs and transportation in the region. Southern Nevada Strong outreach activities included a visual preference survey to determine the level of support for the different building types that could be used to achieve these goals. Participants were shown a variety of residential, commercial and business developments. Participants indicated 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 7 of this document.

Participants supported almost all visual examples, with less support for row townhomes, live/work units and four-story mixed-use structures. Among job center options, large-scale office buildings were less popular. There was strong support for play and community amenities, streetscape improvements and transportation options, with the exception of bus service. Overall, there was support for a variety of housing options that supported a range of incomes and were within easy reach of workplaces and amenities. Participants indicated support for job centers that were people-friendly and not isolated, as well as outdoor spaces that were not resource-intensive and were climate-appropriate. Residents had some concerns about the cost and infrastructure required for some transportation options, but showed strong support for a wider range of transportation options connecting major nodes and throughout the region.

These findings will be used to help the public understand that different development types will be needed to advance the goals and strategies in the plan. The data can also help agency partners, land use planners and developers understand the development types that will more likely be supported by the public.

C. Opportunity Sites

Participants also weighed in on which type of improvements they would like to see within four local opportunity sites which included: North Las Vegas Downtown, Las Vegas Medical District, Maryland Parkway and Boulder Highway/Gibson & Broadbent. They were could also specify where improvements were needed within each, using an online mapping tool.

The most common improvements across all four opportunity sites were safety concerns, public transit and transportation. The Las Vegas Medical District had strong support for parks and recreation improvements and respondents supported community services improvements in Downtown North Las Vegas. Safety concerns included both crime and conflicts between vehicles and other modes of traffic.

At the community workshops held to get input on each of the four opportunity sites, participants gave feedback regarding their level of agreement with general statements reflecting the main themes of the outreach conducted to date and their opinions of various site possibilities. These results will inform plans for improvements at the opportunity sites.
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I. Introduction
From November to June 2014, the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) 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 3 of the Southern Nevada Strong Public Engagement Plan. The outreach goals were as follows:

- Continue to educate the public about the Southern Nevada Strong regional planning process and solicit input for the draft plan
- Gather stakeholder and community input including:
  - Preferred development types that will support the region’s ability to better connect housing, jobs and transportation;
  - Factors that influence people’s ability to find desirable housing in the region;
  - Improvements needed within four opportunity sites (areas to be considered for redevelopment and reinvestment);
  - Review comments on the draft regional plan; and
  - General comments on concerns that might be addressed through this process

The outreach activities conducted included: a web-based visual preference survey and mapping exercise available online, at community events and at public kiosks; community workshops; a Telephone Town Hall; and focus groups.

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 Sustainable Communities grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

II. Outreach Activities and Results
A. Online Community Engagement Survey and Results
From late February through May 2014, a community survey was made available through the SouthernNevadaStrong.org website, and on iPads at Open Houses and kiosks throughout the community. The online tool, called MetroQuest, included a visual preference survey on development types and a mapping exercise on opportunity sites. The survey was available online in English and Spanish and could be accessed at eleven kiosks at various locations throughout the region. iPads were provided at events and open houses. The survey period was late February through the end of May.

The visual preference survey showed multiple styles of development for several land uses and asked respondents to indicate for each if they liked, disliked or were neutral on each. Using the MetroQuest software, survey participants viewed a series of images illustrating different kinds of
development, and asked to provide their opinion of each image by choosing one of the following three options:

- Thumbs up = Like
- Thumbs down = Dislike
- X = Neutral

The survey also asked participants to review the four opportunity sites. The selection of these four sites was informed by the results of Phase 2 outreach. For one or more sites, survey respondents would indicate where they would like to see improvements and what type of improvements. The four opportunity sites were:

- Maryland Parkway
- Downtown North Las Vegas
- Las Vegas Medical District
- Boulder Highway, Gibson & Broadbent

The types of improvements participants could comment on included:

- Safety concerns
- Access issues
- Transportation
- Public transit improvements
- Community services
- Parks and recreation
- Other

**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)
- Paradise (89119, 89121)
- North Las Vegas (89030, 89031, 89115)
- Las Vegas (89108)
- Sunrise Manor (89110)
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.

