NOTICE AND AGENDA OF PUBLIC MEETING

SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE

1:00 P.M. APRIL 28, 2016

RTC/RFCD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
600 S. GRAND CENTRAL PARKWAY
ROOM 108
LAS VEGAS, NV 89106
(702) 676-1500

This agenda with full backup is available at the Regional Transportation Commission Administration Building, 600 S. Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada; the Regional Transportation Commission’s website, http://www.rtcsnv.com; or by contacting Marin DuBois at (702) 676-1836.
Items 2, 3 and 7 are items for possible action. Items 1, 4 through 6 and 8 are discussion items and no action can be taken. Please be advised that the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee has the discretion to take items on the agenda out of order, combine two or more agenda items for consideration, remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda any time.

1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION
2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Meeting of January 28, 2016 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
3. DISCUSS STRATEGIES TO ADVANCE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LAS VEGAS MEDICAL DISTRICT OPPORTUNITY SITE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
4. REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE PLANNING FOR THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG ANNUAL SUMMIT
5. RECEIVE A REPORT FROM THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA ON THE EFFORTS TAKEN OVER THE PAST YEAR TO BUILD CAPACITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION
6. RECEIVE REGIONAL UPDATES
7. DISCUSS FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
8. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

During the initial Citizens Participation, any citizen in the audience may address the Committee on an item featured on the agenda. During the final Citizens Participation, any citizens in the audience may address the Committee on matters within the Committee’s jurisdiction, but not necessarily featured on the agenda. No vote can be taken on a matter not listed on the posted agenda; however, the Committee can direct that the matter be placed on a future agenda.

Each citizen must be recognized by the Chair. The citizen is then asked to approach the microphone at the podium, to state his or her name, and to spell the last name for the record. The Chair may limit remarks to three minutes’ duration, if such remarks are disruptive to the meeting or not within the Committee’s jurisdiction.

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada keeps the official record of all proceedings of the meeting. In order to maintain a complete and accurate record, copies of documents used during presentations should be submitted to the Recording Secretary.

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada appreciates the time citizens devote to be involved in this important process.

Any action taken on these items is advisory to the Regional Transportation Commission.
## Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada

### Agenda Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT: CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, GENERAL MANAGER</td>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: INTEGRATE THE SYSTEM GEOGRAPHICALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fiscal Impact:

None

### Background:

In accordance with State of Nevada Open Meeting Law, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee (Committee) shall invite interested persons to make comments. For the initial Citizens Participation, the public should address items on the current agenda. For the final Citizens Participation, interested persons may make comments on matters within the Committee’s jurisdiction, but not necessarily on the current agenda.

No action can be taken on any matter discussed under this item, although the Committee can direct that it be placed on a future agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND HESS
Director of Planning Services

SNS Item #1
April 28, 2016
Non-Consent
MINUTES
SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
JANUARY 28, 2016

These minutes are prepared in compliance with NRS 241.035. Text is in summarized rather than verbatim format. For complete contents, please refer to meeting recordings on file at the Regional Transportation Commission.

THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED
IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS ON JANUARY 20, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Debra March, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. in Meeting Room 108 of the Regional Transportation Commission Administration Building.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Debra March, Chair, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Chris Giunchigliani, Vice-Chair, Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition
Nancy Amundsen, Clark County (Alternate)
Brock Armantrout, City of Boulder City (Alternate)
Stephanie Garcia-Vause, City of Henderson
Shawn Gerstenberger, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Kenneth MacDonald, Conservation District of Southern Nevada
Doa Meade, Southern Nevada Water Authority (Alternate)
Orlando Sanchez, City of Las Vegas (Alternate)
Deborah Williams, Southern Nevada Health District (Alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT:
John Hill, Southern Nevada Housing Authority
Ryann Juden, City of North Las Vegas
Pat Skorkowsky, Clark County School District

RTC STAFF:
Fred Ohene, Deputy General Manager
David Swallow, Senior Director of Engineering and Technology
Angela Castro, Senior Director of Government Affairs, Media Relations and Marketing
Raymond Hess, Director of Planning Services
Catherine Lu, Media and Marketing Supervisor
Monika Bertaki, Public Affairs Administrator
Marin DuBois, Management Analyst

INTERESTED PARTIES
Shane Ammerman, Clark County
Lisa Corrado, City of Henderson
Kevin Gullette, Clark County
Bill Marion, Purdue Marion & Associates

SNS Item #2
April 28, 2016
**Item:** 1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

**Comments:**
No comments were made.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.

**Item:** 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Meeting of November 19, 2015 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**Comments:**
No comments were made.

**Motion:**
Mr. Kenneth MacDonald, Conservation District of Southern Nevada, made a motion to approve the meeting minutes.

**Vote/Summary:**
8 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.

**Item:** 3. DISCUSS THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLAN (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**Comments:**
Mr. Raymond Hess, Director of Planning Services for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), introduced the agenda item, acknowledging that the proposed Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Public Engagement Plan (Plan) was included in the agenda as backup. Mr. Bill Marion, Purdue Marion & Associates, was introduced and provided an overview of the Plan.

Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached] Mr. Marion introduced the Plan, which would work in tandem with the Communications Plan that had been presented to the SNS Steering Committee (Committee) at its November 19, 2015 meeting. He described the activities that had taken place in 2015, including the formation of the Committee and various meetings that had been held. He noted that regular updates had also been provided to the RTC Board of Commissioners, the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC) Director’s Committee and the RTC Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee. He added that the partnering organizations involved had been encouraged to provide continual updates within their own organizations.

Mr. Marion detailed that one of the main public engagement goals included maintaining community awareness of the SNS initiative. He explained that this would accelerate implementation and increase awareness of the brand.

**Vice-Chair Chris Giunchigliani arrived at 1:08 p.m.**

**Ms. Doa Meade arrived at 1:09 p.m.**

Next, Mr. Marion detailed the function of the RTC as the core administrator of the SNS initiative. One of these functions included modeling best practices such as co-branding, he continued to explain. He stated that some of the RTC’s current projects contained core values that had been identified during the implementation of SNS. As an example, Mr. Marion described a project funded by Fuel Revenue
Indexing (FRI) which also encompassed SNS values. He concluded that, co-branded, the project spoke to the public and legislature more loudly than the two initiatives could do alone. He stated that the final function as core administrator was for the RTC to assist in developing the tools and strategies that would facilitate forward movement for all regional partners.

Mr. Marion next explained what the RTC would ask of the regional partners, including tracking and reporting SNS implementation. Referring to a photo of a City of Henderson park, Mr. Marion acknowledged that a park was a multi-faceted location which represented SNS values. He next explained that the regional partners would be asked to conduct public outreach. Many projects were already utilizing public outreach efforts and could be co-branded with the SNS initiative. Finally, Mr. Marion detailed that the partners would be asked to align their plans with the SNS Regional Plan. As an example, he identified the need for additional law enforcement officers. He explained that this would be an initiative that aligned with the SNS core values, and co-branding would be beneficial.

Mr. Marion continued to say that the core message of the SNS initiative was combining efforts and constructing projects which made Southern Nevada strong. He identified the SNS brand as the umbrella under which the community was united in strength. He added that the intent was to have a liaison within each entity that was constantly identifying projects and initiatives that would support SNS. He discussed obtaining active support from business and non-profit partners, as well as involvement from the community, thanks to tangible concepts and projects. He requested that community partners and regional partners include links to SNS projects and initiatives on their websites to assist in promotion of the initiative. Furthermore, there were plans to utilize a decommissioned RTC vehicle which would be converted into a learning lab to support public outreach.

Mr. Marion concluded the presentation with a request for regional partner support and coordination, as the initiative could not be implemented by the RTC alone.

