On March 22, 2020, the State of Nevada Executive Department issued Declaration of Emergency Directive 006, which suspends the requirement contained in Nevada Revised Statute 241.023(1)(b) that there be a physical location designated for meetings of public bodies where the public can attend and participate. Directive 006 was subsequently extended by the following Emergency Directives: Emergency Directive 010 on March 31, 2020; Emergency Directive 016 on April 29, 2020; Emergency Directive 018 on May 7, 2020; Emergency Directive 021 on May 28, 2020; and Emergency Directive 026 on June 29, 2020. Pursuant to these Directives, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada will not provide a physical location for the public to attend the meeting of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee.

The meeting of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee will be available to livestream via the following link https://www.rtcsnv.com/about/meetings-agendas/southern-nevada-strong-steering-committee/.

Additionally, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada encourages citizen participation at its public meetings and will be accepting public comment via email. Public comment relating to the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee may be submitted via email to PublicComments@rtcsnv.com. Please make sure to include your name and the agenda item number you wish to comment on. Also, please indicate if you would like your comment read on the record as part of the record or just added to the backup for the record. Only the first 500 words of comments submitted to be read into the record will be read aloud. The remaining words will be included in the written record.

This meeting will be accessible to the public online. A sign language interpreter for the deaf will be made available with a 48-hour advance request to the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada offices. Phone: 702-676-1500 TDD: 702-676-1834

This agenda, including the supporting materials, is available at the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada’s website, http://www.rtcsnv.com; or by contacting Marin DuBois by calling (702) 676-1836, or by email at dubois.m@rtcsnv.com.

In accordance with the State of Nevada Executive Department’s Declaration of Emergency, Directive 006, which includes exceptions to Open Meeting Law, it is hereby noted that this meeting agenda has been properly noticed and posted at the following locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTC Website</th>
<th>Nevada Public Notice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.rtcsnv.com">www.rtcsnv.com</a></td>
<td><a href="https://notice.nv.gov">https://notice.nv.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BY: ________________________________
Items 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9 are items for possible action. Items 1, 4, 7, 8, and 10 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 May 28, 2020 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

3. RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE REGIONAL WORK PROGRAM (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

4. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE ON BOARD REGIONAL MOBILITY PLAN

5. RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL POLICY PLAN FROM THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

6. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND A DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE FROM CLARK COUNTY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

7. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION REGARDING PROPOSED FALL 2020 TRANSIT SERVICE CHANGES

8. DISCUSS CURRENT WORK ACTIVITIES AND PRIORITIES RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN

9. DISCUSS FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

10. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

During the initial Citizens Participation, any citizen may address the Committee on an item featured on the agenda. During the final Citizens Participation, any citizens 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.

Public comment relating to the Committee may be submitted via email to PublicComments@rtcsnv.com. Please make sure to include your name and the agenda item number you wish to comment on. Also, please indicate if you would like your comment read on the record as part of the record or just added to the backup for the record. Only the first 500 words of comments submitted to be read into the record will be read aloud. The remaining words will be included in the written record.

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 via PublicComments@rtcsnv.com.

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

In compliance with Nevada Revised Statute 241.035(4), the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada shall create an audio and/or video recording of the meeting and retain such recording(s) for the required period of time.

*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>
</table>

| **SUBJECT:** CITIZENS PARTICIPATION |
| **PETITIONER:** M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA |
| **RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:** THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION |
| **GOAL:** SUPPORT REGIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC VITALITY AND EDUCATION AND INVEST IN COMPLETE COMMUNITIES |

### 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,

Craig Raborn
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

---

SNS Item #1
July 30, 2020
Non-Consent
MINUTES
SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
MAY 28, 2020

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.

In accordance with the State of Nevada Executive Department’s Declaration of Emergency, Directive 006, which includes exceptions to Open Meeting Law, it is hereby noted that this meeting agenda was properly noticed and posted at the following locations on May 20, 2020:

RTC Website  Nevada Public Notice
www.rtcnv.com  https://notice.nv.gov

CALL TO ORDER
Mayor Debra March, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. via Webex conference call. In accordance with the State of Nevada Executive Department’s Declaration of Emergency, Directive 006, the meeting did not have a physical location.

MEMBERS PRESENT (via teleconference):
Debra March, Chair, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada Board Liaison
Nancy Amundsen, Vice-Chair, Clark County (Alternate)
Shane Ammerman, Conservation District of Southern Nevada
Nicole Bungum, Southern Nevada Health District (Alternate)
Mike Casey, Clark County School District
Lisa Corrado, City of Henderson
Joselyn Cousins, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco
Robert Fielden, Urban Land Institute
Shawn Gerstenberger, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Delen Goldberg, City of North Las Vegas (Alternate)
M.J. Maynard, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Michael Mays, City of Boulder City (Alternate)
Doa Meade, Southern Nevada Water Authority
Deborah Reyes, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Alternate)
Janet Quintero, United Way of Southern Nevada
Sondra Rosenberg, Nevada Department of Transportation (Alternate)
Robert Summerfield, City of Las Vegas (Alternate)
Chad Williams, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Jonas Peterson, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance

RTC STAFF (via teleconference):
Craig Raborn, Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization
Andrew Kjellman, Manager of Transportation Planning
Rae Lathrop, Manager of Regional Planning
Deborah Reardon, Principal Transportation Planner
Daniel Fazekas, Senior Transportation Planner
Michelle Larime, Senior Regional Planner
Aileen Pastor, Government Affairs Supervisor
Paul Gully, Management Analyst
Marin DuBois, Management Analyst
David Gloria, Management Analyst

SNS  Item #2
July 30, 2020
Non-Consent
INTERESTED PARTIES (via email submission):
Taj Ainlay, Sierra Club

**Item:** 1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

**Comments:**
In accordance with the State of Nevada Executive Department’s Declaration of Emergency, Directive 006, the meeting did not have a physical location. As the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) encourages citizen participation at its public meetings, it accepted public comments via email. Comments received up until this comment period were read aloud on the record by Ms. Aileen Pastor, Government Affairs Supervisor for the RTC. Below are the comments received by the RTC and read aloud for the record.

Mr. Taj Ainlay submitted the following comments:

*Dear Committee Members... On behalf of the Sierra Club Southern Nevada Group, I thank you for the opportunity to observe the committee proceedings today and submit the following two comments to be read on the record as part of the record for this meeting. 1. Regarding Agenda Item #2, the Minutes of the 1-30-20 Steering Committee Meeting do not include the name of one of our representatives who was present in person as an Interested Party. We request that her name be added to the Minutes. She is: Jasmine Vazin, Clean Transportation For All Campaign of the Sierra Club. 2. Regarding Agenda Item #4, we see that the first two of the four SNS Plan Themes will be addressed by Mr. Raborn in his report, but not the third one, "Increase Transportation Choice." Within his proposed "framework for prioritizing activities" amid the pandemic reality, we respectfully submit that high priority be given to expanding multi-modal transportation, including: walkable communities; bike lanes, dedicated bike paths, and bike accessible transit; environmentally-conscious local, regional, and inter-city buses; and rail - including transit, commuter and inter-city. In addition, we support incentives for expanded consumer access to electric vehicles; to cleaner, more fuel-efficient vehicles; and to cleaner fuels. Thank you for your time and consideration.*

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

---

**Item:** 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Meeting of July 25, 2019 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**Comments:**
No comments were made.

**Motion:**
Mr. Robert Fielden, Urban Land Institute, made a motion to approve the minutes with the noted inclusion mentioned during Item #1 – Citizens Participation.

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

Ayes: Shane Ammerman, Nancy Amundsen, Nicole Bungum, Mike Casey, Lisa Corrado, Joselyn Cousins, Robert Fielden, Shawn Gerstenberger, Delen Goldberg, M.J. Maynard, Debra March, Michael Mays, Doa Meade, Deborah Reyes, Janet Quintero, Sondra Rosenberg, Robert Summerfield, Chad Williams
Nays: None
Absent: Jonas Peterson
| Item: | 3. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG REGIONAL PLAN’S VISION RELATED TO ECONOMIC RECOVERY EFFORTS THAT COULD BE APPLICABLE IN RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC |

**Comments:**
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. Craig Raborn, Director of the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), explained the potential economic recovery efforts in the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan that could be applicable in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. He provided a brief background on the item, saying that due to the pandemic’s effects, transportation and infrastructure had been disrupted throughout the Las Vegas Valley. To help address these impacts, Mr. Raborn was asked to speak at the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC) Board meeting held on May 7, 2020, with respect to the SNS vision for economic recovery.

Mr. Raborn began with a brief overview of the SNS Regional Plan’s most relevant elements. The function of SNS is to identify recommendations to create long-term outcomes. It is not a short-term plan; it is meant to look at strategies that could be implemented over the next two to 20 years. The SNS framework was built, in part, to help guide the region’s long-term recovery from the previous economic crisis. Stakeholders and groups from all across the community were solicited for input and strategies in this area. The SNS Regional Plan also envisions a wide distribution of roles for stakeholders to implement the recommendations. Mr. Raborn described how Southern Nevada consists of three broad components, which include: people and their needs; the economy and its needs; and infrastructure – including resources, transportation system, and environment. The main themes identified in SNS address these key elements. Mr. Raborn highlighted several themes from SNS and the implementation strategies used to bring them to life.

Next, Mr. Raborn referred to the economic competitiveness theme, noting that economic growth is inextricably linked to human capital, skills, education, and connections of the workforce throughout the region. To support this, the SNS Regional Plan identified a goal of better matching land use and transportation plans. He explained that a key objective in reaching this goal was to invest in, and maintain, infrastructure that meets the needs of a diversified economy. He also described how fiscal impacts and timeframes were built into these recommendations, citing the West Henderson interchanges as a project example that supports these goals.

Mr. Raborn then highlighted another component, which involved determining the building and space needs of entrepreneurs and startups to embolden existing small businesses to participate in revitalization. This type of objective is intended to support the development of locally focused small businesses that will be an important part of the region’s recovery.

Then, Mr. Raborn discussed the relationship to the theme of Invest in Complete Communities. He said that this theme was designed to identify strategies to attract housing that meets the needs and desires of a variety of workers and consider how environmental quality, resource availability, and access to necessary services establish quality of life and economic success for the region. Mr. Raborn cited one of the theme’s identified objectives, intended to help develop regional goals and standards that aim to reduce transportation costs and provide increased mobility in neighborhoods to everyday amenities, such as grocery stores, offices and schools.

Additionally, Mr. Raborn described the stakeholders involved in a process like this and the fiscal impacts of such projects. Transportation costs made up a large part of average household costs, so
policies in this area would be helpful for long-term economic recovery. The RTC’s regional planning activities, Mr. Raborn continued to say, are intended to make the RTC a resource for the stakeholders implementing their parts of the Regional Plan. These initiatives involve several steps, including adapting work program projects for relevance to emerging challenges, addressing sustainability plans, housing needs assessments, and more. He remarked how these strategies were designed to be flexible and adaptable to different applications as needed.

Mr. Raborn stated that another important factor in this was looking at which elements should be carried over to the economic recovery efforts and which should not. Mr. Raborn said the RTC would provide input to jurisdictions on these issues, including technical assistance and engagement as needed. There would also be increased priority on measuring and tracking the outcomes the plan wanted to achieve and addressing gaps accordingly.

Mr. Raborn stressed that the RTC’s activities as administrator of the SNS Regional Plan are not and will not be decided in a vacuum. The success of the SNS Regional Plan is and will continue to be a community and regional effort, and as such, the RTC is developing a framework for activity prioritization for the benefit of the jurisdictions. He reviewed a few elements of this framework, including its guiding questions, current priorities, emerging priorities, crisis-specific issues to address, and potential unknowns to account for. He provided an example of how another organization used this framework and applied it to fit its own needs.

Overall, Mr. Raborn stressed that while the RTC itself is constrained by budget, the RTC is committed to supporting the agencies in their own efforts and reaching success with their long-term outcomes. He suggested that all jurisdictions apply this framework to the activities under their purview, with the RTC assisting any way they can. When a plurality of priorities was identified for the region at large, the RTC would be able to coordinate these efforts in a more substantial way.

Ms. Lisa Corrado, City of Henderson, mentioned the need to focus on capacity building. The SNS Regional Plan should address new approaches to access funds, distribute those funds competitively, and build capacity around the area. Mr. Raborn agreed on the importance of the issue, though he noted that further discussions would need to happen to make sure those efforts could be coordinated. The RTC was eager to support the jurisdictions, provided they have a plan in place to make it happen.

Chair Debra March, RTC Board Liaison, brought up the issue of roadway design and ensuring that the jurisdictions are sensitive to the needs of the public. She cited the issue of having bike trails wide enough to support social distancing. She said it could be helpful to have some type of coordinated education and training on these issues. Mr. Raborn agreed, stating that the RTC was engaged with peer cities across the country to gain insights on how to build this type of capacity.

Councilman Brian Knudsen, SNRPC, brought up the role of the SNRPC in these planning efforts, noting that there may be gaps in infrastructure throughout the Las Vegas Valley that could be supported with federal funds. He cited the expansion of the 5G network as an example to enable telehealth and distance learning. This could have a big impact on the region’s economic development plans.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.
Item: 4. RECEIVE UPDATE ON THE REGIONAL WORK PROGRAM (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Comments:
Mr. Craig Raborn, Director of the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), described how this item involved updates to the RTC’s Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and progress within those tasks. He introduced Ms. Rae Lathrop, Manager of Regional Planning for the RTC, to provide the report. Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Ms. Lathrop explained that the UPWP update included two tasks related to the administration of the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan. These were adopted by the RTC Board of Commissioners in February 2020 and approved to begin in April 2020. She described these two new tasks.