Slightly less than one third (31 percent) of respondents identified as White (non-Hispanic), while about another third (29 percent) identified as Hispanic/Latino. Eighteen percent of participants identified as African American/Black. Three percent identified as Asian, 2 percent as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, 4 percent as two or more races and 1 percent as Native American. In terms of age, about one-fourth of respondents (26 percent) were between the ages of 26 and 38. Fourteen (14) percent were between the ages of 19 and 25. Approximately 12 percent were between the ages of 56 and 65. About 9 percent of participants were age 18 or younger, and 4 percent were over 65. Women participated more than men, with 59% participation.
Figure 1: MetroQuest Demographics: Race/Ethnicity

- Hispanic/Latino: 29%
- White (Non-Hispanic): 31%
- African American/Black: 18%
- Hispanic/Latino: 29%
- Other: 8%
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: 1%
- Prefer not to answer: 4%
- Two or More Races: 4%
- Asian: 3%
- American Indian/Native American: 2%
- Prefer not to answer: 4%

Figure 2: MetroQuest Demographics: Age

- 26-38: 26%
- 39-55: 35%
- 56-65: 12%
- 19-25: 14%
- 0-18: 9%
- 65+: 4%
Visual Preference Survey and Results

Survey participants were asked indicate whether they liked, disliked or had a neutral opinion of images in the following categories: housing, job centers, parks and community, streetscape and transportation. Participants were also encouraged to make comments explaining their responses. Below is a brief summary of participants' responses and comments by category.

Housing

The single family home was the housing image most liked by survey respondents (87%). Specifically, respondents liked the design of the single family home, and the landscaping and separation of sidewalk from the roadway in front of the house. However, some expressed concern about its large lawn and the water-intensive landscaping. Many others noted that this is not a “typical” Las Vegas home and that this type of property is out-of-reach for many residents.

Of the remaining housing image choices, three and four story mixed use were favored by more than half of respondents (66% and 56%), with the two story live-work and row townhouse images liked by slightly more than half of the respondents (52% each).

Those who preferred the mixed use options noted their support of mixed use in general, particularly if it allowed easy access to work and amenities, particularly for pedestrians. Some respondents and liked the visual design and landscaping, as well as separation from the street and ample space for pedestrians/bicyclists. However, there were others who didn’t like combining residential with retail uses and thought that mixed use creates an artificial environment. They were also concerned about apparent lack of energy efficiency, too much grass used in landscaping, and inadequate parking, access to transit, and space for pedestrians. Several respondents also commented that the row townhomes had too many people living close together. Others supported the idea of townhomes and live/work spaces but did not care for the design. Several people commented that mixed-use housing should include or provide more affordable housing units.

Housing Option #1: Single Family Home

![Single Family Home Image]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Home</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing Option #2: Three Story Mixed Use

![Three Story Mixed Use Image]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three Story Mixed Use</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing Option #3: Four Story Mixed Use

[Image of Four Story Mixed Use]

Four Story Mixed Use

- Neutral: 19%
- Like: 56%
- Dislike: 25%

Housing Option #4: Two Story Live Work

[Image of Two Story Live Work]

Two Story Live Work

- Neutral: 22%
- Like: 52%
- Dislike: 26%

Housing Option #5: Row Townhouses

[Image of Row Townhouses]

Row Townhouses

- Neutral: 22%
- Like: 52%
- Dislike: 26%
Job Centers
The job center images were all liked by more than half of the respondents. Small and large downtown employment images were liked by 65% and 66% of respondents, respectively. Responses for other options were as follows: small scale office (64%), large scale office (64%) and light manufacturing (56%).

A few respondents commented favorably on the design and walkability of the downtown employment centers, and the idea of building centers to attract more jobs. The majority of comments, however, addressed concerns such as: lack of pedestrian/bike accessibility and insufficient separation from the street; inappropriate landscaping for the climate—either unsustainable plantings and/or lack of shade; and energy-inefficiency. Several people noted that these places should be more inviting and have less empty space. Many people were concerned with insufficient parking for the downtown options.

Job Center Option #1: Light Manufacturing

Job Center Option #2: Small Scale Office

Job Center Option #3: Large Scale Office
Parks and Community
The images in this category were all strongly supported. The shaded playground and creative space images were the most popular, liked by more than 90% of respondents. Sports activities and the nature trail were supported by more than 80%, while 75% of respondents supported the urban plaza.