Ms. Stephanie Garcia-Vause, City of Henderson (COH), explained that public engagement was very important at the COH. She explained that some of the lessons learned from the SNS initiative were now being applied to its public outreach processes. She wondered if there was a way to encourage community partners to embrace the tools and techniques presented. She stated that, utilizing SNS public engagement practices, the COH had seen a community survey response of over 1,000 people within 10 days. She expressed confusion about co-branding; stating that the COH already had projects aligned with SNS values, but was not sure how co-branding would work. Mr. Marion explained that not all projects were anticipated to be co-branded; however those projects which aligned with the over-300 initiatives discussed in the SNS plan would be easily co-branded. He applauded the COH’s Henderson Strong initiative. He pointed out that the co-branding of their city-based initiative with the SNS initiative would be very powerful. He detailed that the efforts made by the regional partners would provide a model for the community partners to follow.

Vice-Chair Chris Giunchigliani, SNRPC, asked if there had been any exploration into the creation of an application for mobile devices which could then be linked to Get Outdoors Nevada, Southern Nevada Health District’s Walk Around Nevada and Neon to Nature initiatives. She also suggested utilizing Survey Monkey for determining times to hold town hall meetings. Mr. Marion believed these were great additions to the Plan. He added that an application would additionally serve as a way for partners to provide up-to-date input. Mr. Hess interjected that a robust website overhaul was currently being conducted and would include interactive content for regional partners, allowing for the updating of information. It would be mobile-compliant and would contain a calendar of events to assist with public engagement efforts. He further stated that this revised website was expected to be launched by the
following meeting.

Chair Debra March reminded the group that Envision Utah had been in place for over 20 years and it represented a brand that traveled all over the state of Utah, as well as other states. She explained that Mr. Robert Grow, Envision Utah, had divulged that the important thing was not when the process was entered into, but *that* the process was entered into.

Vice-Chair Giunchigliani acknowledged the legislation-created Southern Nevada Forum, which had been broken into small working groups. She suggested providing a presentation to those groups in order to facilitate discussions within those groups as well. Mr. Hess detailed that a presentation was made at the December 15, 2015 meeting of the Southern Nevada Forum which detailed the transportation showcase, highlighting the SNS initiative as an RTC function.

Dr. Shawn Gerstenberger, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, questioned what indicators would suggest success of the initiative. He suggested quantifying events held, website hits, attendance numbers for events, traffic driven between linked websites, etc. He was hopeful that there would be some measure of success once the SNS initiative had been well-implemented, which would provide supportive documentation that the initiative was making a difference. Mr. Marion agreed, stating that the SNS initiative provided a great basis to quantify success, so long as the regional partners were providing the data. He acknowledged the importance of the regional partners’ identification of projects which fit within the SNS core values and ensured they were including SNS when conducting public outreach on those projects. This would help to quantify successful outreach endeavors, which could in turn provide funding opportunities. Dr. Gerstenberger suggested a sticker designation on projects which states “This is Southern Nevada Strong”, identifying a recognizable event which supported the initiative. Mr. Marion concluded that regional partner commitment was the key, and would segue into business and community commitment. Mr. Hess followed up that performance measures were expected to be included and would be presented to the Committee at their April meeting for Committee input.

Ms. Nancy Amundsen, Clark County, added that her staff had been proactive in identifying pertinent projects and maintaining an up-to-date matrix. She explained that encouraging partners to input data was beneficial in tracking the items.

Ms. Garcia-Vause requested the RTC share its best practices on all forms of public outreach to better assist the regional partners in modeling its practices. Additionally, she pointed out that selective inclusion of projects that highlighted access to better jobs, transportation, and quality housing would help the community to see a quality of life value to SNS.

Vice-Chair Giunchigliani suggested, regarding the RTC vehicle which would be repurposed for public outreach, that the vehicle be wrapped to provide additional visibility. She further suggested utilizing the learning lab at events such as health fairs and workforce programs. Mr. Hess explained that he was currently presenting the idea for the mobile learning lab to the Leadership Las Vegas group for its assistance with the retrofit process. He added that a schedule would still need to be identified, as well as determining operational costs.

Vice-Chair Giunchigliani additionally suggested providing a presentation on the SNS initiative to the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA). Mr. Marion detailed that the LVCVA would be a welcomed community partner, adding that elected officials who served on the LVCVA Board would be capable of facilitating discussions.

Ms. Doa Meade, Southern Nevada Water Authority, suggested a checklist of criteria which would help to
qualify a proposed project as representing SNS values. As representatives of SNS, she suggested a way for the regional partners to approach projects with the checklist to identify it as being a qualified project. She detailed that qualified projects could include a designated logo on their plans, bringing interest and attention to the initiative. It was possible that other developers would be inclined to construct projects based on the criteria so that they could also utilize the designation. This would also allow developers to utilize the SNS branding within their own marketing, based on their involvement in SNS projects.

Motion:
No motion was necessary.

Vote/Summary:
No vote was taken.

Item:
4. DISCUSS ADDING ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Comments:
Chair Debra March, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), deferred to Mr. Raymond Hess, Director of Planning Services for the RTC, to introduce the item.

Mr. Hess recounted a discussion at the November 19, 2015 meeting regarding the addition of members to fill gaps in community and partnership representation. He referred to the present meeting’s agenda item, which included a list of potential new members. He added that many of the potential members would be familiar with the initiative, as they had previously served on the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Consortium Committee (Consortium Committee). Mr. Hess detailed that the goal was to include new members who would be engaged in the process. He pointed out that the list included justification as to why the potential member may be of service to the SNS Steering Committee (Committee). He added that there would still be an opportunity to add more members in the future, if that was deemed appropriate, while maintaining a manageable committee size.

Vice-Chair Chris Giunchigliani, Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC), queried whether the intent was to ensure equal representation in the event that the Committee was broken down into working groups. She further asked for clarification on the inclusion of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco in the membership. Mr. Hess explained that one of the topics of discussion for SNS was related to affordable housing or equitable housing. Identifying capital to advance those conversations had proven difficult, and the inclusion of member representation for the Federal Reserve Bank could be beneficial in understanding what steps needed to be taken to move those particular initiatives forward. He added that Ms. Joselyn Cousins, who was locally based, was involved in the SNS planning process, previously serving on the Consortium Committee. Mr. Hess additionally explained that there had been discussions with Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance (LVGEA) to construct an economic development subcommittee. He added that SNS might not be the best administrator of such a subcommittee, but that if it was overseen by LVGEA those discussions could be reported back to the Committee for discussion.

Vice-Chair Giunchigliani believed that membership from United Way would be encompassing of Nevada Housing and Neighborhood Development’s (HAND) input. She did not want to duplicate efforts. She also suggested engaging the youth community. Ms. Nancy Amundsen, Clark County, questioned if Vice-Chair Giunchigliani had identified any representatives for that portion of the community. Vice-Chair Giunchigliani detailed that Ms. Patrice Tew, Clark County School District (CCSD) Trustee, was Vice-Chair of the SNRPC Board. She suggested a presentation to the SNRPC Board to garner additional membership. Mr. Hess pointed out that CCSD and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas were both represented on the Committee. He was appreciative of the ongoing efforts made by the Vice-Chair to ensure proper representation for all factions of the community.
Mr. Orlando Sanchez, City of Las Vegas, suggested the addition of a representative for the Resort Corridor, such as Ms. Virginia Valentine, President of the Nevada Resort Association. Chair March agreed.

Ms. Stephanie Garcia-Vause, City of Henderson, suggested reconsideration of Mr. Mike Mullen, representing HAND. She reminded the Committee that workforce housing was a component of SNS and that was something that HAND oversaw. Vice-Chair Giunchigliani was concerned with overrepresentation or inclusion of too many members.