First, Ms. Lathrop described regional policy plan administration. This task encompasses several updates, including Regional Plan core administration, an update to the Regional Plan, indicator tracking and mapping, a community planning academy, outreach and communication, and an annual report. Community engagement is a large part of plan administration, and as a high-priority activity, the RTC created the Community Engagement Toolkit to support engagement efforts. She reviewed the features of this toolkit and how other jurisdictions could use it to engage with their own community members. She also shared several online resources that members could use to better conduct online and virtual engagement efforts during the pandemic. Furthermore, Ms. Lathrop reviewed the Regional Plan updates aspect of the plan administration task, explaining that her team had reviewed and updated several Opportunity Site strategies in the SNS Regional Plan.

From there, Ms. Michelle Larime, Senior Regional Planner for the RTC, spoke to provide more details on the Downtown North Las Vegas Opportunity Site update. The goal was to capture and communicate the outcomes of the five-year planning process as well as creating specific deliverables to share. Ms. Larime recounted how the team engaged with stakeholders in the area to support assessments and provided a high-level overview of the report’s contents. The report contains preliminary visions for planning efforts, as well as a review of specific strategies that could be applied to make these visions a reality.

Ms. Lathrop then described the second task in the UPWP, a thorough research and planning process that contained several steps. These steps included the following: future housing inventory and needs, extreme heat events coordinated response, inventory of regional sustainability planning tools and techniques, and tree canopy social equity impacts. She first detailed the future housing inventory and needs study, designed to estimate supply and demand of regional housing needs. This process involves a review of local data as well as reviews of how other peer cities were applying similar methodologies. Ms. Lathrop introduced Mr. Paul Gully, Management Analyst for the RTC, to provide more detail on this process, noting that the 2020 pandemic changed a few of the planning processes and forecasts used.

Mr. Gully reviewed how the goal of this study is to examine shortages and surpluses in housing availability and affordability. This would provide baseline estimates of what housing would be needed in the future. He reviewed some of the past data used in these forecasts, noting Southern Nevada’s population growth, housing permit allocations, and jobs/housing ratio. Notably, Southern Nevada had not established a regional target for its jobs/housing ratio, which is an important data point in the assessments.

Chair Debra March, RTC Board Liaison, asked if housing data related to single-family homes, multi-family homes, or all types of housing situations. Mr. Gully replied that the data was the total number of
housing units. Ms. Lisa Corrado, City of Henderson, mentioned that in most communities, the goal was to have a one to one ratio. Mr. Gully agreed that some cities had set a one to one target, but he noted that there were many ranges.

Mr. Gully continued, providing more data on the progress of housing units in Southern Nevada over time. However, he noted that much of this data is preliminary and will be subject to change. Ms. Lathrop mentioned that the RTC sends out surveys to learn more about community preferences on issues, and housing has been a key priority in these surveys. She stated that staff would be looking at forming technical advisory groups for various research projects to address these issues more directly moving forward. She encouraged any SNS Steering Committee members who were interested to join these groups.

Next, Ms. Lathrop mentioned the Extreme Heat Vulnerability Study. Southern Nevada was identified as a fast-warming region in the country, which presents challenges and health risks. This project was meant to answer some of these concerns, both short- and long-term. She noted that Mr. Gully would provide more detail. He said that the goal for the initial phase of this project was to identify concentrations of residents who are at high risk for extreme heat events. A key challenge here is that the pandemic is constraining resources, so traditional strategies for heat mitigation may be impacted by these health issues. Initial conversations helped illustrate that certain communities may be impacted more by these environmental issues than others. Several criteria were used to judge this, including land surface temperature, vegetated land cover, developed land, and elevation. He described the process for developing these indicators and how data modeling teams helped develop frameworks for addressing these issues. In general, populations in the central and eastern regions of the Las Vegas Valley are at highest risk. Mr. Gully reviewed the next steps of this process and how they would be using advisory groups to help validate data and come up with actionable solutions.

Ms. Lathrop spoke again to explain the long-term impacts of these evaluations and the importance of sharing data with stakeholders. To support this, staff is creating an inventory of tools and techniques that can be shared with jurisdictions in the area. This toolkit would help provide insight on how various jurisdictions approached the process.

Next, Ms. Larime described a few of the different approaches explored to support sustainability planning. Staff had conducted an academic literature review around the topic as well as an assessment of what other cities had done to support sustainability. In particular, staff reached out to four peer cities to understand what specific approaches had been taken in similar environments. From this, there were two general approaches identified for regional sustainability planning. First was to create a regional sustainability plan. Second was to create a regional climate collaborative or regional resilience collaborative. She explained that the establishment of a formal plan alongside collaboration were the two key components of these strategies. Through the interviews conducted, the team was also able to learn about the general approaches undertaken by other communities for sustainability planning. In general, these findings were grouped into three categories: establish a foundation, processes, and general components.

In terms of next steps, Ms. Larime said staff had drafted a summary of findings which would be shared with a technical advisory committee. With this input, staff could create a draft recommendation of approaches along with which steps would be required to inform research and recommendations moving forward.
Ms. Lathrop concluded by stating that staff would continue to work on collecting and analyzing research to support these goals. There are many different approaches the team could take to support the jurisdictions in their own implementations. She asked that the jurisdictions reach out with feedback on issues important to them.

Mr. Raborn reminded everyone that the Regional Work Program had been adopted by the RTC in February 2020. Due to pandemic-related shutdowns, working groups for these issues had not been created. However, as operations begin to resume, the RTC wanted to give all jurisdictions the option to participate and join technical discussions on these issues. He said that staff would be reaching out to jurisdictions individually to address these concerns.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

---

**Item:**
5. DISCUSS CURRENT WORK ACTIVITIES AND PRIORITIES RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN

**Comments:**
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. Craig Raborn, Director of the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), stated that a Google form survey was sent to Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Steering Committee members to get an understanding of their priorities and needs during the COVID-19 pandemic. He reminded SNS Steering Committee members that the survey is still open if anyone had not yet given their input.

Ms. Rae Lathrop, Manager of Regional Planning for the RTC, related that staff had created three separate word clouds featuring the most prominent words collected from the survey responses. The word cloud themes included: Global Priorities, Emerging Priorities, and Opportunities. She stated that housing was one of the most commonly recurring words mentioned in the survey results as a global priority. It relates to health, economy, and social services. Staff will be reaching out to members to see how their priorities may continue to inform the work program and to form networks between members.

Ms. Lathrop went on to say that small and local business was the most prominent emerging priority according to the survey results. More work needs to be done to see what the Regional Plan says about local business and who the partners are before moving forward.

As Ms. Lathrop continued, the final part of the survey asked members what opportunities they believe are available at this time. Telecommuting came up several times as both a beneficial change and a challenge. Staff would like to partner with members to see what can be done to help everyone move forward through the changes brought on by the pandemic.

In closing, Ms. Lathrop stated that survey responses will be used to tailor individual outreach efforts as well as some follow up items for the team.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

**Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken.
### Item:
6. DISCUSS FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

**Comments:**
Mr. Craig Raborn, Director of the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), said that RTC staff will be in touch with Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee members for input on future agenda items.

**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 2:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marin DuBois, Recording Secretary

Marek Biernacinski, Transcription Secretary
Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee
May 28, 2020

Item #1

Conduct a Comment Period for Citizens Participation
Item #2

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
MEETING OF JANUARY 30, 2020
(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Item #3

RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG REGIONAL PLAN’S VISION RELATED TO ECONOMIC RECOVERY EFFORTS THAT COULD BE APPLICABLE IN RESPONSE TO THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC
Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee
May 28, 2020
Craig Raborn, RTC MPO Director

Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan

- SNS grew from the previous recession
- Jobs, economy, and schools
- Community-driven process
- Approved by local agencies, stakeholders
Southern Nevada Strong Plan Themes

- Improve Economic Competitiveness and Education
- Invest in Complete Communities
- Increase Transportation Choice
- Build Capacity for Implementation

Theme 1: Economic Competitiveness

- Goal 1: Match Land Use and Transportation Plans
- Goal 2: Attract and Retain Future Workers, Visitors, and Businesses
- Goal 3: Embolden Small Businesses to Participate in Revitalization
- Goal 4: Support Education Through Land-Use and Transportation
- Goal 5: Increase Collaboration Between Governments & Education
Theme 2: Invest in Complete Communities

Goal 1: Strengthen Existing Neighborhoods
Goal 2: Encourage Adequate Supply of Housing Types
Goal 3: Support Access to Health Care, Food, Parks, and Services
Goal 4: Improve Neighborhood Safety and Protect from Pollution
Goal 5: Promote Resource-Efficient Land Use and Development

RTC’s Regional Planning Activities

Adapt our Planning Work Program
SNS Plan Flexibility
Start Identifying Opportunities
Provide Technical Help
Measure What Matters
## Framework for Prioritizing Activities

**Guiding Question/Line of Sight**: What will it take to...?  
The guiding question defines the line of sight: Where are you heading? What are you trying to achieve? The question should be open-ended and future-focused. It should not make assumptions about who is responsible or what the solution is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Priority—Still Relevant—Continues Forward (with modified approach)</th>
<th>Pause &amp; Resume when crisis “over” (assuming a 6-18 month delay—high uncertainty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These are items that are relevant and possible and will go forward, though perhaps not as planned. Make a few notes on likely modifications.</td>
<td>These items will be paused. They are either not feasible now, or they need to be paused to make room for emergent priorities. You don’t really know for how long. Six to nine months is a ballpark and may be too long or too short.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Priority or Existing but Newly Prioritized (because of current conditions)</th>
<th>Unknown Status/Approach (need more data, too much in flux to know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These items are new or newly prioritized items that are on the table (or front burner) because of current conditions. You are being asked to do them or you realize they are necessary and/or urgent.</td>
<td>These are items that are either unclear or too much in flux to decide. You need to have more data, talk to others, or let the dust settle a little bit before deciding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Honor and Let Go (not going to happen) | Conditions make these items impossible. |

---

## Prioritizing Activities - Example

**Organization**: Neighborhoods Forward, a community organization in Big City  
**Guiding Question**: What will it take to ensure that our city’s disinvested neighborhoods have the resources they need to weather this crisis and thrive in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Priority—Still Relevant—Continues Forward (with modified approach)</th>
<th>Pause &amp; Resume when crisis “over” (assuming a 6-18 month delay—high uncertainty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Facilitators training (make virtual; split into four modules) | • Gala Event  
• Funders’ Neighborhoods Tour  
• Faith community luncheon  
• All career internships |
| • Community development projects implementation (need to review and assess which can still go forward) | • Financial training for neighborhood lead organizations (shift orientation to virtual and do individualized workshops for each lead organization; integrate cashflow analysis and scenario planning for downsizing)  
• Fundraising for Investment Fund (need to reset case statement; should we direct 1/3 of funds to COVID-response?) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Priority or Existing but Newly Prioritized (because of current conditions)</th>
<th>Unknown Status/Approach (need more data, too much in flux to know)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Help fundraise for and staff emergency feeding centers  
• Recruit virtual in-person (not at-risk) volunteers to support benefits enrollment support and food delivery  
• Neighborhood-level communications strategy (support to neighborhood hubs’ social media strategy)  
• Virtual check-ins with all collective impact partners, prioritize faith community members (group and individual sessions) to reset expectations, and recruit for crisis response lead roles  
• Organize “virtual groundbreaking” for new community center  
• Reset/expand online fundraising strategy | • Policy Roundtable (appetite for non-emergency priorities?)  
• Ballot initiative for permanent funding for Affordable Housing Trust Fund |

| Honor and Let Go (not going to happen) |  
|---|---|
| • South African learning exchange |  

Item #4

Receive an update on the Regional Work Program (for possible action)
Regional Work Program Update
Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee
May 2020

Regional Policy Plan Administration

- Regional Plan Core Administration
- Regional Plan Update
- Indicator Tracking & Mapping
- Community Planning Academy
- Outreach and Communication
- Annual Report
Regional Policy Plan Administration

- Regional Plan Core Administration
- Community Engagement Toolkit

Community Engagement Toolkit

SNS Community Engagement Spectrum

The SNS Community Engagement Spectrum is designed to help clarify and determine the level of community participation in a public process or decision. It can be used in conjunction with the community engagement worksheet and will assist you with determining the goals, stakeholder and audience roles, and engagement tools and tactics for your community engagement process. The SNS Community Engagement Spectrum will help to clarify and determine the level of community participation in a public process or decision.

SNS Community Engagement Worksheet

This step-by-step worksheet will assist you with developing and executing a public engagement plan. Use the worksheet to help identify the purpose, target audience, and strategies for effective communication and engagement with your intended audience.

SNS Community Data Map
Community Engagement Toolkit

The following are additional resources for conducting online and virtual engagement:

7 essential features for your online public engagement toolkit
A blog post identifying tools and strategies for virtual engagement.

10 Tips for picking the best tech tools for your next virtual meeting
Considerations for choosing digital tools for conducting virtual meetings.

Equitable community engagement during a global pandemic and beyond.
Guidelines for hosting accessible and equitable virtual meetings for all who wish to participate.

Extending our reach video series and webinars
A short series of videos developed by FHWA to highlight innovative and proven public engagement strategies.