Respondents supported the shaded playground because shade is a must for the desert environment and particularly important for children—this would make it easier for them to play outdoors. A few comments noted that it’s important to design playgrounds so that they are shaded all day and to use natural materials as much as possible. A few respondents emphasized the importance of maintenance and upkeep of these spaces.

Respondents commented that the creative space images were eye-catching and looked fun, appealing to both children and adults and supportive of creative play.

They also liked the idea of sports activities for promoting a healthy lifestyle and fostering community, and they liked that many different sports were accommodated. However, several respondents expressed concern about the use of water required. There was also a suggestion that underutilized sports areas at local schools should be used rather than build large new fields.

Respondents strongly supported the idea of nature trails, but were concerned that they be landscaped appropriately for the desert, including adequate shade. They wanted to make sure safety was considered—a few suggested emergency call boxes and a CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) analysis. Some who were not supportive of trails...
were concerned about whether these trails would be used frequently enough used to justify the cost of maintenance.

Several liked the idea of an urban plaza, but were concerned about it being right for the climate. They wanted to see more shade, water-smart trees, misters and appropriate groundcover to mitigate the heat.

Parks and Community Option #1: Nature Trail

![Nature Trail Image]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature Trail</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parks and Community Option #2: Shaded Playground

![Shaded Playground Image]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shaded Playground</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parks and Community Option #3: Sports Fields

![Sports Fields Image]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports Fields</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parks and Community Option #4: Urban Plaza

Parks and Community Option #5: Creative Space

Streetscape

The structure shade was among the most highly supported images (89%) in the survey, again revealing the importance of shade in Nevada. The image of a transit center was also highly supported (84%), but several commented that the image in the survey needed more shade and that the metal seating looked uncomfortable and would get too hot in the sun. Concerns about safety and energy use were also noted.

Respondents liked the image of pedestrian improvements (80%), although some comments reflected that some people do not understand what is meant by “pedestrian improvements” based on this image. They commented that they supported the idea of wider sidewalks that are not close to the traffic, as well as more crosswalks. They liked how plantings were integrated as a buffer between the street and sidewalk. There were a few concerns noted about maintenance and the tables in the photo promoting loitering.

The landscape shade option was supported by 73% of respondents. Some commented favorably on the landscape shade image and liked the sidewalk furniture, wide walkway and how it was planted. Several people mentioned the need to balance sidewalk space with appropriate landscaping and shade. Several noted safety concerns including being too close to the road, and shade trees hiding pedestrian traffic, making it dangerous for those crossing the street.
Comments on the public art photo array were mixed (image liked by 73%). Though several commented on how much they loved the idea of public art and how it identifies place, they cautioned that it must be appropriate for the location, placed where it is secure and should use the work of local artists. Others noted that taste in art is very subjective; public art doesn’t appeal to everyone. A few thought it was a waste of public money.

**Streetscape Option #1: Structure Shade**

![Image of streetscape option 1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Shade</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Streetscape Option #2: Landscape Shade**

![Image of streetscape option 2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Shade</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Streetscape Option #3: Public Art**

![Image of streetscape option 3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Art</th>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation
Most transportation images were well received by respondents. Images of light rail, modern streetcar and bus rapid transit (BRT) were liked by participants (85%, 81% and 80%). The bike lane was also received favorably by 80% of respondents.

The bus image received significantly less support, with just under one half of respondents (49%) expressing support. Many comments reflected concern with current bus service, including level of service, frequency, schedules and over-crowding.

Light rail throughout the area—not just downtown, but cross town and to the airport—was supported by many comments, although some thought the high cost is not justified. Some commenters noted that this would be a good option between “nodes” within the city.

Although the modern streetcar image received a very high number of “likes,” and a few positive comments, most comments stated concerns. Several thought the streetcar looked like it was running too close to vehicles and pedestrians, while others were concerned it did not offer enough flexibility. Some respondents cautioned that the BRT must be a truly express service. One commented that BRT needed more bike racks. Several also commented that transit options should be low-emission.
Many supported bike lanes, stating that they are needed all over town, and liked the very visible lane marking shown in the image. However, several noted that they need to be wide and separated from vehicle traffic and not used by pedestrians. They expressed concern that local drivers are not considerate of bicycle traffic.