**Motion:**
Chair Debra March, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada, made a motion to adopt the new potential members, suggesting that the addition of a youth element representative and resort association representative be explored. Additionally, she suggested exploration for the possible addition of a housing representative in the future.

**Vote/Summary:**
10 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.

**Item:**
5. **DISCUSS STRATEGIES TO ADVANCE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MARYLAND PARKWAY OPPORTUNITY SITE REPORT (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**Comments:**
Mr. Raymond Hess, Director of Planning Services for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), introduced the item. He explained that the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Steering Committee (Committee) meetings would act as learning labs. Four opportunity sites had been identified to demonstrate locations that were well suited to model sound urban planning. The locations were ideal due to their proximity to jobs, housing and transit. He hoped that the meetings would help to identify some implementation strategies and advance discussions to move forward on the opportunity sites. He referred to an excerpt of the implementation strategy, included in the agenda, which provided an overview, identified the barriers and opportunities for each site, and provided an action plan.

Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. Hess provided an overview of the Maryland Parkway Opportunity Site. He stated that the corridor ran from McCarran International Airport to Downtown Las Vegas, with major destinations such as the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), Boulevard Mall and Sunrise Hospital along the way.

Mr. Hess remarked that the Maryland Parkway corridor represented a unique opportunity. During the environmental process phase of the transit enhancement along the corridor, 600 acres of redevelopable land had been identified. Mr. Hess explained that the analysis had identified an expected increase of 188 percent to future development within the corridor in response to improved transit. This spoke to the complementary affects of transit and land use development.

Mr. Hess next depicted the three types of transit development that were being considered. This included Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Light Rail (LR) and Urban Light Rail (ULR). He advised the Committee that the RTC was currently leaning toward ULR. The research data had shown this to be the best option for the goals of the corridor. Returning to the three different types of development, he said that the common thread was the use of dedicated transit. Each option utilized its own dedicated lane of travel, which allowed higher ridership and frequency. Station locations were being identified approximately one-third of a mile apart, which was something that was easier to construct along an ULR corridor. He added that the vehicles utilized by ULR were almost identical to those used in LR, only truncated.
Mr. Hess described the RTC’s focus on the downtown alignment project. The alternatives analysis, first conducted when the agency had begun looking into enhancing transit, identified concerns with how to align transit with the Bonneville Transit Center. There had been additional discussions since that analysis was conducted which brought up some considerations on connecting the Maryland Parkway transit enhancements to the medical district near Downtown Las Vegas. Mr. Hess explained that a study had shown that there would be a 44 percent service increase to residents and an 80 percent service increase to employees when the line was extended north of Charleston Boulevard. Mr. Hess acknowledged that City of Las Vegas was interested in LR along the Charleston Boulevard corridor. He detailed that those two systems could be interconnected if this were to move forward. He advised that the Charleston Boulevard corridor was not currently being researched, but that the opportunity could eventually be there.

Mr. Hess concluded his presentation with information regarding discussions on Transit Oriented Development (TOD). He recounted that a TOD primer had been held by the National Transit Institute on September 30, 2015 and October 1, 2015, and was attended by public agency members, although it had been a nationally offered conference. A Volpe Institute TOD Peer Exchange meeting had also been held December 2 and 3, 2015 which included participants from Salt Lake City, UT; Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota; and Nashville, TN. This had provided a snapshot of the TOD programs in those areas. Lastly, Mr. Hess noted an upcoming meeting which would be held in spring 2016. He detailed that the target audience would be the private sector, asking the developers, lenders, and financial institutions what they saw as hurdles in TOD implementation, focusing specifically on the Maryland Parkway corridor. He acknowledged that this was a three-tier approach where they first engaged public sector participants locally, followed by public sector peers and finally reaching out to engage private sector partners.

Mr. Hess turned the agenda item over to Mr. Shane Ammerman, Clark County, to provide a presentation on the Maryland Parkway Design Overlay (MPDO) work.

Mr. Ammerman resumed the presentation, detailing that Clark County had conducted a number of outreach meetings which had garnered numerous comments that could now be compiled. Additionally, a working group had been convened, which consisted of a Maryland Parkway owners group, to identify some additional ideas. He added that Clark County had also met with City of Las Vegas to ensure cohesion between the two entities during the process. Mr. Ammerman explained that the tables shown in the presentation highlighted Southern Nevada Strong actions alongside the design components of the MPDO for each phase. He described the process of creating the overlay and determining which design components would be included, noting that there was an essential relationship between the street design and land use. Mr. Ammerman explained that a review had been conducted on approximately 12 cities that were the same size with similar geography. He explained that there had been interest in establishing sections within the corridor, such as the medical district, a commercial district, the UNLV section and the McCarran International Airport section, similar to what had been identified in Tempe, Arizona. Portland, Oregon had also presented some excellent options regarding walkability and transit-friendly design. Another of the cities that had been reviewed was Grand Junction, Colorado, where they had identified an overlay design which allowed an option for developers to opt-in to the design. He pointed out that the common theme within these communities was outdoor dining and wide pedestrian areas.

Vice-Chair Chris Giunchigliani requested that the Huntridge area be included on the map, as it was a very important area for the city. Mr. Ammerman detailed that the City of Las Vegas had also requested the addition of Huntridge area in a previous meeting.

Next, Mr. Ammerman, described a design checklist that had been constructed to help develop the core of the Maryland Parkway Overlay District. The design features would be divided into three categories:
essential, desirable and worthwhile. He added that these items were subject to change as the working group progressed.

** Vice-Chair Giunchigliani and Ms. Nancy Amundsen left the meeting at 2:04 p.m.**

Chair Debra March wondered if there should be a standard established for signage to ensure consistent signage within the cities and the county. She acknowledged that Salt Lake City, Utah had detailed a cooperative agreement that they had established regarding these topics. She expected that the RTC would play a role in establishing those types of practices as well. Ms. Deborah Williams, Southern Nevada Health District, pointed out that the Regional Open Space and Trails (ROST) Workgroup was currently conducting research around consistent signage for the trail system. She suggested reviewing recommendations that came from those meetings and potentially applying them to the co-branding and consistency in signage efforts of SNS. Mr. Ammerman agreed, stating that a unified theme was the goal as they worked through development of the corridor.

Mr. Ammerman concluded his portion of the presentation by providing an overview of the $50,000 public arts grant that had been awarded cooperatively to UNLV, City of Las Vegas, and Clark County. Chair March pointed out that the grant funded project was a perfect example of co-branding.

Mr. Kevin Gullette, Development Director for Clark County, resumed the presentation, describing the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Brownfields Assessment Grant that had been awarded to Clark County, the RTC and the City of Las Vegas to fund an assessment of the Maryland Parkway corridor. He detailed that the assessment was typically the first step in identifying the viability of a redevelopment area. The grant had been awarded for $500,000, covering the entire Maryland Parkway corridor as established by SNS. He expected that a contract would be awarded on February 19, 2016. The EPA would also be brought in to conduct a kickoff meeting with the advisory committee which had been established by Clark County. Detailing the process associated with the EPA Brownfields Assessment, Mr. Gullette stated that the first phase was typically based off of research for prior use of an area and whether there would be potential for contaminants in those areas. An additional use of the funds allowed the agencies to step in and remediate the sites so that they were reverted to green potential. He detailed that it was a three-year process, which included on-going public engagement.

Mr. Gullette said that one of the goals was to identify the transit nodes and identify the properties that abut those areas to ensure cohesion with the proposed overlay district. This would allow them to approach the developers and property owners to discuss redevelopment opportunities.

Mr. Hess concluded the presentation by detailing the plan for action. He stated that there was still much work to be conducted, but the discussions and collaborations helped to move the initiative forward. He requested the assistance of the Committee in continuing to spread the word on the initiative. Consensus from the community on this investment was crucial and support was an important piece of the process. Mr. Hess pointed out that the Maryland Parkway corridor was one with great community champions that could help to facilitate community support and commitment.