Regional Policy Plan Administration

Opportunity Site Updates
- Where we are
- Downtown North Las Vegas Opportunity Site Strategy Update
5-yr Progress Report

Phase I: Set expectations, goals, and prioritize
Broad research; agency interviews; determine scope and goals; prioritize workflow; seek stakeholder input

Phase II: Research & data gathering
Literature review; existing conditions; stakeholder interviews

Phase III: Analysis & recommendation
Update implementation strategies; review accomplishments, milestones, challenges, & barriers; new research and case studies

Phase IV: Reporting & deliverables
Complete 5-yr Progress Report and all deliverables

Deliverables:
• 5-yr Progress Report
• Update of SNS web page and resources
• Identify future projects and actions for SNS and partner agencies

• Site Specific Deliverables (DTNLV)
  • Support development of marketing and promotional tools
  • Focus on strategies and tools for overcoming language barriers and communication challenges
  • Identify opportunities for districts and catalyst development

Where we’re at:
• Completed literature review, review of existing conditions, and conducted stakeholder interviews (Appendices)
• Consolidated past planning efforts into a vision section
• Completed a review of the planning strategies and assessed progress
• Provided an updated strategies framework complete with recommendations
• Conducted additional case study research
• Completed final draft of 5-year Progress Report

Next steps:
• Share report with City of North Las Vegas stakeholders for review
• Obtain final comments and finalize report
• Update the SNS website to reflect these current efforts
Vision: District Concept Map*

Legend

- RDA site development opportunities
- Points of interest
- Site of new Milestone Park
- Existing Parks
- Existing downtown connectivity

*Map is an SNS effort to spatially consolidate planning efforts for communication purposes only.

Strategies reviewed

5 primary actions

- Improve safety for all transportation modes
- Create a safe and attractive environment
- Improve district identity
- Support existing businesses and create opportunities
- Support building rehabilitation and new development
Recommendations

2020 updated actions

1. Improve safety for all transportation modes
2. Create a safe and attractive environment
3. Improve district identity
4. Support existing businesses and create opportunities
5. Support building rehabilitation and new development
6. NEW! Coordinate plan implementation

Recommendations

• Actionable steps for progressing the 2020 updated strategies

Case studies

Before

After
Regional Planning & Research

• Future Housing Inventory and Needs
• Extreme Heat Events Coordinated Response
• Inventory of Regional Sustainability Planning Tools and Techniques
• Tree Canopy Social Equity Impacts

Future Housing Inventory and Needs

• Forecast regional housing surplus or shortfall
• Estimate demand by affordability

Future inventory

- Long-range housing units forecasts
- Population and employment forecasts
- Historic housing production
- Historic housing affordability
### Future Housing Inventory and Needs

**Southern Nevada’s Jobs-Housing Ratio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>JOBS-HOUSING RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.32:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.34:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1.36:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1.38:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1.43:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1.47:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.52:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1.55:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1.58:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1.56:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1.56:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extreme Heat Vulnerability

- Vulnerability to extreme heat
- Threat of increasing local temperatures
- Targeted, coordinated response
**Extreme Heat Vulnerability**

- Vulnerability to extreme heat
- Threat of increasing local temperatures
- Targeted, coordinated response

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land surface temperature</td>
<td>Difference in daytime and nighttime land surface temperature from June 18 – 25, 2017 (1 km)</td>
<td>NASA, MODIS Land Surface Temperature and Emissivity (MOD11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed land</td>
<td>Percent of developed land (such as cement, asphalt, buildings, etc.)</td>
<td>Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics (MRLC) consortium, National Land Cover Database (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetated land cover</td>
<td>Percent of an area covered in vegetation (such as trees, shrubs, grass, etc.) from August 29, 2019 (10m)</td>
<td>ESA Sentinel-2 Satellite, Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Population ages 65-64 with a disability (hearing, vision, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care, or independent living difficulty)</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>Adults 25 years and older who did not receive a regular high school diploma (or any foreign alternative)</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated older adults</td>
<td>Adults 65 and older who live alone</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (limited English proficiency)</td>
<td>Population age 5 and older with limited English proficiency</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Population age 20-64 with an income in the past 12 months below the poverty level</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (non-white population)</td>
<td>Population of a race other than White (non-Hispanic or Latino)</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered homelessness</td>
<td>Number of unsheltered homeless</td>
<td>Southern Nevada Homeless Continuum of Care, Homeless Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicleless households</td>
<td>Households without a vehicle</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor workers (TBD)</td>
<td>Percent of workforce working in sectors commonly associated with outdoor work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>Population age 65 and older</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young children</td>
<td>Population age 4 and younger</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>Diabetes-related health incidents per 100,000 (age adjusted)</td>
<td>Southern Nevada Health District, Nevada death certificate data (2013-2017); Nevada hospital discharge data (2016-2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>Asthma-related health incidents per 100,000 (age adjusted)</td>
<td>Southern Nevada Health District, Nevada death certificate data (2013-2017); Nevada hospital discharge data (2016-2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exposure
Composite score

- Land surface temperature
- Vegetated land cover
- Developed land
- Elevation

Inventory of Regional Sustainability Planning Tools and Techniques

Interviewed communities

- City of Tempe, Arizona
- East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC), Florida
- Triangle J Council of Governments (TJCOG), North Carolina
- Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), California

Two general approaches to regional sustainability planning

- Create a regional sustainability plan
- Create a regional climate collaborative (RCC) / regional resilience collaborative (RRC)
Inventory of Regional Sustainability Planning Tools and Techniques

Process
- Project team
- Scope
- Engagement

Foundation
- Knowledge and language
- Goals and Purpose
- Data, gaps, assumptions

Plan Components
- Goals
- Deliverables
- Implementation
- Evaluation
- Communication

Regional Work Program Update
Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee
May 2020
Item #5

Discuss current work activities and priorities related to implementation of the regional plan.

Global Priorities

- School
- Safety
- Housing
- Access
- COVID-19
- Affordable
- Equitable
- Long-term
Emerging Priorities

Opportunities
Item #6

DISCUSS FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Item #7

CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION
AGENDA ITEM

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

SUBJECT: REGIONAL WORK PROGRAM UPDATE

PETITIONER: M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE REGIONAL WORK PROGRAM (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

GOAL: SUPPORT REGIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC VITALITY AND EDUCATION AND INVEST IN COMPLETE COMMUNITIES

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:
The Regional Planning function of the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), which administers the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan, recently moved into the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Department of the RTC. With this transition, it was necessary to develop a regional planning work program that guides staff in effective administration of the Regional Plan. The work program was adopted at the February 2020 RTC Board of Commissioners meeting and received final approval in April 2020 for work to begin. The work program consists of two main tasks: Regional Policy Plan Administration and Regional Planning and Research Projects.

Staff will present an update on progress within these tasks, including the following:

- Initial data for the inventory of future housing study
- Methodology to the extreme heat and vulnerability assessment
- Findings from the inventory of sustainability planning

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG RABORN
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

SNS Item #3
July 30, 2020
Non-Consent
Southern Nevada has been identified as one of the fastest warming regions in the U.S., and recent research indicates a substantial risk of heat-related deaths from an increasing number of extreme heat events in the valley.

Despite the history of adverse health impacts associated with extreme heat in our region, experts hold that many of these outcomes are preventable. Reducing future adverse outcomes will require developing effective and coordinated responses, as well as improving the awareness of public health officials and the general public about the health risks associated with extreme heat. This is especially critical in areas with high concentrations of those most vulnerable during extreme heat events.

WHAT WE’RE DOING:

• Identifying local demographic and environmental factors that increase vulnerability to extreme heat
• Analyzing relevant data to pinpoint areas in Southern Nevada with high concentrations of at-risk populations
• Identifying targeted responses and interventions that could help save lives during extreme heat events

WHAT DOES THE SNS REGIONAL PLAN SAY ABOUT THIS ISSUE?
The SNS Regional Plan provides a few recommendations for mitigating the negative impacts of our region’s high temperatures, including:

- Include shade and other design features in transit stops that provide relief from extreme heat
- Invest in streetscape amenities that provide respite from the heat in neighborhoods with higher transit ridership and pedestrian rates
- Encourage new development to incorporate design features that mitigate heat impacts

Heat-related deaths in Southern Nevada between 2007 and 2016: 437
Average daytime high during summer months in Southern Nevada between 2015 and 2019: 104°F
Excessive heat warnings issued in Southern Nevada between 2015 and 2019: 23
Days exceeding 100°F in Southern Nevada in 2019: 84
IT’S GETTING HOTTER IN SOUTHERN NEVADA

Southern Nevada is the fastest warming region in the U.S., with temperatures increasing more than 5°F since 1970, according to recent research. The number of days exceeding 100°F has also been on the rise in recent decades, as shown in the chart below.

![Graph showing the number of days exceeding 100°F per year from 1990 to 2019. The line shows a steady increase in the number of days exceeding 100°F.]

ASPECTS OF EXTREME HEAT VULNERABILITY

While all Southern Nevadans are impacted during extreme heat events, impacts are not evenly distributed. Certain communities in our region will be particularly affected based on:

- **LEVEL OF EXPOSURE** – Weather patterns, and both the natural and built environments can influence levels of exposure to extreme heat

- **SENSITIVITY TO EXPOSURE** – Demographic, physiological, and health factors may predispose individuals to greater risk during extreme heat events

- **ADAPTIVE CAPACITY** – The ability to prepare for or cope with high temperatures – whether through economic, political, or social resources – plays an important role in extreme heat vulnerability

**HEALTH CONDITIONS**, especially diabetes and heart disease, can be greatly exacerbated by extreme heat events. High temperatures can also negatively impact glucose metabolism.

**AMBIENT TEMPERATURE** above 90°F can be dangerous to the human body.

**DEVELOPED LAND** retains heat and takes longer to cool, and can create urban heat islands.

**VEGETATED LANDCOVER** can be a source of shade and facilitates evaporation, which results in a cooling effect.

**OLDER ADULTS**, especially those who are socially isolated, are among the most vulnerable during extreme heat events.

**VEHICLELESS HOUSEHOLDS** may have a more difficult time accessing cooled locations and other mitigation resources. And walking, bicycling, or utilizing public transit can increase exposure.

**UNSHELTERED HOMELESS** lack many of the resources needed to prepare for and endure extreme heat, and are among the most exposed and vulnerable.

**DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS** – such as race, income, language, education level, and disability – can impact vulnerability to extreme heat.
EXTREME HEAT VULNERABILITY

Southern Nevada has been identified as one of the fastest warming regions in the U.S., and recent research indicates a substantial risk of heat-related deaths from an increasing number of extreme heat events in the valley.

Despite the history of adverse health impacts associated with extreme heat in our region, experts hold that many of these outcomes are preventable. Reducing future adverse outcomes will require developing effective and coordinated responses, as well as improving the awareness of public health officials and the general public about the health risks associated with extreme heat. This is especially critical in areas with high concentrations of those most vulnerable during extreme heat events.

WHAT WE’RE DOING:

- Identifying local demographic and environmental factors that increase vulnerability to extreme heat
- Analyzing relevant data to pinpoint areas in Southern Nevada with high concentrations of at-risk populations
- Identifying targeted responses and interventions that could help save lives during extreme heat events

WHAT DOES THE SNS REGIONAL PLAN SAY ABOUT THIS ISSUE?

The SNS Regional Plan provides a few recommendations for mitigating the negative impacts of our region’s high temperatures, including:

- Include shade and other design features in transit stops that provide relief from extreme heat
- Invest in streetscape amenities that provide respite from the heat in neighborhoods with higher transit ridership and pedestrian rates
- Encourage new development to incorporate design features that mitigate heat impacts

437
Heat-related deaths in Southern Nevada between 2007 and 2016

104°F
Average daytime high during summer months in Southern Nevada between 2015 and 2019

23
Excessive heat warnings issued in Southern Nevada between 2015 and 2019

84
Days exceeding 100°F in Southern Nevada in 2019
IT’S GETTING HOTTER IN SOUTHERN NEVADA
Southern Nevada is the fastest warming region in the U.S., with temperatures increasing more than 5°F since 1970, according to recent research. The number of days exceeding 100°F has also been on the rise in recent decades, as shown in the chart below.

ASPECTS OF EXTREME HEAT VULNERABILITY
While all Southern Nevadans are impacted during extreme heat events, impacts are not evenly distributed. Certain communities in our region will be particularly affected based on:

- **LEVEL OF EXPOSURE** – Weather patterns, and both the natural and built environments can influence levels of exposure to extreme heat.

- **SENSITIVITY TO EXPOSURE** – Demographic, physiological, and health factors may predispose individuals to greater risk during extreme heat events.

- **ADAPTIVE CAPACITY** – The ability to prepare for or cope with high temperatures – whether through economic, political, or social resources – plays an important role in extreme heat vulnerability.

---

HEALTH CONDITIONS, especially diabetes and heart disease, can be greatly exacerbated by extreme heat events. High temperatures can also negatively impact glucose metabolism.

AMBIENT TEMPERATURE above 90°F can be dangerous to the human body.

DEVELOPED LAND retains heat and takes longer to cool, and can create urban heat islands.

VEGETATED LANDCOVER can be a source of shade and facilitates evaporation, which results in a cooling effect.

OLDER ADULTS, especially those who are socially isolated, are among the most vulnerable during extreme heat events.

VEHICLELESS HOUSEHOLDS may have a more difficult time accessing cooled locations and other mitigation resources. And walking, bicycling, or utilizing public transit can increase exposure.

UNSHELTERED HOMELESS lack many of the resources needed to prepare for and endure extreme heat, and are among the most exposed and vulnerable.

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS – such as race, income, language, education level, and disability – can impact vulnerability to extreme heat.
RTC REGIONAL PLANNING project FACTsheet

SUSTAINABILITY INVENTORY

In the last year, there has been substantial discussion about the need for sustainability and climate action planning in Nevada. Much of these discussions have been a response to recent state legislation and action as well as public input at the local level. As a result, there are new opportunities for sustainability planning in Southern Nevada. In response, the regional planning team conducted an inventory of sustainability planning processes and best practices which can help guide any future sustainability or climate action work that may occur in our region.