Transportation Option #1: Bus

Transportation Option #2: Light Rail

Transportation Option #3: Bus Rapid Transit
Transportation Option #4: Bike Lane

[Image of person biking on a designated bike lane]

**Bike Lane**

- Like: 80%
- Dislike: 8%
- Neutral: 12%

Transportation Option #5: Modern Streetcar

[Image of modern streetcar]

**Modern Streetcar**

- Like: 81%
- Dislike: 8%
- Neutral: 11%
**Opportunity Site Results**

Participants were asked to provide comments on one of four opportunity sites in the following categories: safety concerns, public transit improvements, parks and recreation, transportation, community services and other. Respondents could also use the mapping tool to place markers in locations where they would like to see these improvements.

The following is a brief summary of the comments in each category by opportunity site and the distribution of the improvement makers. Please note that comments for transportation and public transit have been combined due to the overlap and mix of modes mentioned by respondents.

**Boulder Highway**

Site markers indicate that the primary improvements needed in this area are for safety, public transit improvements, and transportation as shown in the table below. A total of 953 markers were placed for this opportunity site. The majority of markers were located at the intersection of Boulder Highway, Gibson and Broadbent.

**Figure #3: Boulder Highway Opportunity Site Markers**
Safety Concerns: Comments indicate that the area would benefit from safety improvements such as improved lighting and more crosswalks. Jaywalking was a significant issue and it was suggested that some physical improvements might be needed to curtail these activities and improve safety for all users.

Safety concern markers most often reflected crime, vehicle/pedestrian conflicts and the need for crosswalks.

Transportation and Public Transit Improvements: There were suggestions to increase bus service by adding new routes and additional bus stops and make the area more bike-friendly. Light rail was mentioned along with a park and ride closer to the Galleria to facilitate commuter express transit.

A majority (81%) of transit improvement markers focused on bus service, including additional routes and stops and improvements to stops and shelters.

Parks and Recreation: There were suggestions to add a pool/splash pad and more trails near the wetlands park.

Community Services: There were suggestions to provide child care and mental health services.

Access Issues: There were several suggestions to improve access, connecting 215 to the 515 and connecting Sloan to Vegas Valley.
**Las Vegas Medical District**

Site markers indicate that the primary improvements needed in this area are for safety, parks and recreation and public transit improvements, as shown in the table below. A total of 1107 markers were placed for this opportunity site. Markers were relatively evenly distributed throughout the site, with the exception of the northern-most blocks.

**Figure #4: Las Vegas Medical District Markers**
**Safety Concerns:** Respondents were concerned about jaywalking and drivers exceeding the speed limit. The majority of safety concern markers were focused on vehicle and pedestrian conflicts (33%) and crime (28%).

**Transportation and Public Transit Improvements:** Respondents want increased and more frequent transit service and improved bus stops. One participant suggested reinstating the old 401 bus route that connected the area to government. It was also suggested that light rail would be a logical addition to Charleston Boulevard. Some concerns were expressed about how Project Neon would impact the area.

A majority (70%) of transit improvement markers focused on bus service, including additional routes and stops and improvements to stops and shelters.

**Parks and Recreation:** The addition of a park would be a great addition to the area, and support wellness as promoted by the medical facilities. The old health district parking lot was suggested as a possible location.

**Community Services:** There were suggestions to provide a job training center that is run by UNLV. The proximity to existing medical facilities would make it a good location for additional services such as mental health services and services for the homeless.

**Access Issues:** Project Neon was identified as a major impediment for bicyclists and pedestrians. Sidewalk improvements are needed in the area for pedestrians. There were several suggestions to improve access, connecting 215 to the 515 and connecting Sloan to Vegas Valley.
Other: The site generated numerous comments in this category, with some participants commenting positively on the area and other identifying the need for improvements and an overall “facelift” to the area.

Downtown North Las Vegas

Site markers indicate that the primary improvements needed in this area are for safety, parks and recreation and community services, as shown in the table below. A total of 1,838 markers were placed for this opportunity site. Markers were relatively evenly distributed throughout the site, with many markers centered along Las Vegas Boulevard.

Figure #5: Downtown North Las Vegas Opportunity Sites Markers
Safety Concerns: There were numerous comments about safety in the area—many residents feel unsafe. The presence of homeless was intimidating for some. Also unsafe crosswalks and insufficient lighting were also identified as making the area feel less safe.

Parks and Recreation: A central park was suggested along with areas to support exercise.