Chair March suggested regular updates to the Committee on this topic to ensure support could be provided where most needed.

Mr. Kenneth MacDonald, Conservation District of Southern Nevada, suggested reaching out to the National Association of Industrial and Office Parks and provide a presentation to it in the future. Chair March agreed, stating that there would likely be many interested attendees at such a meeting.
Mr. Orlando Sanchez, City of Las Vegas, asked if this information would be included on the SNS website. Mr. Hess responded in the affirmative, adding that the information for each opportunity site would be found under the “Our Plan” header.

Dr. Shawn Gerstenberger, UNLV, acknowledged the successes that were being realized and suggested ensuring those successes were communicated to the Committee to maintain member engagement. Mr. Sanchez agreed, adding that it would be nice to reach out to the original stakeholders of the SNS initiative to ensure their awareness that their time was valuable and that the initiative continued to move forward. Chair March suggested an event to bring the original participants back to show them how the initiative was proceeding. Mr. Hess detailed that an annual summit was currently being discussed. He added that a newsletter was also being considered, which would be brought before the Committee, followed by the RTC Board of Commissioners and then distributed within the community.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.

**Item:**
6. DISCUSS FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**Comments:**
Chair Debra March, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), suggested items related to implementation successes and accomplishments, a website overview and performance measures going forward. She additionally suggested a presentation item related to the City of Las Vegas’ plans for the Medical District.

Mr. Raymond Hess, Director of Planning Services for the RTC, hoped that they would have a Save the Date prepared for the next meeting regarding the proposed Southern Nevada Strong annual summit.

Dr. Shawn Gerstenberger, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, explained that he would be interested in the formation of a committee which would identify Request for Proposals (RFP) and facilitated submission of those RFPs. He further suggested funding from each entity to hire grant writers to assist in obtaining grant funding for SNS-related projects. Chair March asked that a discussion item be presented at the next meeting on the topic.

Chair March reminded the Committee that there would be additional members at the following meeting. She suggested the allotment of additional time to ensure proper introductions could be made.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.

**Item:**
7. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

**Comments:**
No comments were made.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.
ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marin DuBois, Recording Secretary

Elizabeth Johnson, Transcription Secretary
Public Engagement Plan
Overview

2015 Activities

• SNS Steering Committee formed
• Dozens of meetings with Regional Partner’s staff
• Lunch & Learn w/ AZMAG, Wasatch Front, & Envision Utah
• Regular updates to RTC Board, SNRPC Director’s Committee, & RTC Metropolitan Subcommittee
• Resource forums with federal agencies
• Presentations and community outreach events
Public Engagement Goals

• Build SNS awareness
• Accelerate implementation
• Increase community participation

RTC as Core Administrator

• Coordinate Steering Committee
• Model best practices
• Provide capacity building
Regional Partners

- Track and report SNS implementation
- Co-brand initiatives
- Enhance public outreach
- Align plans with SNS Regional Plan

SNS Core Message
For Individual Projects and Broad Initiatives

Southern Nevada Strong is Making Southern Nevada Strong
Elected Officials

• Be champions for SNS
• Leverage SNS brand value
• Connect priority initiatives with SNS

Community Partners

• Partner to implement SNS initiatives
• Support SNS principles
• Provide capacity building
General Public

- Update website to promote implementation
- Deploy mobile learning lab
- Find new ways to reach them

Opportunity Sites

- Engage residents, land owners and businesses
- Partner with neighborhood organizations
- Provide capacity building
Making Southern Nevada Strong
MARYLAND PARKWAY OPPORTUNITY SITE
January 28, 2016

Implementation Strategy

• Integrating Land Use and Transportation Planning
• Catalyzing Development
• Overlay District
• Coordinating Resources
Land Suitability

Redevelopable Land
- High
- Medium
- Low

Acres of Vacant + Redevelopable Land: ~600

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
<th>Partially Vacant</th>
<th>Redevelopable</th>
<th>Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECONorthwest, MIG & Dr. Arthur Nelson
Future Development Simulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline (No New Transit)</th>
<th>With New Transit</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Res SqFt (million)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>188%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Spaces</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>196%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Dwellings</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>171%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Likely Development Types
  - Mix of everything
  - Depends on Segment

Policy issues
- Zoning
- Incentives and Investment

Based on assumptions about increases in rents

ECONorthwest, MIG & Dr. Arthur Nelson

Technology to be Selected

**Bus Rapid Transit**
- Typically 5-20 mile lines with 1/2- to 1-mile station spacing
- Single 60’ articulated buses
- Max. speed 55 mph
- “Branded” as premium transit service
- Capacity = 100 passengers/vehicle
- Typically in-street; dedicated lanes or mixed flow (or combination); can be in separate ROW

**Light Rail Transit**
- Typically multi-line regional system of 5-15 mile lines with ¾- to 1¼-mile station spacing
- Max. speed 65 mph
- 1-4 car trains: 86’-91’ (3 cars = 273’)
- Capacity = 280 passengers (2-car train); higher capacity for higher ridership demand, longer trips
- Separate right-of-way or dedicated in-street lanes

**Urban Light Rail**
- Typically downtown circulator: 1-5 miles with 1½ to 3½-mile station spacing
- Max. speed 45 mph
- Single unit cars: 66’-91’: shorter turning radius than LRT
- Capacity = 140 passengers; higher capacity than BRT; less than LRT
- Typically in-street; dedicated lanes or mixed flow operation (or combination)
Downtown Alignment

44% more population & 80% more employees served

While every effort has been made to ensure accuracy of this information, the RTC makes no warranty, expressed or implied, as to its accuracy and expressly disclaims liability for the accuracy thereof. The information provided is for planning purposes only and should not be interpreted to be an intent or an offer to acquire property.

Alignments for new streets, transit and pedestrian facilities will be determined following the completion of appropriate planning, design and environmental studies.

Transit Oriented Development

• National Transit Institute – TOD Primer
  • September 30-October 1, 2015

• Volpe Institute – TOD Peer Exchange
  • December 2-3, 2015

• Building Blocks Technical Assistance on Infill Development
  • Spring 2016
PROJECT SUMMARY

This project provides the framework to create and adopt a design overlay along the Maryland Parkway Corridor to encourage transit oriented development and a pedestrian friendly environment.
**Future Land Use designations** indicate the intended use category and development density for a particular area. Zoning Districts more specifically define allowable uses and contain the design and development guidelines for these intended uses. Although there are various Zoning Districts which may be allowed within a particular Future Land Use designation, no Zoning District can be allowed for an area if it conflicts with the Future Land Use designation for that area.

**WHAT IS AN OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT**

An Overlay is a zoning district that modifies the regulation of the existing zoning district in recognition of special circumstances and characteristics of an area.

**ANALYSIS OF CURRENT TRENDS**

**SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG**

- Economic Development & Education
- Healthy Communities
- Housing
- Environment
- Transportation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS/PHASE ONE</th>
<th>WORK GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage transit supportive development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create Design Guidelines with appropriate dimensions and spacing to accommodate pedestrians and complete streets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement incentives such as density bonuses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing building facade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct outreach with businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate rehabilitation and retrofit programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address public safety along the corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crime prevention by design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Police enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN COMPONENTS</th>
<th>Incentive Analysis &amp; Structuring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage transit supportive development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create Design Guidelines with appropriate dimensions and spacing to accommodate pedestrians and complete streets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement incentives such as density bonuses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve existing building facade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct outreach with businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate rehabilitation and retrofit programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address public safety issues along the corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Crime prevention by design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Police enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS/PHASE TWO</th>
<th>WORK GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Widen sidewalks and add furnishing in key station areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider shade and heat absorption in design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Add pedestrian amenities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extend the Flamingo Wash Trail to UNLV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve corridor Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve signing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Art &amp; Urban Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community gathering &amp; recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Green infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinate policies &amp; improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximize public gathering spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESIGN COMPONENTS</th>
<th>Incentive Analysis &amp; Structuring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage pedestrian environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create Design Guidelines with appropriate dimensions and spacing to accommodate pedestrians and complete streets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implement incentives such as density bonuses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve corridor aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct outreach with businesses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate rehabilitation and retrofit programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve community gathering &amp; recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Green infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinate policies &amp; improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximize public gathering spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below summarizes a set of actions for the Maryland Parkway Corridor from the SNS Strategy Report.