METHODOLOGY
The RTC’s MPO regional planning staff conducted a literature review as well as conducted peer interviews with local and regional governments across the country. Preliminary findings were then reviewed by a local technical advisory group and regional stakeholders, whose feedback was incorporated into the final report.

The four interviewed communities include:
- City of Tempe, Arizona
- East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC), Florida
- Triangle J Council of Governments (TJCOG), North Carolina
- Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), California

WHAT DOES THE REGIONAL PLAN SAY

INVEST IN COMPLETE COMMUNITIES
Many goals and strategies include protecting residents from pollution through efficient land use and development practices as well as promoting energy efficiency, water conservation, and waste reduction.

INCREASE TRANSPORTATION CHOICE
Several goals and strategies are related to the development of more active modes of transportation, and the reduction of vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions.

BUILDING CAPACITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION
Goals 1, 2, and 3 broadly state the need for the region to enhance collaboration around regional planning priorities.

70%
Urban areas account for 70% of global energy and greenhouse gas emissions.¹

35%
As of 2015, transportation sector emissions make up the greatest percentage (35%) of gross GHG emissions in Nevada.²

49%
Las Vegas’ climate action plan scored 49% on a scoring rubric designed to assess the comprehensiveness of long-term GHG reduction strategies.¹
FINDINGS

Our research finds two broad approaches for sustainability planning. The first is a local, sum-of-parts approach, where local efforts by individual jurisdictions may have some regional impact when they are (figuratively) added together. The second approach is a collaborative, multi-jurisdictional approach where local jurisdictions share knowledge and resources and work together to collectively create goals, plans, and strategies for sustainability work. There are pros and cons for each approach, but our research finds that collaborative approaches are overwhelmingly supported as best practice for sustainability planning.

Additionally, our research identifies several principles for sustainability planning. These best practices broadly fit within three categories: Foundation, process and components. Foundation focuses on best practices for getting started, process identifies the pieces that are needed for sustainability work, and components identify the common elements that other communities have included in their sustainability work.

The full report can be downloaded on our website.

ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

A recent study compared 29 climate action plans from cities across the U.S. and identified 22 different planning policies that have been adopted in an attempt to reduce GHG emissions. These planning policies were grouped into three categories: Essential, priority, and additional (see left sidebar). Essential policies are important policies that would seriously undermine success if excluded. Priority policies would also limit effectiveness if excluded, but not as much as the exclusion of essential policies. Additional policies can be omitted without having detrimental effects, although they can contribute to climate action as well.

In the last year, there has been substantial discussion about the need for sustainability planning in Southern Nevada. These discussions have been both a response to public input as well as a response to recent state legislation. As a result, there are new opportunities for sustainability planning (the term sustainability is synonymous with climate action planning in this report) at the local, county and state levels in Nevada. The alignment of these plans is a rare opportunity for public entities, non-profits, and like agencies to collaborate and create shared goals and actions for a sustainable and resilient Nevada in the future.

In response, the Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) researched sustainability planning in order to learn how other large, metropolitan regions are approaching this work. This report compiles these findings, identifying specific approaches and best practices that can inform sustainability planning here in Southern Nevada. This information will be shared with a regional technical advisory committee and stakeholders, who will make recommendations for progressing sustainability planning in Southern Nevada.

Methodology

The RTC MPO researched various methods and best practices for sustainability and climate action planning. Regional planning staff conducted an academic literature review as well as interviewed multiple local and regional governments across the country in order to learn about how other large regions have addressed and engaged in sustainability planning. The following four agencies were available to discuss their past and present sustainability planning efforts with the regional planning staff:

- City of Tempe, Arizona
- East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC), Florida
- Triangle J Council of Governments (TJCOG), North Carolina
- Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), California

Out of the four communities interviewed, three had recently developed plans and one recently created a regional resilience collaborative (RRC).
Through this research, regional planning staff identified two primary approaches to regional sustainability planning (Part I). Several best practices also emerged through our conversations with other communities who recently engaged in this work (Part II).

Additionally, earlier drafts of this report were reviewed by members of a technical advisory committee as well as individual regional stakeholders, all of whom provided feedback that was incorporated in this final report. Thus, this report synthesizes the research, identifying different approaches to regional sustainability planning as well as best practices for progressing this work here in Southern Nevada in the future.

Background

Generally, sustainability plans (or climate action plans) are developed in response to local or regional issues that have arisen due to unanticipated or rapid growth, climate change, or other similar issues related to sustainability and resiliency. Sustainability plans may address a large spectrum of economic, environmental, and social goals whereas climate action plans focus on mitigating the causes of climate change (i.e. greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions) and improving the resiliency of a community so that it can better adapt to our changing climate (i.e. planning for extreme heat events). Robust climate action and resiliency plans may address economic and social issues as well, typically through discussions on environmental justice for frontline communities, but generally climate action plans are not as broad as sustainability plans, focusing instead on the environmental component of sustainability.

In the past, many communities have been motivated by public or political forces to tackle the impacts of a specific or local threat that is perceived to be within government control. For example, water and air pollution concerns in the 1960s led to federal and state regulations, implicating multiple facets of the planning realm. Recent legislation in Nevada, specifically SB 254, SB 358, and Executive Order 2019-22, are again encouraging local governments to address environmental concerns, most notably GHG emissions and state goals for reducing carbon levels.

In response, the RTC MPO interviewed four communities to learn more about their recent sustainability planning processes. Out of the four communities interviewed, three had recently developed plans and one recently created a regional resilience collaborative (RRC). Together, their work primarily focuses on climate action planning, both mitigation and adaption, although some of this work grew out of earlier sustainability planning. Below is a brief summary of each region’s plan or RRC.

On March 12, 2019, Nevada joined the US Climate Alliance, committing to support the United Nation’s Climate Goals established at the 2015 Paris Conference.

- Primary goal is to reduce carbon emissions by 28% below 2005 levels by 2025
- Nevada is also committed to reducing carbon emissions by 45% below 2005 levels by 2030

Executive order 2019-22
Order directing the executive branch of the Governor’s Office to advance climate goals. Directive includes the following actions:

- Create a State Climate Strategy by December 2020
- Evaluate policies and strategies for how state agencies can contribute to meeting Nevada’s goals
- Prepare agency risk assessments for all state agencies
- Prepare priority lists for state agencies to implement building energy efficiency projects
- Encourage collaboration between state, local governments, and tribal organizations

SB 254
Requires annual statewide inventory of GHG emissions as well as a projection of annual GHG emissions for the 20 years following the most current report

SB 358
Raises Nevada’s renewable energy portfolio standard to 50% by 2030
PART I: General approaches to sustainability planning

Approaches to sustainability planning vary from region to region. Some regions approach the work at the local level, relying on individual municipalities and jurisdictions to undertake the work alone, while other regions are coming together for a multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approach. Overwhelmingly, the literature finds that collective rather than individual approaches have been more effective and successful overall.

1. Local, sum-of-parts approach

Regional collaboration around sustainability is still a new concept. Ten years ago, there was almost no discussion at the regional level concerning sustainability or climate action planning. Instead, there was a shared view that regional outcomes were no more than a sum of local efforts. Many regions still employ this “sum-of-parts” approach towards sustainability and climate action planning. In this scenario, local agencies adopt resolutions or plans that are manageable within the boundaries of their local agency and hope that when added together, their local efforts contribute to a regional impact. In this approach, sustainability issues are addressed solely as local issues, negating the need for a negotiation of shared values and goals at the regional level.

Prior to establishing their collaborative, the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council (ECFRPC) saw examples of this happening in their region. Coastal cities in the ECFRPC region began working on the threat of rising sea levels by adopting mitigation strategies that were deployed only within their jurisdictional boundaries. Rather than identifying the universe of solutions, ECFRPC’s coastal cities developed plans that were solely within their purview to implement.
Additionally, in the Maricopa region, the City of Tempe adopted their own climate action plan, which has been used to inform city programs that incentivize the agency and city residents to take action towards reducing emissions within the City of Tempe’s jurisdictional boundaries.

While these efforts can see some positive results, there are also many potential problems that can arise when local agencies work on these issues alone. Specifically, many of the elements in sustainability planning have synergies or trade-offs with one another and so when agencies are going at this work alone, there is a tendency to end up inadvertently counteracting or negating one another’s work. It’s also extremely difficult to measure and track results since issues related to sustainability and resiliency are rarely confined to jurisdictional boundaries. In recent research, the US Sustainability Directors Network (USDN) found that standalone plans at the local level are not very successful. Ultimately, our research confirmed these findings. Instead, our research strongly emphasized the need for multi-jurisdictional collaboration around sustainability and climate action planning if possible.

2. Multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approaches

Multi-jurisdictional, collaborative sustainability planning is not easy work. Regional planning and sustainability are inherently complex which makes collaborative approaches difficult to begin and maintain. Yet, many regions are finding ways to work together and develop regional plans and solutions for tackling issues related to sustainability and climate action planning. Our research found two broad multi-jurisdictional approaches to sustainability planning. In the first approach, communities such as TJCOG and WRCOG developed regional sustainability plans or documents that then guide local actions. The second approach is to form a regional collaborative group, like the ECFRPC’s Regional Resilience Collaborative, that works toward common goals through shared resources and knowledge.

In the first method, a regional sustainability plan seeks to guide the goals, strategies, implementation, and evaluation of climate action practices in a region. In this approach, the focus is primarily on developing shared regional goals and committing to achieving these goals as a region. Implementation of the regional sustainability plan occurs through the actions of the local agencies where the regional goals and targets influence the goals and strategies adopted through local jurisdiction’s individual plans or programs. Additionally, this method often includes agreement around specific goals and targets. Benefits of this approach include the opportunity to seek community input as well as build consensus around goals and values for the region and gaining knowledge about specific program and policy opportunities. The public nature of this work can also inspire certain individuals, stakeholders, or community-based organizations to action, specifically if the plan is backed by political authority (i.e. local plan adoption) that can bring about change. Conversely, implementation of the plan, even if adopted by local agencies, is typically voluntary and not all local jurisdictions have the same capacity for implementation.

In lieu of a traditional regional sustainability plan, many communities have approached regional sustainability planning through the formation of collaboratives commonly called regional resiliency collaboratives (RRCs) or regional climate collaboratives (RCCs). This approach emphasizes consensus-oriented decision making and relationship building, and seeks to build consensus around shared sustainability goals for the region. The focus is on long-term collaboration rather than the development of a formal plan, although it does not preclude the collaborative from adopting a formal plan. Benefits of this approach include improved efficiency through shared resources and staff, consensus building, and coordinated implementation across the region. However, regional collaboration and consensus-building are difficult work and it is not always feasible to reach regional consensus around certain issue areas. Another drawback is that administration and funding for a collaboratives’ work as well as local commitment to this work can be difficult to sustain.

Both approaches have seen some signs of early success, but their long-term impacts are unknown. Generally, multi-jurisdictional work has been successful in building data (i.e. inventories) and forecasting, but implementation and the ability to meet regional targets is still challenging due to lack of authority of regional agencies and collaboratives. However, it’s been observed that the more data and tools that can be provided through multi-jurisdictional collaboration, the less likely it is that local agencies will develop their own, resulting in more coordinated efforts throughout a region.
Southern Nevada Strong

Southern Nevada Strong was created in 2015 through a collaborative regional planning process that sought to broadly engage the Southern Nevada community in developing a vision for future development and quality of life. That effort is regionally adopted as the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan Policy. It describes a future where residents have access to quality jobs, education, housing, community, transit, urban and natural amenities, and opportunities for all. These priorities are captured in the following regional planning goals:

- Improve economic competitiveness and education
- Invest in complete communities
- Increase transportation choice

Much like Southern Nevada Strong, a regional sustainability plan, informed by broad public engagement, can guide Southern Nevada’s goals and strategies for resilience and climate action in the region as well.

PART II: Best practices for sustainability planning

Additionally, interviewees shared their first hand experiences with their work in their respective regions. While each region defined and approached their work differently, common themes emerged. Subsequently, our research identified several planning principles that contributed to successful sustainability planning processes in the interviewed communities. These best practices broadly fit within three categories: Build a foundation, collaborative processes, and final components. Building a foundation focuses on best practices for getting started, collaborative processes addresses the work that will be done during the planning process, and final components discusses the common elements that other communities have included in their sustainability work. While the literature recommends taking a multi-jurisdictional approach when possible, these best practices are applicable to both local and multi-jurisdictional approaches towards sustainability planning.

Build a foundation

In discussing how other communities worked through their sustainability planning processes, we found that all of the interviewed communities found that some foundational work was necessary. Below are four principles for building a foundation for collaborative sustainability planning:

1. Determine overall goals and purpose

This may be an obvious statement, but it’s extremely important to clarify the purpose of collaborative work and to define shared goals early on in the process of building a foundation for sustainability work. This will likely take time, involve a good deal of compromise and consensus building, and will lay the groundwork for lasting relationships that are essential for the work to come.

It’s inevitable that different agencies have different priorities and foci, making early consensus building around purpose and goals essential for collaborative sustainability planning. Local agencies will likely be at different points in their sustainability planning processes and on different timelines, leading to differences in short-term and long-term philosophies, strategies, and approaches. Reaching a consensus on regional priorities will not be an easy task and it may be necessary to focus on consensus building a key early step in the process. In their work with establishing a RRC, the ECFRPC worked with the Institute for...
Sustainable Communities, who facilitated a consensus building process early on in the formation of the RCC. It was stated that this process was essential for laying the early groundwork for the collaborative and helped to build trust and new relationships among members from the different participating agencies. The consensus building process helped the collaborative to agree on the purpose and goals for their work.