Transportation and Public Transit Improvements: Respondents wanted improved bus shelters that were safe, included wayfinding information and were better distributed throughout the area. It was suggested the team consider adding shuttle buses to loop around the downtown area. Light rail could also be integrated—connecting from Boulder Highway to the airport down Maryland Parkway to the Strip, then downtown and on to downtown North Las Vegas.

It was suggested that widening sidewalks along Lake Mead Boulevard would be helpful. New road striping and a mid-block crosswalk near McCall Elementary School and the park on Donna would be helpful. One commenter suggested raising the speed limit.

Community Services: Few comments were received. One participant suggested providing signage so people could better locate services.

Access issues: The only comment made centered on the need for major repairs to local roads and highways.

Other: One commenter suggested giving some parcels away to developers to stimulate improvements in the area. Other suggested that more stores, signage and lighting could help improve the area.
Maryland Parkway

Site markers indicate that the primary improvements needed in this area are for safety, with relatively even support for parks and recreation, public transit and transportation improvements. A total of 1,995 markers were placed for this opportunity site. Markers were relatively evenly distributed throughout the site along Maryland Parkway, with the exception of the north end.

Figure #5: Maryland Parkway Markers
Safety Concerns: The area where Maryland splits into Maryland and 13th Street was identified as a dangerous location. There were comments about crime and panhandlers in the area. Some crosswalks were considered unsafe. One respondent suggested eliminating the pedestrian bridge due to its lack of use. They also called out numerous pedestrian vehicle conflicts that occurred.

Transportation and Public Transit Improvements: Respondents wanted improved bus stops with more shade and better “real-time” information about the buses. There were also suggestions to add: a park and ride facility, and a center bus-only transitway. Several respondents suggested light rail for the area, as well.

Bike lanes and elevated crosswalks would help improve conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists. Some crosswalks also needed improvements.

Parks and Recreation: It was suggested there be continuing work on Circle Park to make it fully functional. There were safety concerns expressed about the existing parks and adults loitering. The soccer field should be improved.

Community Services: Services for the homeless were suggested.

Other: This site attracted a number of comments in this category. Some participants urged that the area should be cleaned up and made more appealing. It was suggested that a fiber-optic communication program be installed the length of the parkway. Landscaping would be a valuable addition. And as a university corridor, it should be enhanced to help attract more students and faculty to the area.
B. Opportunity Site Workshop Surveys and Results

In May of 2014, SNS conducted four community workshops to seek public input on the site possibilities for the four opportunity sites. The workshops were held in an open house format that allowed participants to move at their own pace through six stations while providing feedback and engaging in conversation with members of the project team. During the workshops, participants were surveyed regarding:

- Their level of agreement with general statements reflecting the main themes of the outreach conducted to date; and
- Their opinion of whether various images for site possibilities, based on the preliminary analysis, would be the appropriate for each site.

Below is a summary of participants’ responses. Note that for the outreach statements, green dots indicate that respondents agree with the statement; yellow dots indicate neutrality; red dots indicate that respondents disagree with the statement.

**Boulder Highway**

**Outreach Statements**

1. The Boulder Highway opportunity site is close to major facilities and good infrastructure. (25 green dots, 1 yellow dot)
2. We should explore ways to improve Boulder Highway so that it is safer and easier for people to walk and bike. (25 green dots, 1 yellow dot, 1 red dot)
3. Narrowing Boulder Highway so there is more room for bikes, pathways and transit should be considered. (10 green dots, 3 yellow dots, 12 red dots)
4. The area would benefit from improved transit service. (19 green dots, 5 yellow dots, 3 red dots)
5. The feasibility of light rail in this area should be explored. (14 green dots, 6 yellow dots, 8 red dots)
6. The Boulder Highway could use more housing that serves different income levels. (6 green dots, 6 yellow dots, 15 red dots)

**Site Possibilities**

**Retail:**
- Mixed-uses with ground floor retail—3
- Single-tenant commercial—4
- Larger scale shopping with a mix of services—12

Respondents commented that they preferred 1- and 2-story buildings to preserve the view and smaller scale businesses.

**Housing:**
- Two-story condominiums—5
- Two-story condominiums and apartments—5
• Three- to four-story apartments—1

Respondents expressed concerns that owner occupied housing is needed since renters don’t respect property as much.