**ACTIONS/ PHASE THREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support development rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop criteria for incentives for desired development that achieves the vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide technical assistance and capacity building support to create a community development organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create a regulatory incentive package for station areas, including reduction of parking standards, density bonus, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESIGN COMPONENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive Analysis &amp; Structuring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support Development &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE COMPLETE STREET**

**MARYLAND PARWAY DESIGN OVERLAY**

**MPDO**

**ORDINANCE DEVELOPMENT PHASE**

**M A R Y L A N D  P A R W A Y  D E S I G N  O V E R L A Y**

**MPDO**

**ORDINANCE DEVELOPMENT PHASE**

**THE COMPLETE STREET**

**MARYLAND CORRIDOR – THE COMPLETE STREET**

**MPDO**
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**THE COMPLETE STREET**

**MARYLAND PARKWAY DESIGN OVERLAY**

**MPDO**

**ORDINANCE DEVELOPMENT PHASE**

**THE COMPLETE STREET**

**MARYLAND PARKWAY DESIGN OVERLAY**

**MPDO**

**ORDINANCE DEVELOPMENT PHASE**

**THE COMPLETE STREET**

**MARYLAND PARKWAY DESIGN OVERLAY**

**MPDO**

**ORDINANCE DEVELOPMENT PHASE**
### THE COMPLETE STREET
#### Roadside Zone Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadside Zone Standards</th>
<th>A 1.5 to 3 feet</th>
<th>B 3 to 6 feet</th>
<th>C 5 to 15 feet</th>
<th>D Up to 4 feet</th>
<th>E Parking Overhang</th>
<th>F Lighting</th>
<th>G Landscaping</th>
<th>H Furniture</th>
<th>I Awning/Signage</th>
<th>J Sidewalk Cafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curbside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking overhang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface between sidewalk and curb for vehicle overhang. Additional width should be provided where adjacent to parking for vehicle overhang. This area may also include parking meters and electrical charging stations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location for parking overhang where diagonal and perpendicular parking is provided or for opening vehicle doors when parallel parking is provided.</td>
<td>Lighting pedestrian scale lighting in addition to street lighting is recommended in areas with high pedestrian activity.</td>
<td>Street trees and landscaping should be provided in the furnishing area.</td>
<td>Furniture includes seating and trash receptacles and should be provided in the furniture areas.</td>
<td>Awnings and signs may be located in the frontage area.</td>
<td>Sidewalk cafe and private furnishing may be located in the frontage area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 to 6 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include space for landscaping, transit stops, streetlights, and solar chargers. Additional width may be provided in areas with high pedestrian activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 to 15 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area for pedestrian travel. Must be clear of obstructions and conform to ADA requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 to 10 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a buffer building frontage and sidewalk and may include outdoor seating and overhanging awnings or signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 4 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a buffer building frontage and sidewalk and may include outdoor seating and overhanging awnings or signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OTHER JURISDICTIONS*

Named one of the American Planning Association's 2008 Great Streets in America, Mill Avenue in Tempe AZ demonstrates how public- and private-sector commitment, a willingness to take risks, and a dedication to community design and historic preservation create a place of lasting value.
A vibrant and lively street, Mill Avenue has often been characterized as the heart of Tempe, Arizona.

Portland might be the most walkable, bikable, and public transit friendly city on the West Coast. Most neighborhoods have walkable food cart pods, supermarkets, movie theaters and cafes. Portland’s neighborhoods are a mix of classic craftsman homes, rental apartments, and new construction condos, some of them green built and LEED certified.
Portland is a dynamic urban core that provide mass transit, civic spaces, abundant street public art and a sense of place that invites a variety of recreational and cultural activities.

The Grand Junction visionary planners turned main street commercial district into a tree-lined, pedestrian friendly shopping park and a vibrant main street urban environment.
Grand Junction has a vibrant and pedestrian friendly main street. It is a magnet for civic activities and shopping experience.

Maryland Parkway Design Overlay

This proposed design study will provide the guidelines and framework to formulate the design overlay district along the Maryland Parkway Corridor. It will encourage transit oriented development and a pedestrian friendly environment.
The proposed Checklist in this study, contains a set of design features that will help to develop the core of the Maryland Parkway Design Overlay District. The design features are divided into three categories.

**DESIGN CHECKLIST**

- **Essential**
- **Desirable**
- **Worthwhile**

**CHECKLIST**

- Medium (25 du/ac) to high densities (60 du/ac)
- Fine grain mix of land uses
- A blend of residential and non-residential uses within walking distance of each other
- Short to medium length blocks (400’, 600’, 1,000’)
- Transit stops every ½ mile or closer
- 2 to 4 lane streets
- Continuous sidewalks appropriately scaled
- Safe street crossings
- Appropriate buffering from traffic
- Street oriented buildings
- Comfortable and safe places to wait
A blend of residential and non-residential uses within walking distance of each other.

Mixed land uses medium (25 du/ac) to high densities (60 du/ac).

Bus & transit stop every 1/4 mile or closer, safe street crossing, and pedestrian circulation.

Appropriate buffering from traffic, street oriented buildings, continuous sidewalks, and pedestrian friendly environment.
CHECKLIST

Desirable

- Supportive commercial uses
- Grid-like street network
- Traffic calming
- Closely spaced shade trees
- Minimize dead space (parking lots, long blank walls, vacant lots, etc.)
- Nearby parks and other public spaces
- Small scale buildings/articulated larger buildings
- Pedestrian scaled lighting
- Attractive transit facilities
Desert street landscape & shade
Attractive transit facilities
Small scale buildings/articulated larger buildings

Treating dead spaces, parking lots and blank walls
Civic spaces, urban parks and mass building articulation
CHECKLIST

- Landmarks
- Street walls (maximum setbacks, building to street, ex: Seattle)
- Functional street furniture
- Coherent small scale signage
- Special pavement
- Public art
- Water features
- Outdoor dining
- Underground utilities
Outdoor dining experience in an urban setting

OTHER EFFORTS

PUBLIC ARTS GRANT
• UNLV, the City of Las Vegas, and Clark County applied together and received a $50,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts to fund the study.

CLARK COUNTY/EP A BROWNFIELDS ASSESSMENT GRANT
• Awarded $500,000 grant to conduct an assessment of the Maryland Parkway corridor
• Focus area will mirror Southern Nevada Strong's efforts along the corridor
• Clark County established an Advisory Committee made up of Clark County, City of Las Vegas, RTC and Maryland Parkway Coalition
• Survey work will commence in 1st Quarter of 2016 and grant concludes October of 2018

GOALS AND OUTCOMES
• Grant will allow for inventorying all properties along the corridor that may be considered a brownfield
• Identifying potential Brownfield sites and conducting Phase 1 assessments, which document past use and the potential for site contaminants
• Additional funding is included for those site which may be candidates for Phase 2 assessments, which involve on-site soil testing and remediation plans
• Proposed redevelopment scenarios and visioning is also part of this grant
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

Action Plan (Phase 1)

- Build public/private sector commitment
- Continue transit infrastructure planning
- Encourage transit supportive development
- Evaluate TOD opportunities and options for redevelopment area formation
- Improve existing building façades
- Address public safety along the corridor
How can the SNS Steering Committee help with Opportunity Site Implementation?