2. **Determine a common language and baseline of knowledge**

Building a foundation for collaborative sustainability planning also requires developing a common language in which to discuss the group’s objectives as well as providing educational opportunities so that all group members have a baseline of knowledge for the issues at hand. All interviewed agencies expressed that these were key activities in their recent work.

In beginning to work as a region, many of the working group members had political realities that needed to be addressed before any real work on the plan could begin. The need to develop a common language that allowed all agencies to participate without risk of political fallout was extremely important for moving the planning process forward. In many communities, the concept of climate change has become a polarizing topic. Reframing this concept using alternative language may be necessary in order to ensure that working group members do not experience push back on these efforts. Many communities found that resiliency and adaptation work was generally more politically agreeable, but that mitigation efforts (i.e. carbon reduction) often created conflicts that could not be resolved.

Additionally, almost all of the communities found that there were large differences in the amount of knowledge working group members had in the issues at hand. Depending on the priorities of their respective agencies and their resources at hand, many members may not have shared experiences in their sustainability work. The interviewed agencies found it necessary to provide some early educational opportunities in order to build an equal foundation of knowledge for their working groups. This also informed where the group may need to seek additional assistance in the form of technical assistance and consultant services.

3. **Begin with data**

Sustainability planning requires a strong fact base using the best data available. Each interviewed community stressed the importance of beginning the planning process with an assessment of the available data. This includes data on current conditions, future projections, and modeled impacts if available. Existing data may include detailed GHG inventories or vulnerability assessments where climate impacts are likely to occur or where vulnerable populations will likely be impacted.

Additionally, existing data and resources can be used to identify shared values, potential threats, and opportunities for the planning process. The agreed upon threats and opportunities became the foundation of...
the interviewed communities’ plans. Understanding the existing conditions should also inform proposed strategies when
the planning process begins. Establishing a baseline also provides an opportunity to establish performance-based goals
where the data available is used for evaluating progress of the plan. Of the communities that had established metrics for
tracking the plan, these metrics were directly informed by the baseline data at hand. Additionally, by utilizing existing
data and tools, local agencies are more likely to use what’s provided and less likely to forge their own path or produce
contradictory metrics for evaluating current and future conditions.

4. Consider opportunities to align with existing plans

Another common strategy that was adopted by multiple regions was to assess other existing plans – federal, state, and
local – and to consider how sustainability plans and efforts could align with these existing plans. The interviewed
agencies emphasized that, by aligning new sustainability work with current plans, the planning process would be more
efficient as well as actionable for combating climate threats and adopting resiliency solutions. By following existing
plans, the strategies are then included in various plans and coordinated across differing sectors and actors that dictate
responsibilities for relevant agencies. Thus, outcomes will be coordinated not only locally, but across the region and
state as well. Additionally, coordination with existing plans can reduce duplication and inconsistencies, and, at the same
time, increase the ability to allocate resources to multiple like-minded efforts and increase overall participation in
implementation by local agencies throughout the region.

Many communities may also have existing legislation or sustainability plans that can guide priorities and strategies for
climate action plans or focused environmental sustainability work. In California, the WRCOG developed a sustainability
framework document prior to developing their climate action plan. This sustainability framework established their
community’s vision, defined issues and threats, and provided potential strategies for future work, all of which assisted
with determining the scope of their subsequent climate action plans. California legislation also guided the priorities for
developing these plans, although the legislation allows for quite a bit of flexibility in how communities will meet their
state’s goals. Regardless of whether or not there is guiding legislation, having foundational and/or guiding documents to
work from served as an opportunity for regional working groups to focus their conversations and negotiations towards
achieving the vision of previously approved and adopted plans.

Examples of guiding documents in Southern Nevada might include the State Climate Strategy (2020), the Regional
Transportation Plan (2017), the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan (2015), county wide emergency response and
hazard mitigation plans, etc. Assuming that local agencies have aligned their comprehensive and master plans with these
regional guiding documents, alignment of the sustainability plan to one or more of these documents as well will likely
see similar opportunities, threats, and solutions rise to the top, informing a regional sustainability plan.

Collaborative planning processes

In addition to building a foundation for sustainability planning, our research also found several similarities in how in the
interviewed communities approached their collaborative planning processes. While these practices are somewhat
intuitive for professional planners, their experiences provided valuable insight that bear discussion. Three principles are
key for working through collaborative planning processes.

1. Determine an advisory process for oversight and validation

Each agency that was interviewed had an advisory structure in place that provided oversight for the project.
Additionally, the advisory group also helped to create buy-in among local partners, positioning the plan for success once
the collaborative planning process finished. While these practices looked slightly different for each region,
each region stressed the important role their advisory groups played in the process.

In most cases, the advisory group consisted of local agencies’ sustainability officers/managers, or similar positions, such
as principal planners, when agencies did not have in-house staff dedicated solely to sustainability. In many instances,
other regional sustainability stakeholders were included in the advisory group as well. Depending on the agency
interviewed, additional stakeholders varied substantially. Other stakeholders included organizations working in the area
of sustainability, such as water authorities and waste management services, as well as relevant non-profits and semi-
public organizations. In some instances, public health officials, social workers, emergency response personnel, and other
professionals with working experience of vulnerable communities were also included in the communities’ advisory groups. Further discussion on this latter point is included in the principle on equity below.

2. Incorporate equity and community engagement

All the interviewed communities acknowledged the importance of community engagement and equity in developing their plans, although some admitted that there was room for improvement in their initial efforts. Most communities relied on their advisory groups or technical assistance partners to represent the needs of their local jurisdictions and vulnerable populations, while the City of Tempe acknowledged that equity work is slow and instead focused on laying a foundation for changing the decision making processes. These experiences represent two different approaches to how community needs and equity have been incorporated into sustainability planning processes.

The first approach is a heavy reliance on past community engagement efforts, data and analysis. As discussed earlier, many communities’ climate action plans grew out of earlier sustainability work where significant community engagement was previously done. In these cases, the interviewed agencies relied on their recent engagement efforts to guide their priorities for their future sustainability work. In the absence of recent engagement, some communities worked to ensure their advisory groups adequately represented vulnerable populations within their communities. The TJCOG sought to include public health officials, social workers, emergency response personnel, and other professionals with on the ground experience in frontline communities in their stakeholder advisory group, ensuring that the needs of their vulnerable populations were heard during their planning process.

Other efforts to incorporate equity into the planning process includes spatial analysis that identifies vulnerable populations and communities. In climate action plans, these focus on frontline communities and seek to identify what factors contribute to the inequitable burdens that are experienced by these communities. Again, TJCOG’s assessment included spatial analysis related to equity and social vulnerability, providing a dataset that identifies how frontline communities and vulnerable populations are disproportionately affected by climate threats such as extreme heat and flooding. Such analysis does require expertise in data and GIS analysis, but the EPA’s Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping tool is a user-friendly platform that helps communities who lack access to expertise identify their vulnerable populations.
Conversely, the second approach prioritizes inclusive engagement and seeks to change the planning and decision making processes so that equity is the primary focus driving the project. At the time of our interviews, only the City of Tempe was attempting this approach, although they were in the very early stages of their equity work. Instead, they shared that their work was heavily modeled after successful efforts in Providence, Rhode Island, and Portland, Oregon. We then included these two communities in our overall plan review in order to learn more about their equity work.

In both cities, equity coalitions and/or citizens advisory committees were formed, born out of extensive engagement within the community as well as grant initiatives which compensated participants for their time. City staff then worked with these coalitions to create equity frameworks for guiding planning processes and decisions. In Portland, this framework was then retroactively applied to the climate action plan to better align the plan with the needs of their frontline communities. In Providence, the coalition’s first project was to create a climate justice plan. Overall, the basic philosophy of this approach is based on the idea of targeted universalism – the idea that if a plan or policy is created to address the extreme inequities of vulnerable populations, then it inevitably address the needs of everyone. So, in Portland and Providence, their climate action work is specifically focused at addressing the inequities experienced by frontline communities first, an idea which fundamentally changes planning and decision making processes. Tempe is now in the process of building their own equity coalition, whose first project will be to advise the 2021 update of their climate action plan.

Regardless of the approach, it was clear that sustainability planning offers a unique opportunity to look at historic inequities and prioritize the voices of communities often left out of the public process. Tackling these large systemic issues increased the complexity of the planning process, but ultimately produced plans that were unique, realistic, and inclusive.

3. Determine scope and project staff

In discussing how each agency went about doing their sustainability work, it was learned that each agency had different approaches depending on their project’s focus and goals. Each agency did dedicate significant in-house staff time to their projects, but ultimately the project scope and staff expertise dictated whether or not there was a need to partner with outside agencies or seek consultant services for developing the plan and accompanying tools.

All of the agencies interviewed felt that, if possible, developing the plan in-house, utilizing agency staff and resources, is the preferred method for this type of work. Conducting the work in-house was preferred not only due to the cost and time savings aspect, but because staff tend to be more knowledgeable in local conditions and can more readily contribute during the plan’s development. Additionally, the interviewed agencies felt that by using in-house staff, their agency was more likely to ensure adoption and future implementation of the plan. Agency staff “own it,” ensuring that staff are committed to the daily, on the ground work that’s required in order to make the plan successful. The agencies reiterated the importance of building strong relationships and trust in this work, making in-house plan development an ideal scenario for building a long-term network of agencies and staff who will ultimately be involved with the implementation of the plan. Working together on the plan development, rather than outsourcing this, was key for building relationships and creating a foundation for implementation and future sustainability work in the region.

It was, however, recommended that technical assistance partners or consultants be used for specialty services such as data/GIS analysis and facilitation. The City of Tempe partnered with Arizona State University to conduct a citywide GHG emissions inventory and TJCOG partnered with the National Environmental and Modeling Analysis Center (NEMAC) to provide data analysis services on what present day conditions look like in the community. Both partnerships helped to establish a baseline for local agencies. Similarly, in establishing their collaborative, the ECFRPC contracted with a
facilitator who helped the group work through some of the early challenges of consensus building work. Through this facilitation, the ECFRPC collaborative was able to find common ground and establish shared goals which defined the group’s work moving forward. Ultimately, all of these agencies then used this information to develop their own plan in-house. Because of funding restrictions, the WRCOG hired a consultant to develop the plan, but plans to update the plan in-house when the time arises.

**Final plan components**

Finally, our research also found many similarities in how the interviewed agencies developed their final plan. These similarities include common elements that other communities have included in their sustainability work as well as advice for how to frame and approach some of these elements. Five key principles emerged for working through the final components of a sustainability plan.

1. **Keep it simple and set achievable goals**

   Key advice that was given by many of the interviewed agencies is to keep the plan simple and to set ambitious but achievable goals. Plans and initiatives that are overly ambitious will not be implemented well. Conversely, plans that have a clear purpose and vision for the future with well-defined outcomes and measurable goals are much more likely to be successful.

   One key strategy for setting achievable goals is keep the plan simple. Limiting the goals to only the few that emerge as the top priorities among regional stakeholders ensures that participating agencies “buy-in,” and implementation by local agencies is much more likely to occur. Creating plans with too many goals and strategies can unintentionally create competing priorities within the region as well as make implementation and tracking unmanageable, ultimately effecting the success of the plan. By limiting the goals to a few select priorities (i.e. carbon reduction, transitioning to renewable energy, seeking environmental justice) it ensures that local agencies can make and measure progress on the shared issues at hand. This can help to foster pride and motivation for keeping the work moving ahead in the future.

   Communities also described the value in adopting a phased approach in their initial undertaking as well. By setting expectations up front that the resulting plan will be a “phase I” document, the interviewed agencies found that this helped to ease tensions, pressures, and expectations on the local agencies. Knowing that there will be future phases of the document allowed stakeholders to let go of the notion of developing a “perfect plan.” Instead, the interviewed agencies suggested that “getting on with it” – the writing, adopting, and implementation of a plan – was the best way to forge ahead. Ultimately, the interviewees agreed it was more important to get something started rather than to see efforts stalled because of conflicts in trying to create an all-inclusive plan. This allowed participating agencies to focus on their shared priorities, knowing that areas of conflict or tension could continue to be negotiated and worked out in the future.

2. **Create flexible strategies that encourage synergies**

   Depending on a region’s priorities, the implementation strategies that are developed as part of the final plan may look very different. Overall, climate action work will require diverse strategies that focus on both mitigation and adaptation. Strategies may include efforts to change planning processes, policies and design standards, land use, physical infrastructure, green infrastructure, and individual behavior. Additionally, strategies may seek to increase education, capacity building, technology, and research.

   Regardless of the focus, it can be beneficial to calculate the economic costs of climate action – both the costs of implementation as well as the costs of inaction. Additionally, identifying co-benefits that are associated with various strategies is helpful for prioritizing implementation and future sustainability work. It’s also important to determine who receives these co-benefits and to ensure that co-benefits are directed towards frontline and vulnerable communities, who are often disproportionately impacted by climate threats.
Our research also found that common strategies and policies for climate action have numerous dependencies, trade-offs, and synergies between them. A recent study compared 29 climate action plans from cities across the U.S. and identified 22 different planning policies that have been adopted in an attempt to reduce GHG emissions and adapt to climate change. It was found that in many cases, regions adopted various strategies that inadvertently counteracted one another. Not only does this make a strong case for multi-jurisdictional collaboration in sustainability work, but these relationships create important considerations for determining climate action strategies. Strategies should be developed that strengthen and reinforce one another, ensuring positive results when measuring regional impacts against climate change.