Open Space:
• Public plazas with water features—9
• Larger open spaces and pathways—5
• Small open spaces and landscaping—3

Mobility:
• Four-lane street with median and separated sidewalk—7
• Two-way bus transit lanes—1
• Off-street shared-use pathway—7

Las Vegas Medical District

Outreach Statements
1. We should consider expanding the Medical District’s southern boundaries and better connecting facilities adjacent to the district, including METRO, Smith Center, Government Center. (10 green dots, 4 yellow dots, 0 red dots)
2. We should consider adding a medical school and opportunities for clinical research education. (12 green dots, 1 yellow dot, 0 red dots)
3. Medical services should be available 24/7 to accommodate the 24/7 Las Vegas community. (11 green dots, 2 yellow dots, 0 red dots)
4. We need more housing choices and amenities with easy access to hospitals for on-call residents. (13 green dots, 1 yellow dot, 0 red dots)
5. The Medical District needs additional services and amenities including child care, parking that is closer together, and wayfinding improvements. (13 green dots, 1 yellow dot, 0 red dots)

Site Possibilities

Retail:
• Small scale multi-tenant (Neighborhood retail)—2
• Single-tenant (Neighborhood retail)—0
• Mixed-use (District supportive)—12
• Entertainment/retail (District supportive)—10

Housing:
• Two-story townhouses—4
• Four- to five-story condominiums—4
• Multi-story apartments—4
• Multi-story student housing—5
Office:
- One- to two-story medical offices—1
- Multi-story medical office with ground floor retail—10
- Multi-story medical office—3

Several participants commented that they’d like to see a multi-story office with ground floor retail as the core of the district, with more restaurants and coffee shops along with a full medical school. Participants also suggested that one- to two-story medical offices be located along Charleston.

Underpass:
- Non-motorized underpass—4
- Visual interest underpass—5
- Shared motorist/non-motorist underpass—12

Pedestrian/Bike Circulation:
- Separated pathways—4
- Bike lanes and separated sidewalks—11
- Marked crossings and pedestrian refuges—8

Open Space:
- Murals and public art—12
- Central gathering area and spray ground—7
- Landscaped plazas—10

Parking:
- Integrated parking structure (parking on top level)—10
- Multi-story parking structure with ground floor offices—7
- Multi-story parking structure with design façade—3

Participants suggested that the integrated parking structure mimic the style of other local buildings.

Downtown North Las Vegas

Outreach Statements
1. Downtown North Las Vegas is the gateway to our City—it needs to serve as a true destination and be something we are proud of. (14 green dots, 4 yellow dots, 0 red dots)
2. Safety improvements are critical. More lighting, better transit shelters and more security are some of the ways we can achieve this. (14 green dots, 1 yellow dots, 0 red dots)
3. A community plaza and local parks are important amenities that can help improve the area. (13 green dots, 4 yellow dots, 0 red dots)
4. We need to encourage local businesses and grow services that meet the needs of people who already live here. As the downtown becomes more vibrant, we will be able to attract businesses and visitors from outside the city. *(16 green dots, 2 yellow dots, 0 red dots)*

**Getting Around North Las Vegas**

During the Downtown North Las Vegas workshop, participants were asked to view a map listing options for ways to get around and were asked to identify which they used by placing dots under those options. First, they were asked to identify the streets that they typically use to get to and from North Las Vegas, and responded as follows:

- Carey Ave.—6
- North Fifth Street—3
- Lake Mead Blvd.—6
- Las Vegas Blvd.—6
- Other Street—5 (I-15, Civic Center)

Next, participants were asked to place a dot under the modes of transportation they typically rely on to get to and from North Las Vegas, and identified the following:

- Drive Alone—12
- Carpool—3
- Walk or Bike—5
- Take the Bus—3

**Site Possibilities**

**Market Space:**

- Outdoor market space—10
- Indoor market—6

One participant made a note regarding the Nevada cottage food law restricting food product sales, possibly referring to the earlier comment made about restaurants being allowed to serve food outside.

**Mixed use:**

- Retail and apartments/condos with outdoor seating—10
- Retail and offices—8

**Retail:**

- Single-tenant—7
- Small scale multi-tenant—3
Housing:
- Single family detached—8
- Two-story condominiums—7

Open Space:
- Plaza with spray ground—11
- Plaza with landscaping—8

A participant expressed the need for community space hosting activities such as boxing, soccer, singing and cultural events.