BE THE FIRST TO KNOW!

Connect with Us:

RTCSNV.COM
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: LAS VEGAS MEDICAL DISTRICT OPPORTUNITY SITE

PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, GENERAL MANAGER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE DISCUSS STRATEGIES TO ADVANCE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LAS VEGAS MEDICAL DISTRICT OPPORTUNITY SITE (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

GOAL: INTEGRATE THE SYSTEM GEOGRAPHICALLY

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:
The Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan (Regional Plan) identifies four opportunity sites to demonstrate specific locations that are well suited to model principles of sound urban planning: Maryland Parkway; Boulder Highway at Broadbent/Gibson; Downtown North Las Vegas; and the Las Vegas Medical District. These locations are optimal for redevelopment because of access to jobs, housing and transit. The SNS Regional Plan identifies implementation of the four opportunity site strategies as a top implementation priority.

Staff from City of Las Vegas and University of Nevada, Las Vegas will give a brief presentation on current efforts to implement the Las Vegas Medical District Strategy Report (Report) and will seek input on how to further advance implementation.


Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND HESS
Director of Planning Services

SNS Item #3
April 28, 2016
Non-Consent
introduction: an investment strategy

City and regional leadership involved in conversations about the Medical District’s future agree that its successful revitalization as a center of excellence is critical to the region’s ability to remain competitive in attracting and retaining new industries and residents. Currently, Clark County’s concentration of employment in medical professions is much lower than is found in other regions. This means that Southern Nevadans are underserved for critical health care needs. It also means that the region lacks the (generally) well-paying jobs that come with the industry, and that it is not enjoying the benefits that prestigious medical institutions can bring to a region’s ability to generate or attract ancillary industries and entrepreneurs.

Stakeholders also agree that the Medical District study area, in its current state of development, does not contain all of the necessary components of a complete medical district. The study area lacks the asupportive uses that typically are part of medical districts (housing and lodging, retail, and parks or open space, for example). Additional medical uses are also desired, in particular the planned expansion of the Cleveland Clinic and the possible location of a medical school in the study area are recognized as key steps toward a complete District.

The Las Vegas Medical District has been the focus of planning and revitalization efforts by the City of Las Vegas since at least 1997, when the Medical District boundary was adopted. These efforts have resulted in the completion of foundational planning work, including a

Two of the existing Medical District facilities, the Cleveland Clinic Lou Ruvo Brain Institute (above) and the University Medical Center Hospital (below).

Cleveland Clinic photo courtesy of Tim Anchor, “angular_perspectives, health,” January 6, 2012 via Flickr; Creative Commons Attribution.
EXHIBIT 1. MEDICAL DISTRICT STUDY AREA AND CURRENT MEDICAL DISTRICT

MEDICAL DISTRICT STUDY AREA

- Medical District Study Area
- Current Medical District
- Medical Facilities
- Universities
- Parks
- Parcels

Source: City of Las Vegas, City of Henderson, RTC
2002 Master Plan (revised and amended in 2007) that established land use regulations for the District. Recognizing the importance of a thriving medical district to the City’s future, the City of Las Vegas’ 2013 Economic Development Strategy listed “Expand and Strengthen the Las Vegas Medical District” as its first goal. The City will soon initiate a Facilities Master Plan for the study area that will coordinate and support the planned facility expansions of major medical users in the study area. Together, these plans and documents will set a course for a more vital District that contributes to the region.

This document is the second of a two-part analysis that provides the foundation for the coming Facilities Master Plan. The first document, the Opportunities and Barriers Report, compiles and interprets data that describe the current conditions in and around the Medical District study area, as well as information about the regional demand for medical services and other market information. The second part (this Investment Strategy) identifies the investments and policy changes that are necessary to set the stage for successful implementation through the Facilities Master Plan. It focuses on the supportive uses necessary to create a vibrant and attractive area: identifying the key opportunities upon which the Master Plan can build and the major barriers that it must overcome. It provides a set of recommendations to focus the portions of the Facilities Master Plan that deal with public space and mixed-use investment, builds from a substantial public outreach effort coordinated by Southern Nevada Strong, and elevates the following issues for further discussion and resolution through the Facilities Master Plan:

(1) Phased implementation; coordination of public and private investment. This Strategy suggests preliminary phasing of implementation steps and highlights the importance of timing public improvements to incent institutional investment in a more vital medical district. Securing commitments for the expansion of Cleveland Clinic and confirming the location of the University of Nevada Las Vegas Medical School are key elements of this Strategy.
Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) Medical School in the study area will require commensurate public commitment to fund improvements to the study area and support new development. These decisions will set the tone for phasing and development in the Medical District as a whole. Resource limitations for all stakeholders mean that phasing based on jointly-held priorities will be critical to successful implementation and for gaining support for federal and state funding.

(2) Parking. The key obstacle highlighted in the City’s Economic Development Strategy is the limited supply of developable land in the existing Medical District boundary. Expanding to consider the larger study area evaluated for this Investment Strategy is helpful, but is likely to be insufficient. The Opportunities and Barriers Report found that there are nearly 160 acres of potentially developable land in the study area, but that nearly all of it (120 acres) is in use as surface parking. A more efficient and coordinated solution that includes shared parking strategies will be necessary to allow redevelopment to occur.

(3) Placemaking. The Las Vegas Medical District Advisory Council, a stakeholder group convened by the City, is already working on creating a branded identity for the District. This Strategy forwards a series of associated land uses and other improvements that can dovetail with those branding efforts to create a unique and identifiable place that is attractive to employees, patients and visitors, residents of the District, and residents of nearby neighborhoods. Allowing for a mix of uses, provision of open space, improvements to streetscapes, multi-modal transportation improvements, and other recommendations are detailed in the Strategy. The identity of the District should emphasize its location at the heart of the region.

Guide to Frequently-Used Acronyms

ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act
CLV: City of Las Vegas
CPTED: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
FWSI: Fort Worth South, Inc.
EUD: Department of Economic and Urban Development
LID: Local Improvement District
LVGEA: Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
NDOT: Nevada Department of Transportation
NEZ: Neighborhood Empowerment Zone
RTCSNV: Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
SNS: Southern Nevada Strong
TMA: Transportation Management Association
UMC: University Medical Center
The key finding from the opportunities and barriers research is that the study area is not perceived as a complete, cohesive medical district and, as a result, has not competed well with newer medical facilities at the fringe of the region. While significant opportunities for new medical and other development exist in the study area, perceptions about public safety issues, inconsistencies in existing urban form and development patterns, and the lack of a cohesive, medically-oriented identity create barriers that are not present in competing areas. Increasing the study area’s attractiveness to new medical and other uses will require improvements to the quality of place and the identity of the Medical District. Investment from both public and private partners will be necessary to achieve the vision, and to overcome the following challenges:

- **Disparate and fragmented land use patterns and existing land uses that are inconsistent with Medical District development types:** Several areas within the study area are physically separated from each other, have limited connectivity, or lack a cohesive or integrated development pattern. Several key parcels are currently developed with uses that are atypical of medical districts elsewhere (warehouses, trade show facilities, and commercial outlets). The parcel size is relatively small, with an average of one-acre parcels. In addition, there are several different zoning and land use regulations, as well as small lots within the study area. The combination of these conditions will limit the near-term potential to assemble large, developable parcels.

- **Pedestrian access:** The study area is flanked by high-speed arterial streets, discouraging pedestrian access into the study area. The internal circulation of the historic Medical District is more pedestrian friendly, but there are few pedestrian-oriented uses and virtually no usable open space.