Additionally, strategies should be flexible enough that local agencies can adopt them in a way that fits with their agencies political realities and resources. In the regions that created full-scale planning documents, two of the regions produced plans that provided a “menu of strategies,” rather than specific, prescribed actions, so that local agencies could adopt those that were most realistic and achievable within their organizations. Specifically, the TJCOC’s Regional Resiliency Assessment provides an assortment of data, analysis, and accompanying strategies for a variety of climate threats that were found significant for their region. Alternatively, the WRCOG’s plan presents each strategy with options for platinum, gold, or silver levels of participation. In this model, agencies can choose to participate at a level that is compatible with their staff expertise and resources. By creating strategies that are flexible enough to encourage a broad range of participation, local agencies are more likely to follow through with implementation of the plan throughout the region.

In lieu of formal planning documents, the ECFRPC’s collaborative has also been extremely successful in cultivating shared responsibility for climate action in their region and incentivizing the adoption of various strategies throughout their region. Here, the collaborative works with local agencies to adopt resolutions that commit staff and resources towards the work and shared goals of the collaborative. This allows participating agencies to collaborate on shared priorities and an accompanying MOU ensures that each agency embeds the RRC’s work within their own agency’s policies and programs as well.

3. Include a clear process for implementation and monitoring

Providing a clear process for implementation is one of the most important aspects of sustainability and climate action planning. Effective results cannot be achieved without successful implementation. In many instances, the literature review found that there is still a gap between sustainability planning and successful implementation. Few plans are actually put into practice and monitored. Additionally, it is still too early in their work to know whether or not the interviewed communities have successfully implemented their plans, although early progress is promising.

Despite not having much evidence of successful implementation at this time, the interviewed agencies did offer some insight into best practices for creating a clear process for implementation and monitoring. In order to aid implementation efforts, plans need clear and reliable timelines, funding sources, and responsible organizations. Additionally, plans should outline the method of evaluation, parties responsible for evaluation, and requirements for reporting progress and updating the plan.

Many on the interviewed communities agreed that “working backwards” was a successful approach for writing an effective, implementable plan. By first determining the measurable outcomes (i.e. reduce GHG emissions by 25% below a baseline in five years), project staff could work through various strategies and benchmarks which could achieve the desired end result. In the process, a clear implementation plan was formed.

Monitoring implementation and progress of the plan also plays a key role in whether or not the plan will be successful. Plans are living documents and implementation will take place over the course of many years. Short-term goals may see success anywhere between 1-5 years, whereas long-term goals may take 10 or even twenty years before goals are achieved. It’s critical, then, to monitor whether or not interim benchmarks are being met in order to evaluate whether or not proposed strategies are achieving their intended outcomes. In some cases, strategies may need to be updated or significantly altered in order to course correct if progress is not being made.
Additionally, implementation efforts also need to be closely monitored to understand who is being affected by the plan. It’s essential to understand if benefits created as a result of the planning process are distributed equally, or if any unintended consequences have occurred. Existing inequalities may be exacerbated by sustainability planning efforts and additional adaptation strategies or protective policies may be necessary in order to ensure that frontline and vulnerable communities benefit and are not disproportionately harmed from implementation of the plan.

4. Include benchmarks and performance measures for tracking progress

As was just discussed, benchmarks and performance measures are critical components of the implementation process. Ultimately, these metrics will tell the story of whether or not climate action efforts in a region are successful. Generally, interviewees shared two types of approaches for tracking benchmarks and performance measures: Process tracking and outcome tracking.

Process tracking refers to actions that increase the capacity or operationalization of the plan. Process activities may include hiring new staff, aligning other plans to reflect sustainability goals, or increasing capacity within the community through the formation of new coalitions or advocates. Increased public education around sustainability issues can also contribute to achieving process type goals.

Outcome tracking refers to measurable regional impacts that may occur as a result of sustainability work. Typically, this occurs by monitoring baseline data and the changes that occur in that data over time (i.e. emissions levels). While process goals are usually tracked, outcomes have not, historically, been tracked. However, our research finds that communities who have recently engaged in sustainability work have adopted explicit and quantifiable goals and have clear strategies for tracking these goals.

The interviewed agencies shared that establishing metrics for their work was no doubt the most difficult aspect to define during their planning processes. Many local agencies were reluctant to commit to specific goals so early in the process and it was agreed that setting targets would be a task for future phases of their plans. In some cases, the tracking and evaluation methods were left open to be defined by the local agencies, making overall evaluation of the regional plan more difficult to define. Regardless, all of the agencies agreed that, in an ideal planning scenario, stakeholders would agree to measurable goals as well as a process for tracking progress towards these goals over time.

5. Utilize human-focused communication strategies

Finally, many of the interviewed communities also emphasized the need to publicize and communicate the plan to the general public in order to increase awareness and acceptance of sustainability work in their communities. This is often done with other, more high-profile planning efforts (i.e. comprehensive, master plans and regional transportation plans) but is less common for climate action work. However, research finds that many residents need to develop a better understanding of the regional sustainability issues facing their communities in order to truly take long-term perspectives into account. Without increased visibility for this work, individual behaviors and community culture around large scale sustainability issues (i.e. single occupancy vehicles and VMT) are unlikely to change.

Increased visibility and communication can also help residents understand how public monies and investment contributes directly to their quality of life and experiences within the city. The interviewed agencies shared that their communications strategies focused less on branding and splash, and more human-centered messaging to show residents what implementation of the plan would look like (i.e. jobs closer to home, more open/green space). Specifically, communications and education strategies connected residents to local issues and potential local outcomes rather than focusing on large, global outcomes which are difficult for people to personally connect to. Instead, they deployed messages that tied their climate action plans to local issues like public health, housing, economic development, and education so that it was pertinent and relevant to their residents. This can help create political buy-in for future efforts as well.
Conclusion

In conclusion, there is not a one-size-fits-all approach to sustainability planning but there are many things to be learned from communities that have already gone through sustainability planning processes. Through a robust literature review and a series of interviews, RTC learned that many communities are moving beyond local approaches to sustainability, and climate action planning, and are instead adopting multi-jurisdictional approaches for addressing sustainability issues. In some cases, communities are forming regional collaboratives to guide and coordinate local planning efforts. Both methods to multi-jurisdictional work requires participating agencies to identify shared values and goals, and to determine outcomes that are realistic for each individual agency to implement. The greater the ability of each agency to implement shared goals, the more successful the plan will be in the long term.

Additionally, several best practices were identified in this research which can be applied to both individual, local efforts as well as multi-jurisdictional approaches. These best practices were grouped into three categories: building a foundation, collaborative processes, and final plan components. The resulting twelve principles for sustainability planning highlight the need to determine achievable and measurable goals and strategies as well as the importance of creating a clear implementation and evaluation process. They also focus on the need for broad and inclusive community engagement where equity and environmental justice is centered in the plan. Ultimately, the plan should reflect the community’s vision for quality of life and communicate how sustainability efforts will positively impact the community’s future.
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Regional Policy Plan Administration

- Regional Plan Core Administration
- Regional Plan Update
- Indicator Tracking & Mapping
- Community Planning Academy
- Outreach and Communication
- Annual Report
Regional Policy Plan Administration

- Outreach and Communications:
  - Nevada Housing Coalition
  - SNHD Community Health Assessment
  - Southern Nevada Food Council

Regional Planning & Research

- Future Housing Inventory and Needs
- Extreme Heat Events Coordinated Response
- Inventory of Regional Sustainability Planning Tools and Techniques
- Tree Canopy Social Equity Impacts
Extreme Heat Vulnerability

- Vulnerability to extreme heat
- Threat of increasing local temperatures
- Targeted, coordinated response

Sensitivity
- Health Conditions
- Physiological Considerations

Adaptive Capacity
- Socio-economic Factors
- Demographics

Exposure
- Surface Temperature
- Land Cover (Vegetation, impervious surfaces)
Extreme Heat Vulnerability

Technical Advisory Group

- Clark County
- City of Las Vegas
- City of North Las Vegas
- Conservation District of Southern Nevada
- Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco

- RTC of Southern Nevada
- Southern Nevada Health District
- UNLV School of Public Health
**Extreme Heat Vulnerability**

**TAG Purpose & Expectations**

- **Review & Refine**
  - Review methods and findings
  - Recommend additional data to consider
  - Assist with development and review of project deliverables

- **Data Collection**
  - Assist with data collection

- **Strategize**
  - Develop recommendations based on findings
  - Help make research actionable
  - Recommend next steps (further research, educational campaign, etc.)

**Proposed Deliverables**

- Factsheet
- White paper
- Neighborhood Profiles
- Webmap
- Project webpage
Extreme Heat Vulnerability

**Exposure**
- Temperature
- Vegetated land cover
- Developed land

**Adaptive Capacity**
- Disability
- Educational attainment
- Limited English proficiency
- Poverty
- Race (non-white)
- Unsheltered homeless
- Vehicleless households

**Sensitivity**
- Older adults
- Isolated older adults
- Diabetes
- Cardiovascular disease

Future Housing Inventory and Needs

- Forecast regional housing surplus or shortfall
- Estimate demand by affordability

Future inventory
- Long-range housing units forecasts
- Population and employment forecasts
- Historic housing production
- Historic housing affordability
**Future Housing Inventory and Needs**

**Recent Progress:**
- Updated data
- Additional research
- TAG meeting planning

---

**Future Housing Inventory and Needs**

**Balance**
Use population and housing forecasts to assess whether our region is expected to maintain a healthy balance of jobs and housing units

**Affordability**
Assess how much housing the region needs to add at different price points to ensure housing is affordable across income levels

**Type/Stock**
Use preference surveys to estimate future demand by housing type
Inventory of Regional Sustainability Planning Tools and Techniques

- Final report
- Planning process decision tree
- Plan comparison matrix
Planning Process Decision Tree

Sum of Parts Approach
Multi-jurisdictional approach
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SUBJECT: ON BOARD MOBILITY PLAN

PETITIONER: M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE ON BOARD REGIONAL MOBILITY PLAN

GOAL: ENHANCE MOBILITY BY IMPROVING TRANSPORTATION CHOICES AND FACILITATING MULTI-MODAL CONNECTIVITY

FISCAL IMPACT:
None by this action.

BACKGROUND:
The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and designated recipient of planning funding from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), has completed the On Board Regional Mobility Plan. During the plan development process, the RTC gathered substantial community and stakeholder input to identify needs and develop long-range alternatives for high-capacity transit, traditional transit, mobility competitiveness, mobility strategies, and emerging transit technologies.

The RTC and a team of national mobility experts began developing On Board in the spring of 2017. Staff will review the On Board “Big Move” recommendations, consisting of eight Primary Strategies and 64 implementing projects. A three-month public engagement process was conducted from January to March 2020, with more than 10,000 participants rating the recommendations between 4.3 and 4.5 on a scale of five stars. The RTC Board of Commissioners is expected to consider the final plan for approval at its August 2020 meeting.

The Executive Summary is attached, and the final plan is available to view at www.OnBoardSNV.com.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG RABORN
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization
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On Board is the vision for transportation and mobility in Southern Nevada for the next two decades. Implementing the strategies and projects in On Board will facilitate development of a strong and diverse regional economy.

COVID-19

On Board was initiated in 2017, in the midst of rapid growth in Southern Nevada. Indeed, the pace of growth was so fast that congestion was limiting access, impacting regional quality of life, and constraining development. It was within this context that Southern Nevada stakeholders pursued On Board, a mobility plan designed to strengthen and diversify the region’s transportation network, providing more options to meet the needs of the broader population. On Board accomplished these goals with a strategy targeted around 8 Big Moves and defined with 64 individual projects.

In Spring 2020, during the final stages of completing On Board, Southern Nevada, like the rest of the United States, faced an unprecedented challenge with the COVID-19 pandemic. “Stay home for Nevada” orders were imposed to control the spread of the virus, effectively putting a hold on local, regional, and international travel, and closing or significantly limiting entertainment and hospitality industries. The impacts on Southern Nevada’s economy are expected to be severe, at least in the short term. Data collected in the early stages of the pandemic by the Las Vegas Convention and Visitor Association show that visitor volumes for April 2020 were a mere fraction of expected rates; Southern Nevada attracted 16,900 visitors in April 2020 as compared with 3,542,000 in April 2019. In addition, gaming revenue in Clark County decreased by 99.5%. Resorts and casinos began re-opening in June 2020, but the time and pace of recovery to pre-COVID-19 conditions remains uncertain.

Despite changes in the region’s immediate economic forecasts, On Board remains relevant. The On Board Mobility Plan includes investments and strategies designed to diversify and expand regional travel opportunities and make it easier for people to get to work and moving forward with these strategies is critical to the region’s recovery. As the immediate impacts of COVID-19 subside, On Board provides a roadmap for mobility improvements and a flexible and adaptable strategy that responds to short- and longer-term regional transportation needs. There is a strong body of research showing investment in public transportation generates local jobs during periods of construction and operations. On Board provides an investment schedule that will both stimulate the local economy and support workers and employers as residents return to work and as the region begins to recover.

1 Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority (LVCVA) April 2020 Executive Summary (https://www.lvcva.com/stats-and-facts/visitor-statistics/)
2 2020 APTA Economic Impact of Public Transit Investment, AASHTO EconWorks database and General Accountability Office (GAO) report Bus Rapid Transit: Projects Improve Transit Service and Can Contribute to Economic Development
INTRODUCTION

Overview

Southern Nevada’s population and economy have grown rapidly, with economic activity expanding in nearly every sector. In the past several years, Southern Nevada added new sports teams, hospitals, master planned communities, employment centers, resorts and a convention center, and education facilities. Forecasts prior to COVID-19 projected the region attracting 640,000 new residents by 2035, increasing Southern Nevada residents from 2.28 million to 2.82 million.1 While the COVID-19 pandemic dampens these forecasts, regional economists expect Southern Nevada to begin growing again. On Board lays out a plan for regional mobility infrastructure that will stimulate growth in the short term and prepare for continued development in the longer term.