Streetscape:
- North Fifth Street—5
- Las Vegas Boulevard (South)—9
- McDaniel Street—10
- Lake Mead Boulevard—5
- Gateway Signage—6

One participant noted that bricks alone aren’t sufficient to communicate to drivers that they must slow down for approaching crossings; other features are needed to help make this obvious.

**Maryland Parkway**

Outreach Statements
1. Maryland Parkway has a lot to offer to the region and its surrounding neighborhoods. With the airport located at one end and hospitals, UNLV, and residential communities in between, its assets are rich and varied. *(34 green dots, 1 yellow dot, 4 red dots)*
2. Maryland Parkway would benefit from activities that improve its streets, including widening sidewalks, adding landscaping and shade, and integrating public art and other amenities. *(32 green dots, 6 yellow dots, 0 red dots)*
3. Maryland Parkway would benefit from having better and more frequent transit service, dedicated bike lanes and intersection improvements that make it safer for pedestrians. *(38 green dots, 6 yellow dots, 6 red dots)*
4. Maryland Parkway is a series of distinctive neighborhoods that include a variety of housing types. The area would benefit from better integrating student housing and including more housing that is affordable to a wider range of income levels. *(27 green dots, 7 yellow dots, 2 red dots)*

Site Possibilities

**Housing (9 dots on whole category):**
- Two-story townhouses—8
- Multi-story condominiums—8
- Multi-story apartments—6
• Multi-story student housing—6

Retail (4):
• Services—5
• Neighborhood serving retail—8
• Cafes and convenience dining—13
• Shopping centers with internal circulation—10

Mixed Use (12):
• Housing above retail—7
• Office above retail—6
• Office and housing above retail—4
• Mixed use development wrapping parking structure—9

Public Art (12):
• Public art integrated into transit stations—6
• Cultural trail with art installations—7
• Gateway monuments and sculptures—6
• Mosaic tiles in sidewalks—3

Pedestrian Amenities (13):
• In sidewalk multi-use pathway—9
• Covered transit stops with furnishings—11
• Sidewalk shade structure—6
• Highly visible and decorative crossing—12

C. Telephone Town Hall

On May 29, 2014, SNS hosted a Telephone Town Hall (TTH) designed to allow participants to receive information about the process and respond to polling questions using their telephone key pad. Two town halls were conducted: one in English and another in Spanish. SNS dialed out to approximately 20,000 low-income and Spanish speaking residents to participate in the call. Over 4,800 people participated in the call, with approximately 200 responding to the polls, and their responses to the telephone polling questions were consistent with many of the findings from other outreach sources.

D. Focus Groups

In June of 2014, seven focus groups were conducted to collect information for the Regional Analysis of Impediments (RAI). The RAI is a study that is required in any area that receives federal funding for subsidized housing and assesses whether people have the freedom to choose where they live solely based on their budget or if other factors limit their choices.
Focus group participants included: representatives from low-income minority households, families with children, single female heads of household, persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP), persons with disabilities and community- and faith-based organizations that serve the above mentioned groups. The survey questions below were adapted from materials provided by HUD. Participants were screened in advance to ensure participants were representative of the requested demographics.

SNS gained valuable insight into the challenges that low-income and minority families face when they are looking for housing in the Southern Nevada Region. Some participants had found their current housing with support from the Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority. Several participants expressed concerns for safety where they lived; they had difficulty moving to a safer location due to higher costs and the application process. A key finding was that most landlords require that applicants pay an application fee to cover the costs of a background check. The fee was applied to each adult who will live in the residence. An applicant may end up paying $50 - $100 per location. This incentivizes the landlord to accept as many applications as possible for a property. Some participants explained they felt they continue to be penalized for poor rental history that is more than a decade old. When asked to describe their neighborhood, several participants spoke positively about where they lived, noting their location was well-served by transit and had recreation and community facilities nearby.

Consistent with SNS outreach findings, many of these participants expressed support for increased public transit and community amenities and investments that would improve safety for pedestrians and reduce neighborhood crime.

E. Review Comments on Draft Regional Plan

At all outreach activities throughout Phase 3, participants were reminded of the opportunity to review the draft regional plan, available for online review as a dynamic document. A variety of methods for giving input were provided, including: iPads available at workshops and outreach events; and emails directly to Southern Nevada Strong. A total of 80 comments were received from a wide range of stakeholders and community members, including residents, agency representatives, local government officials and members of the Consortium Committee.