- **Compatibility with surrounding uses:** The Medical District study area’s location within a single-family neighborhood has led to regulations that minimize development impacts on existing neighborhoods, such as the one-story height limit on Charleston Boulevard west of Rancho Drive. New development
Parks, green spaces, and public plazas like the example above will make the Medical District more attractive to potential residents.

should minimize impacts on stable neighborhoods while strategically developing new uses that support both the proposed Medical District and the adjacent neighborhoods. In addition, zoning adjacent to the proposed boundary could allow for uses that conflict with the future vision for the proposed Medical District, such as auto-oriented or strip commercial development.

• **Need for ongoing collaboration with adjacent neighborhoods:** While outreach associated with this process found support for a medical district, people living in adjacent neighborhoods have expressed concerns about development heights and density. Development in the southern portion of the study area along Charleston Boulevard will require working with adjacent neighborhoods both to overcome these concerns and/or to adjust development to a scale that is acceptable to neighbors.

• **A lack of supporting uses and amenities:** At this point in time, there are very few supporting services and amenities that would attract residents to housing in the Medical District study area. There are no public plazas, green spaces, or parks to serve the study area. This barrier is an important focus of the work in this project.
Table 1. Priority Actions Overview
These actions are critical to the revitalization of the Medical District and should be the primary focus of the Master Plan, the Las Vegas Medical District Advisory Council, and CLV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Rationale/Problems to Overcome</th>
<th>Interventions Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure commitments for expanded or new medically-oriented facilities; coordinate investments, partnerships, and phasing</td>
<td>Growth and revitalization in the Medical District will be catalyzed by new development and new facilities.</td>
<td>Policies&lt;br&gt;• Advisory Council should adopt the Facilities Master Plan as policy for the group, effectively committing institutional expansion plans (Lead: EUD)&lt;br&gt;• Evaluate the role of the Advisory Council as an implementing body to ensure ongoing attention to collaboration as expansion occurs (Lead: EUD)&lt;br&gt;• Clarify the role of the City in supporting the revitalization of the District, and in particular, its role in public-private partnership formation and its desired outcomes with development of the Symphony Park area. (Lead: Las Vegas City Council and City Manager’s Office)&lt;br&gt;• Coordinate phasing and implementation with development; based on needs and desires of partners, determine whether initial focus is on study area core or Symphony Park area (Lead: EUD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate public commitment to District through investment</td>
<td>Implementing public projects sends a clear signal to private and institutional partners that CLV is serious about revitalizing the Medical District. This creates the certainty necessary to support partner investments.</td>
<td>Policies&lt;br&gt;• Finalize and adopt the Centennial Plan (Lead: Planning)&lt;br&gt;• Finalize and adopt Master Plan (Lead: EUD)&lt;br&gt;• Master Plan should include a specific funding strategy for infrastructure and parking facilities. (Lead: City Council and CMO)&lt;br&gt;• Evaluate existing utilities and plan for future infrastructure to ensure adequate capacity to support Medical District development. (Lead: Public Works)&lt;br&gt;• Develop a toolkit of incentives for District development (Lead: EUD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td>Rationale/Problems to Overcome</td>
<td>Interventions Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Parking Management | Most developable land is currently used as parking; shared parking increases efficient use of land and reduces costs for partners. Without parking management, urban-scale redevelopment might not be possible. | Policies | • Consider formation of TMA (Lead: EUD)  
• Evaluate parking minimums and maximums to ensure they are appropriate, based on demand for shared parking (Lead: EUD)  
• Evaluate the City’s role in parking provision, accessing the parking enterprise fund (Lead: EUD)  

Partners | • Major medical institutions and property owners (Lead: EUD)  
• The Advisory Council (Lead: EUD)  
• TMA (if formed) (Lead: EUD)  
• Residents in surrounding neighborhoods (Lead: EUD)  

Projects | • Undertake data collection on current utilization to understand peak usage times, employee commute patterns, parking inventory (Lead: EUD)  
• Identify likely future parking demand; opportunities for shared parking; opportunities for employee-based incentives for carpooling, transit, or biking (Lead: EUD)  
• Identify location for shared parking garage (Lead: EUD)  
• Evaluate funding opportunities for shared parking (Lead: EUD)  
• Explore circulator within district and partnering campuses (long term strategy) (Lead: EUD) |
| Placemaking | Creating amenity and an identifiable place will help the District compete with other medically-oriented development options | Policies | • Refine adjacency setback standards (Lead: Planning)  
• Impervious surface reduction guidelines (Lead: Planning)  
• Refine 50 sq ft open space requirement (Lead: Planning)  

Partners | • Major medical institutions (Lead: Planning)  
• The Advisory Council (especially branding and planning subcommittees) (Lead: Planning)  
• Property owners (Lead: Planning)  

Projects | • Confirm and clarify location for open space / plaza through Facilities Master Plan (Lead: Planning)  
• Develop funding strategy for open space (Lead: Planning)  
• Implement improvements to paths and streetscapes (Lead: Planning)  
• Create a consistent identity across I-15 (Lead: Planning)  
• Ensure appropriate transitions to surrounding neighborhoods (addressing transition in height, pedestrian and bike) (Lead: Planning) |
| District branding, marketing and recruitment | Continued activities of the Advisory Council will create a distinct Medical District identity and brand to attract new medically-oriented development, faculty, staff, students and patients | Policies | • Integrate branding efforts during implementation of placemaking actions (i.e., reflect District brand in signage and wayfinding, public art, gateways, open space and streetscape design). (Lead: EUD and PIO)  

Partners | • Major medical institutions (Lead: EUD)  
• The Advisory Council (especially branding and planning subcommittees) (Lead: EUD)  
• Property owners (Lead: EUD)  

Projects | • Identify champions, possibly from the Advisory Council, to assist with recruitment of new or expanded medical institutions (Lead: EUD)  
• Consistent signage, public art, and landscaping throughout District (implementation phased per phasing strategy) (Lead: EUD) |
Table 6. Secondary Actions Overview:
These actions are also important to the revitalization of the Medical District, but are less than the primary actions. These investments should be phased per the phasing strategy outlined in this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Rationale/Problems to Overcome</th>
<th>Interventions Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe multi-modal transportation connections</td>
<td>Access to and through the site for all modes of travel is important to creating a successful District.</td>
<td>Policies&lt;br&gt;&lt;ul&gt;&lt;li&gt;Confirm and clarify location for open space/plaza through Facilities Master Plan (Lead: Planning)&lt;li&gt;Implement improvements to paths and streetscapes (Lead: Planning)&lt;li&gt;Create a consistent identity across I-15 (Lead: Planning)&lt;li&gt;Ensure appropriate transitions to surrounding neighborhoods (addressing transition in height, pedestrian and bike) (Lead: Planning)&lt;li&gt;Consistent signage, public art, and landscaping throughout District (implementation phased per phasing strategy) (Lead: Planning)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects<br><ul><li>Pedestrian<br><ul><li>Upgrade sidewalks throughout the District through widening, landscaping and adding street trees for buffer and shade (Lead: Planning)<li>Mark crosswalks or mid-block crossings on busy streets (Lead: Planning) |

Bicycle<br><ul><li>Build end-of-trip facilities in buildings, including bicycle parking (Lead: Planning)<li>Designate Shadow Lane as a shared roadway for bicycle circulation with sharrow markings and traffic calming measures (Lead: Planning) |