On Board Development

On Board was developed through a combination of technical analysis and input from stakeholders, elected officials, and over 80,000 Southern Nevada residents. The technical analysis spanned numerous analytical and evaluation steps, including peer reviews, transit demand analysis, market assessments, and cost estimations. Other technical work reflected ridership forecasts and the detailing of local, regional, and corridor-specific transit markets. On Board also encompassed rigorous economic impact analysis.

On Board was prepared with extensive engagement from stakeholders and the general public. Stakeholders participated in interviews, surveys, public meetings, and pop-up events. A Technical Advisory Group included staff from local planning and public works departments and representatives from business groups, community organizations, and regional authorities like McCarran Airport. The TAG met more than 20 times during the On Board process and participated in all parts of plan development. The project team made more than 100 presentations, with residents participating in multiple surveys and over 250 community events, encouraging residents to share their perceptions, priorities, and aspirations about expanded mobility options and reaching over 80,000 people during the outreach phase.

EIGHT BIG MOVES

Big Move #1: Build High Capacity Transit System

Big Move #2: Expand Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing

Big Move #3: Make All Travel Options Safer and More Secure

Big Move #4: Make Short Trips Easier

Big Move #5: Expand Service for Seniors, Veterans and People with Disabilities

Big Move #6: Improve Connections to Major Destinations

Big Move #7: Provide Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees

Big Move #8: Leverage New Technology to Improve Mobility

These Big Moves will improve the quality of life for Southern Nevada’s residents, workers, and visitors as the region emerges from the COVID-19 pandemic and prepares for growth. Investments recommended in On Board will make transportation more convenient, more comfortable, and safer. By providing more choices for more people, the investment strategy will strengthen the regional transportation system by making it more reliable, sustainable, and equitable. An economic impact analysis conducted as part of the strategy demonstrates that On Board maximizes regional economic competitiveness and improves transportation sustainability. Recommendations will generate economic benefits that greatly exceed costs.
ON BOARD’S BENEFITS AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS

On Board, as discussed, is organized into 8 Big Moves that collectively and individually increase mobility in Southern Nevada. Strategies and projects will increase the intensity and diversity of mobility infrastructure, making it more convenient, easier, and safer for people to travel. Investments are designed to encourage using transit, biking, and walking for short trips as well as commuting. Southern Nevada residents who drive will benefit from reduced congestion, improved safety, and better air quality. On Board analyzed the collective economic value of the proposed investments and the resulting changes in behavior. The analysis evaluated the impact through four lenses:

- **Spending impacts** that capture the jobs and business sales in the regional economy supported by money spent on building, operating, and maintaining the transit system as well as mobility services and infrastructure.

- **Societal benefits** that reflect time and money savings accruing to people and businesses, plus regional benefits associated with improved safety, and fewer negative environmental effects from vehicle emissions. Societal benefits capture these performance effects and their value to society in monetary (dollar value) terms.¹

- **Long-term economic impacts.** Transportation system performance improvements will support long-term economic growth in the Southern Nevada region. Long-term economic impacts represent changes in regional economic activity from improved regional productivity and competitiveness.

- **Land value and local development.** Transportation performance improvements from High Capacity Transit (HCT) can lead to increased land values and changes in local development along HCT corridors. This represents a “capitalization” of transportation benefits. With targeted local development policies and support, HCT can also serve as a catalyst for transformative impact in station areas, supporting local and regional land use and economic development goals.

On Board will create both short- and long-term benefits and economic opportunities for Southern Nevada. HCT corridors—roads where light rail, bus rapid transit, and rapid bus operate—are the backbone of the On Board Plan and the single largest source of benefits and economic impacts. The 7 other Big Moves were designed to deliver mutually supportive strategies that stimulate the regional economy through their construction and operations, deliver benefits to transit users and non-users, and support long-term economic growth long past the 2040 plan horizon.

The economic impact analysis evaluated the collective impact of the 8 Big Moves using cost, ridership, and travel characteristics (e.g., travel time, service frequency); changes in these characteristics were used in conjunction with the TREDIS® “Transportation Economic Development Impact System”² to understand societal benefits and impacts on the Southern Nevada economy.

---

¹ The full economic analysis report includes additional qualitative and non-monetized but quantified measures of benefit.

² Inside TREDIS.
Summary of Economic Findings

**BIG MOVE 1:**
High Capacity Transit

- **Spending Impact**
  - Every dollar spent on HCT will generate 1.5 to 1.6 times that amount for the regional economy.

- **Societal Benefits**
  - HCT will also create between $700 and $800 million in annual societal benefits.

- **Economic Growth**
  - $2.8-$3.5 billion added business output over first 20 years of implementation.

- **Land Value & Development**
  - +1-6% property value increase in HCT corridors, +10-15% for commercial office rents. $1-4 x private investment per public $.

**BIG MOVE 2-8:**
Supportive Mobility Strategies

- All 8 Big Moves will generate between $19.4 and $26.9 billion in business sales.

- Transportation performance improvements will provide between $800 and $900 million in annual societal benefits.*

- $300-$350 million added in business sales each year to the overall output of the economy.

* At full implementation (2040). NOTE: The range of outcomes reflect the fact that the final HCT network may take the form of a “low scenario,” in which the network is mostly bus-based forms of transit or “high scenario” which is a mix of BRT and light rail.
BIG MOVE #1: Build High Capacity Transit System

Overview
High Capacity Transit (HCT) provides faster, more frequent and convenient service for passengers on high demand routes. It includes Light Rail, Bus Rapid Transit, which is light rail-like service provided with buses, and Rapid Bus, which consists of a mix of transit measures. HCT also generates economic development for the region and along the corridors where it operates. On Board would build a total of about 200 miles of HCT in Southern Nevada on 17 different routes (which will take five to 10 years for the first projects).

Implementation
The first step in the development of HCT will be completion of High Capacity Transit on Maryland Parkway. Additional development will be in two phases over about 20 years. A proposed system map is on the inside cover, and each project is listed on the next page.

In addition:
• Until HCT is developed, existing local bus service would be improved to operate frequently to start providing improved service to future HCT passengers
• RTC would pursue public-Private Partnerships to build Transit-Oriented Developments (TOD) along High Capacity Transit routes that could generate on-going revenue and increase transit use.

Evaluation Framework

85% rated Big Move 1 at least
RTC On Board Strategies Survey (January-March 2020)
11,221 respondents
Projects and Programs

Complete Maryland Parkway BRT

Phase One Projects*:
- Charleston (LRT or BRT)
- Cross-Valley Connector [Boulder Highway-Flamingo-Decatur] (BRT or LRT)
- North 5th (BRT or LRT)
- 6 Rapid Bus (Rancho, Craig, Nellis, Eastern, Sunset, Paradise)

Phase Two Projects (10+ years)*:
- Sahara (BRT)
- Craig Road (BRT)
- Eastern (BRT)
- 5 Rapid Bus (Tropicana/Jones/Rainbow, Martin Luther King, Jr, North Las Vegas, South Las Vegas, extend Nellis Corridor south to Stephanie Street)

Develop Resort Corridor Rail-Based Transit (“Euro-Tram”) between Downtown Las Vegas and McCarran Intl Airport Via the Strip (Long-term: -20-year)

Key Benefits

All mobility strategies generate benefits for individual travelers, the regional economy and the environment. The graphic below provides a relative scale of the benefits.

Effectiveness in Addressing Regional Priorities

Building a High Capacity Transit System in Southern Nevada will directly help achieve the following priorities identified through extensive public outreach with nearly 80,000 people and multiple surveys that had almost 25,000 combined responses:

REGIONAL MOBILITY PRIORITIES

1. Improved Road & Transit Safety
2. Fewer Traffic Jams
3. High Capacity Transit (including light rail)
4. Better Connectivity
5. Well-Maintained Roads
6. Frequent Bus Service
7. More Transportation Choices
8. Expanded Service for Seniors, Veterans, & People with Disabilities
9. Improved Job & Housing Access
10. Better Walking & Biking Conditions
11. New Modal Technologies & Investments
12. Expanded Transit Service Area
13. New Information Technologies
14. Better Transit Stops & Stations
15. Improved Transit Security

KEY
- Strongest
- Strong
- Less Strong

*See proposed system map, inside cover.
BIG MOVE #2: Expand Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing

Overview
On Board will improve existing transit services to complement investments in High Capacity Transit (Big Move 1). Big Move 2 will also expand transit to new areas, increasing the availability and accessibility of transit to Southern Nevada. These investments are designed to support regional growth that has occurred over the past decade, as well as future growth, including economic recovery in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. As part of investing in existing and new transit services, On Board proposes to develop and implement new transit service models, such as demand-responsive services and partnerships with companies like Uber and Lyft. These service models are designed to reflect local needs while also being cost effective.

82% rated Big Move 2 at least

RTC On Board Strategies Survey (January-March 2020) 11,221 respondents
Projects and Programs

2-1: Develop Regional Service Goals
2-2: Implement Program to Fill Identified Current Transit Service Needs
2-3: Expand Frequent Transit Network in High Demand Areas
2-4: Implement Frequency and Operating Hours Improvements on Existing Service
2-5: Rideshare Partnerships First Mile/Last Mile Connections to Transit in Suburban Areas
2-6: Micro-Circulator Zones with Suburban Express Connectors to High Frequency Service or Major Transit Hubs
2-7: Rideshare Partnerships for Non-Suburban First Mile/Last Mile Services
2-8: Develop Service Buy-Up Options
2-9: Implement Transit Fare Capping Program
2-10: Reduced Fare Program for Students, Seniors, and Veterans

Key Benefits

All mobility strategies generate benefits for individual travelers, the regional economy and the environment. The graphic below provides a relative scale of the benefits.

Effectiveness in Addressing Regional Priorities

Expanding Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing will directly help achieve the following priorities identified through extensive public outreach with nearly 80,000 people and multiple surveys that had almost 25,000 combined responses:

REGIONAL MOBILITY PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Improved Road &amp; Transit Safety</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fewer Traffic Jams</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 High Capacity Transit (including light rail)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Better Connectivity</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Well-Maintained Roads</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Frequent Bus Service</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 More Transportation Choices</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Expanded Service for Seniors, Veterans, &amp; People with Disabilities</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Improved Job &amp; Housing Access</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Better Walking &amp; Biking Conditions</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 New Modal Technologies &amp; Investments</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Expanded Transit Service Area</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 New Information Technologies</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Better Transit Stops &amp; Stations</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Improved Transit Security</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

〇 Strongest
● Strong
○ Less Strong
BIG MOVE #3: Make All Travel Options Safer and More Secure

Overview

On Board emphasizes safety and security as core values for RTC’s operations and planning. The RTC has advanced its Lights, Camera, Action! Program to communicate the agency’s commitment to safety and security. In addition to recent investments in transit rider safety, there are opportunities to continue existing programs and expand on others. Stakeholders and members of the public consistently identified safety and security as priority concerns associated with moving throughout Southern Nevada. This Big Move is oriented around safety and security measures that focus on transit riders. Safety measures aimed at pedestrians, people who bike, and other roadway users are described in Big Move #4: Make Short Trips Easier.

Making travel more secure refers to a person’s sense of safety and security, including public health protections. Concerns include the communication of public health-related information and reminders, the distribution of masks and disinfectant, and the deep cleaning of touch points at bus stops.

Many of these projects and strategies have increased in importance during the COVID-19 pandemic, which has underscored the importance of safety in terms of public health. While short- and medium-term public health concerns are discussed in other parts of On Board, they are also included in Projects 3-1, 3-2, 3-4, and 3-5.

RTC On Board Strategies Survey (January-March 2020)
11,221 respondents

RTC's Existing “Light, Camera, Action” Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIGHTS</th>
<th>LIGHTING</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 1,670 SHELTERS, 2/3 currently have lighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMERA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEILLANCE</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to install surveillance software that provides local law enforcement REAL-TIME ACCESS to live video stream on transit vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHELTERS</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.81 MILLION in federal funding to move shelters five feet behind the curb to enforce the safety of transit riders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,113 SHELTERS moved</td>
<td>900 NEW SHELTERS purchased and installed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RTC

86% rated Big Move 5 at least

RTC On Board Strategies Survey (January-March 2020)
11,221 respondents
Projects and Programs

3-1: Utilize established Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) strategies during design of transit facilities
3-2: Increase transit security staff presence
3-3: Develop technology-based active security monitoring at bus stops
3-4: Install emergency Blue Light call boxes at high risk locations
3-5: Expand RTC Transit Watch program
3-6: Review criminal codes to ensure appropriate treatment of transit-related criminal activity

Closely related to the above strategies are projects that protect users of all travel options from crashes with motorized vehicles:

3-7: Traffic crash review and countermeasures program
3-8: Accelerate efforts to move bus stops back from fast moving traffic
3-9: Install bollards at high-volume stops with fast moving traffic

Key Benefits

All mobility strategies generate benefits for individual travelers, the regional economy and the environment. The graphic below provides a relative scale of the benefits.