Transit<br><ul><li>Upgrade transit stops to include shelters, benches, and timetable information (Lead: Planning) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Rationale/Problems to Overcome</th>
<th>Interventions Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set the stage for successful supportive uses</strong></td>
<td>A complete Medical District will have uses that support medical institutions, including housing and retail. These uses follow medical expansion.</td>
<td><strong>Policies</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Master Plan should explore: (1) institutions’ needs for supporting housing in their growth plans, as well as preferences for retail uses; (2) specific locations for retail and housing, given expansion plans; (3) opportunities to co-locate housing and retail with institutional expansion (Lead: Planning)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Partners</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Developers (Lead: Planning)&lt;br&gt;• Potential future medical school for student housing (Lead: Planning)&lt;br&gt;• Key property owners (Lead: Planning)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Projects</strong>&lt;br&gt;• All placemaking projects and multi-modal transportation projects defined above are important to create a place that can support new housing development (Lead: Planning)&lt;br&gt;• Explore opportunities to partner with developers to provide supportive uses in appropriate locations (Lead: Planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charleston Corridor revitalization</strong></td>
<td>Charleston is the front doorstep to the Medical District and provides a critical first impression and connectivity to Downtown and adjacent neighborhoods. Improving overall aesthetics and balancing Medical District and neighborhood serving uses along the corridor will be necessary for long-term success.</td>
<td><strong>Policies</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Increase lot coverage maximums and create minimums (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;• Reduce setbacks (remove in some locations) (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;• Explore appropriate height limits (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Partners</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Nevada Department of Transportation (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;• Advisory Council (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;• RTC/SNV (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;• City of Las Vegas; Planning and Development, Public Works Departments (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;• Adjacent neighborhoods (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Projects</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Create and implement an access management plan (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;• Make landscaping and other streetscape improvements (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;• Promote façade improvement program (Lead: Planning and EUD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing evaluation of need / opportunities for expansion along MLK north of Alta</strong></td>
<td>The area along MLK north of Alta has few immediate development opportunities and is not likely to be needed in the near-term. However, over time, additional land may be needed, and this may be a logical location for future growth.</td>
<td><strong>Policies</strong>&lt;br&gt;• No policy changes currently needed (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Partners</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Maintain connections with property owners in this area; if opportunities arise, evaluate them for implementation (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;• NDOT, as the re-alignment of MLK is completed (Lead: Planning and EUD)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Projects</strong>&lt;br&gt;• None in the near-term, except for ongoing (Lead: Planning and EUD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUBJECT: SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG ANNUAL SUMMIT

PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, GENERAL MANAGER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE REVIEW AND DISCUSS THE PLANNING FOR THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG ANNUAL SUMMIT

GOAL: INTEGRATE THE SYSTEM GEOGRAPHICALLY

FISCAL IMPACT:

None

BACKGROUND:

Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) staff is planning the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Annual Summit to be held during the summer of 2016. The draft agenda of the Annual Summit is included in the backup to this agenda item. RTC staff will review and discuss the planning process with the SNS Steering Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND HESS
Director of Planning Services

SNS  Item #4
April 28, 2016
Non-Consent
2016 Southern Nevada Strong Annual Summit

**Summary**
Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) will host a large annual event in Spring/Summer 2016 to celebrate SNS implementation activities and accomplishments, and the leaders who are making them happen. This will serve as the first SNS summit since the RTC assumed the core administrator role.

**Theme**
Southern Nevada Strong: The Public and Private Story

**Goals**
1. Convene Southern Nevada Strong’s broad network of stakeholders and implementation partners.
2. Showcase specific activities, accomplishments and leaders who best demonstrate implementation of the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan.
3. Strengthen understanding and support for Southern Nevada Strong.

**Audiences/Participants**
- Elected officials
- Regional Partners
- Business and community leaders
- Community based organizations
- Philanthropic foundations
- Media

**Anticipated attendance**
150-200 people

**Format**
A half-day event to provide a comprehensive snapshot of the successes of SNS regional partners and stakeholders, and communicate a vision of the future.

The event will begin with welcoming remarks, transitioning into an audience building activity, a series of panel discussions focusing on the four themes of the Regional Plan, and concluding with a keynote of regional import.

Sessions will be 30-minute “TED Talks” style organized into the Regional Plan’s four themes: Improve Economic Competitiveness and Education; Invest in Complete Communities; Increase Transportation Choice; Building Capacity for Implementation. Each session will feature two speakers who can focus on sharing the same story through their perspective, whether it is from the public or private sector. The two speakers can collaborate on their presentation and speak for 10 minutes each, leaving a few minutes at the end of each session for Q&A.
After each of the four sessions, encourage attendees to move seats at various tables to create a short break but also an opportunity for people to meet other attendees at the event.

**Agenda**

7:30 – 8:00 AM – Registration & Breakfast  
8:00 – 8:15 AM – Welcome Remarks  
8:15 – 8:30 AM – Audience Engaging Activity  
8:30 – 9:00 AM – Story #1 Improve Economic Competitiveness and Education  
9:00 – 9:30 AM – Story #2 Invest in Complete Communities  
9:30 – 10:00 AM – Story #3 Increasing Transportation Choice  
10:00 – 10:30 AM – Story # 4 Building Capacity for Implementation  
10:30 – 10:45 AM – Break  
10:45 – 11:30 AM – Keynote Speaker  
11:30 AM – 11:40 AM – Closing
SUBJECT: BUILDING IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITY OF SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG

PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, GENERAL MANAGER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE RECEIVE A REPORT FROM THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA ON THE EFFORTS TAKEN OVER THE PAST YEAR TO BUILD CAPACITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

GOAL: INTEGRATE THE SYSTEM GEOGRAPHICALLY

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:
The Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition approved the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) to assume responsibility for the implementation of the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan in 2015. Over the past year the RTC has undertaken numerous initiatives to build capacity for implementation as outlined in the Regional Plan.

Staff will give a brief presentation on some of the efforts that have taken place.

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND HESSION
Director of Planning Services

SNS Item #5
April 28, 2016
Non-Consent
Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada

AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT: REGITIONAL STAFF UPDATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, GENERAL MANAGER</td>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER: THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE RECEIVE REGIONAL UPDATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: INTEGRATE THE SYSTEM GEOGRAPHICALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT:

None

BACKGROUND:

Collaboration and coordination is critical to the success of Southern Nevada Strong (SNS). Since the SNS Steering Committee (Steering Committee) represents a broad spectrum of interests, it would be beneficial for Steering Committee members to share information and updates related to implementation of the SNS Regional Plan.

While no action may be taken on the subjects discussed, this item provides opportunity for the exchange of information.

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND HEss
Director of Planning Services

SNS Item #6 April 28, 2016
Non-Consent

rl
# REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OF
SOUTHERN NEVADA

## AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBJECT:** SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS

**PETITIONER:** TINA QUIGLEY, GENERAL MANAGER  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

**RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:**  
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE DISCUSS FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**GOAL:** INTEGRATE THE SYSTEM GEOGRAPHICALLY

## FISCAL IMPACT:

None by this action

## BACKGROUND:

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), as core administrator of the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) initiative, seeks guidance from the SNS Steering Committee (Committee) on future agenda items. Staff desires to keep meetings of the Committee engaging and informational and would like direction on future agenda items which would further advance the implementation of the Regional Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND HESS  
Director of Planning Services  

SNS  Item #7  
April 28, 2016  
Non-Consent
SUBJECT: CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

PETITIONER: TINA QUIGLEY, GENERAL MANAGER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE CONDUCT A
COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

GOAL: INTEGRATE THE SYSTEM GEOGRAPHICALLY

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:
In accordance with State of Nevada Open Meeting Law, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee (Committee) shall invite interested persons to make comments. For the initial Citizens Participation, the public should address items on the current agenda. For the final Citizens Participation, interested persons may make comments on matters within the Committee’s jurisdiction, but not necessarily on the current agenda.

No action can be taken on any matter discussed under this item, although the Committee can direct that it be placed on a future agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND HESS
Director of Planning Services

Non-Consent