Effectiveness in Addressing Regional Priorities

Making All Travel Options Safer and More Secure will directly help achieve the following priorities identified through extensive public outreach with nearly 80,000 people and multiple surveys that had almost 25,000 combined responses:

REGIONAL MOBILITY PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improved Road &amp; Transit Safety</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fewer Traffic Jams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Capacity Transit (including light rail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Better Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Well-Maintained Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Frequent Bus Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>More Transportation Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expanded Service for Seniors, Veterans, &amp; People with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Improved Job &amp; Housing Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Better Walking &amp; Biking Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New Modal Technologies &amp; Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expanded Transit Service Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>New Information Technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Better Transit Stops &amp; Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Improved Transit Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

Strongest
Strong
Less Strong
BIG MOVE #4:  
Make Short Trips Easier

Overview

The On Board Mobility Plan integrates transit and multimodal transportation investments to strengthen mobility and accessibility, ensuring that transportation programs and projects connect people, places, and opportunities in ways that are easy, safe, and affordable. It is crucial to ensure that people feel comfortable making all types of trips—traveling by car, walking, biking, and riding the bus. On Board makes investments in alternatives to the private automobile, including projects and programs for pedestrians and cyclists that also support investments in high-capacity transit (Big Move 1), expand transit services (Big Move 2) and make all travel options safe and secure (Big Move 3).

This recommendation includes a combination of infrastructure investments, policies and programs to influence and change the Southern Nevada urban environments, making it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people to walk and bike or use transit. Additionally, these recommendations would provide a more compelling environment for micro mobility strategies like bike share.

81% rated Big Move 4 at least

RTC On Board Strategies Survey (January-March 2020)  
11,221 respondents
Projects and Programs

4-1 Upgrade Streets to Be Safe for All Users (Complete Streets)
4-2 Offer Mid-Block Pedestrian Crossings at Long Block Segments and High Traffic Volumes
4-3 Develop a Walkability Infrastructure Funding Program
4-4 Make Bus Stops Inviting and Safe
4-5 Develop Regional Mobility Hubs
4-6 Develop Neighborhood Mobility Hubs
4-6 Improve Wayfinding in High Volume Pedestrian Locations

Key Benefits

All mobility strategies generate benefits for individual travelers, the regional economy and the environment. The graphic below provides a relative scale of the benefits.

Effectiveness in Addressing Regional Priorities

Making Short Trips Easier and Safer will directly help achieve the following priorities identified through extensive public outreach with nearly 80,000 people and multiple surveys that had almost 25,000 combined responses:

REGIONAL MOBILITY PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improved Road &amp; Transit Safety</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fewer Traffic Jams</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Capacity Transit (including light rail)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Better Connectivity</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Well-Maintained Roads</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Frequent Bus Service</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>More Transportation Choices</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expanded Service for Seniors, Veterans, &amp; People with Disabilities</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Improved Job &amp; Housing Access</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Better Walking &amp; Biking Conditions</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New Modal Technologies &amp; Investments</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expanded Transit Service Area</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>New Information Technologies</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Better Transit Stops &amp; Stations</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Improved Transit Security</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

● Strongest
○ Strong
○ Less Strong
BIG MOVE #5: Expand Service for Seniors, Veterans, and People with Disabilities

Overview

Southern Nevada has repeatedly expressed its support for vulnerable residents, including older adults, veterans, and people with disabilities. Surveys conducted by the RTC underscore the importance of these services; in 2018, roughly half of all responses identified specialized senior services or improved paratransit as the RTC’s most important service.

RTC currently provides several services designed to support seniors, veterans, and people with disabilities. These include ADA paratransit service, Silver STAR, Flexible Demand Response (FDR), the Veterans Medical Transportation Network, and the Downtown & Veterans, Medical Center Express (DVX) routes. RTC also offers a variety of discount programs that reduce the cost of using fixed route services for these populations. The On Board Plan would significantly increase investment in these services, including offering more service and increasing service quality.

85% rated Big Move 5 at least

RTC On Board Strategies Survey (January-March 2020) 11,221 respondents
Projects and Programs

5-1: Double transportation services for seniors
5-2: Double specialized transportation services
5-3: Double service for veterans
5-4: Provide full regional coverage for people with disabilities (ADA paratransit)
5-5: Provide app-based reservations and fare payment for specialized services
5-6: Provide app-based vehicle tracking for specialized service

Key Benefits

All mobility strategies generate benefits for individual travelers, the regional economy, and the environment. The graphic below provides a relative scale of the benefits.

Effectiveness in Addressing Regional Priorities

Expanding Service for Seniors, Veterans, & People with Disabilities will directly help achieve the following priorities identified through extensive public outreach with nearly 80,000 people and multiple surveys that had almost 25,000 combined responses:

REGIONAL MOBILITY PRIORITIES

1. Improved Road & Transit Safety
2. Fewer Traffic Jams
3. High Capacity Transit (including light rail)
4. Better Connectivity
5. Well-Maintained Roads
6. Frequent Bus Service
7. More Transportation Choices
8. Expanded Service for Seniors, Veterans, & People with Disabilities
9. Improved Job & Housing Access
10. Better Walking & Biking Conditions
11. New Modal Technologies & Investments
12. Expanded Transit Service Area
13. New Information Technologies
14. Better Transit Stops & Stations
15. Improved Transit Security

KEY

Strongest
Strong
Less Strong
BIG MOVE #6: Improve Connections to Major Destinations

Overview
On Board’s Big Move #6 will improve connections to and between major destinations in Southern Nevada. New services will connect riders directly to important locations using a combination of express bus routes, commuter services, and game day and event shuttles. These improvements will help both visitors and workers. People visiting Las Vegas will be able to better navigate the RTC transit system, starting from when they arrive at the airport. The airport and other major event centers also employ many residents of the Valley, so improving services will help more workers get to and retain their jobs.

Big Move #6 will develop new mobility services and options for getting to the Resort Corridor, McCarran Airport, and Downtown Las Vegas, which are Southern Nevada’s largest job centers. Expanding connections to these locations is a critical part of the region’s future success. In the wake of COVID-19, when the region is focused on economic recovery, these routes will help connect people and jobs.

87% rated Big Move 6 at least

RTC On Board Strategies Survey (January-March 2020)
11,221 respondents
Projects and Programs

6-1: Provide Rapid Bus Services to McCarran Airport
6-2: Develop Airport Mobility Hub
6-3: Serve Both Terminals with All Airport Connections
6-4: Improve Transit-Related Airport Wayfinding and Onsite Information
6-5: Implement Express Routes to Resort Corridor or Downtown
6-6: Improve Commuter Facilities & Services: Develop Park-and-Ride Lots with Express Service Connections to Major Destinations
6-7: Provide Game Day and Major Event Shuttles

Key Benefits

All mobility strategies generate benefits for individual travelers, the regional economy and the environment. The graphic below provides a relative scale of the benefits.

Effectiveness in Addressing Regional Priorities

Improving Connections to Major Destinations will directly help achieve the following priorities identified through extensive public outreach with nearly 80,000 people and multiple surveys that had almost 25,000 combined responses:

REGIONAL MOBILITY PRIORITIES

1. Improved Road & Transit Safety
2. Fewer Traffic Jams
3. High Capacity Transit (including light rail)
4. Better Connectivity
5. Well-Maintained Roads
6. Frequent Bus Service
7. More Transportation Choices
8. Expanded Service for Seniors, Veterans, & People with Disabilities
9. Improved Job & Housing Access
10. Better Walking & Biking Conditions
11. New Modal Technologies & Investments
12. Expanded Transit Service Area
13. New Information Technologies
14. Better Transit Stops & Stations
15. Improved Transit Security

KEY

- Strongest
- Strong
- Less Strong
BIG MOVE #7:
Provide Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees

Overview
The Resort Corridor is the largest employment center in Southern Nevada, with 24% of regional employment and 27% of private sector jobs\(^1\). As the region’s densest job center, it should be one of the region’s strongest transit markets—but transit ridership among employees commuting to and from work is relatively low.

The On Board Mobility Plan includes strategies to ensure people can easily and reliably get to work, enhancing employer access to a large regional employment pool. These investments will be important during periods of economic growth, and are also a critical part of regional economic recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic. As the region transitions back to work, investments that offer reliable and affordable access to employment will help prevent people from falling into poverty and homelessness.

\(^1\) The Economic Impact of Southern Nevada’s Tourism Industry and Convention Sector, June 2019 Revised Economic Impact Series Brief (Applied Analysis).
Projects and Programs

7-1: Develop Mobility Hubs Focused on Resort Corridor & Downtown Connections.
7-2: Develop Direct Service Shuttles to “Back of House” Resort Corridor Employee Entrances.
7-3: Construct Pedestrian Connections for Grade-Separated “Back of House” Locations on West Side of Strip.

Key Benefits

All mobility strategies generate benefits for individual travelers, the regional economy and the environment. The graphic below provides a relative scale of the benefits.

Effectiveness in Addressing Regional Priorities

Providing Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees will directly help achieve the following priorities identified through extensive public outreach with nearly 80,000 people and multiple surveys that had almost 25,000 combined responses:

REGIONAL MOBILITY PRIORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improved Road &amp; Transit Safety</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fewer Traffic Jams</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Capacity Transit (including light rail)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Better Connectivity</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Well-Maintained Roads</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Frequent Bus Service</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>More Transportation Choices</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expanded Service for Seniors, Veterans, &amp; People with Disabilities</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Improved Job &amp; Housing Access</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Better Walking &amp; Biking Conditions</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>New Modal Technologies &amp; Investments</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Expanded Transit Service Area</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>New Information Technologies</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Better Transit Stops &amp; Stations</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Improved Transit Security</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

● Strongest
○ Strong
○ Less Strong
BIG MOVE #8:
Leverage New Technology to Improve Mobility and Sustainability

Overview
Emerging transportation technologies are creating new opportunities for RTC to improve and augment all modes of transportation across Southern Nevada. On Board includes a variety of projects and recommendations that would leverage new, emerging, and next generation technologies that are already influencing and will continue to change the way we travel. These systems will make it easier to plan, book or schedule, and pay for trips and travel; they will create more ways to track and watch vehicles arrive at their destinations, and integrate travel choices across a variety of modes, such as transit, rideshare and micro mobility. There are also a multitude of technologies that will change our vehicles and roadways, including connected and autonomous vehicles and alternative fuels and fueling systems.

On Board is designed to prepare Southern Nevada to move forward with new systems and technologies as they prove viable and effective. RTC and Southern Nevada’s transportation providers can begin to prepare for these technologies and future proof investments so the region can adapt and respond.
Projects and Programs
Leveraging new technology to improve mobility and sustainability will require monitoring technology developments, and carefully determining how to implement them across the region:

8-1: Provide Real-Time Arrival Information at Major Transit Stops
8-2: Improve Payment Options and Information Sharing
8-3: Implement "Mobility as a Service" Program
8-4: Develop Public Solar Electric Vehicle Charging Network
8-5: Shift to Electric Transit Vehicles
8-6: Expand Solar Charging for RTC’s Transit Vehicles and Facilities
8-7: Expand Travel Demand Management (TDM) Programs
8-8: Evolve the Region’s Advanced Traffic Management System
8-9: Implement Autonomous Vehicles as Technology Permits (10+ years)
8-10: Monitor and Incorporate Emerging Transportation Technologies and Update Road Design as Needed

Key Benefits
All mobility strategies generate benefits for individual travelers, the regional economy and the environment. The graphic below provides a relative scale of the benefits.

Effectiveness in Addressing Regional Priorities
Improving Regional Connections to Major Destinations will directly help achieve the following priorities identified through extensive public outreach with nearly 80,000 people and multiple surveys that had almost 25,000 combined responses:

REGIONAL MOBILITY PRIORITIES
1. Improved Road & Transit Safety
2. Fewer Traffic Jams
3. High Capacity Transit (including light rail)
4. Better Connectivity
5. Well-Maintained Roads
6. Frequent Bus Service
7. More Transportation Choices
8. Expanded Service for Seniors, Veterans, & People with Disabilities
9. Improved Job & Housing Access
10. Better Walking & Biking Conditions
11. New Modal Technologies & Investments
12. Expanded Transit Service Area
13. New Information Technologies
14. Better Transit Stops & Stations
15. Improved Transit Security

KEY
Strongest
Strong
Less Strong
MOVING FORWARD TO IMPLEMENTATION

DEVELOP FUNDING PLAN
On Board will require major investments in Southern Nevada’s transportation infrastructure and programs. Some improvements may begin immediately using eligible funding sources. However, larger projects and service upgrades will require funding that goes beyond what is currently available. Consistent with how the Fuel Revenue Indexing program developed a source of funding for road-related improvements, RTC and the region will need to develop new funding sources for On Board’s projects.

There are potential funding options, but no single approach that works for every region. Instead, Southern Nevada will need to develop a mobility funding plan that will engender broad-based support from the public and community leaders (see Appendix A for an overview of existing and potential funding programs).

DEVELOP A DETAILED SHORT-TERM IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
On Board presents implementation timeframes for recommended projects and programs within the 8 Big Moves in terms of the short term (the next 10 years) and long term (beyond 2030). RTC and its partners will need to develop a more detailed short-term implementation plan that specifies schedules for implementation and key milestones, responsible parties, and funding sources, among other elements.

BEGIN PROJECT DEVELOPMENT FOR FIRST HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT LINES
The High Capacity Transit element of On Board includes LRT and BRT lines that would be strong candidates for Federal Transit Administration New Starts funding, as well Rapid Bus lines that would be strong candidates for Small Starts funding. FTA requires that these projects undergo a project development process that consists of developing and reviewing alternatives and selecting a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). This process can take 12 to 18 months and full implementation of HCT lines can take eight to 10 years. RTC will need to begin project development for the highest priority HCT lines soon.
INCORPORATE HCT ELEMENTS INTO UPCOMING ROADWAY PROJECTS

Roadway improvements are currently planned in some of the corridors where HCT is also planned and may precede HCT development. Incorporating HCT elements into the roadway improvement projects can expedite transit improvements and result in cost savings. The first opportunity will be along Boulder Highway, where early implementation of bus lanes would benefit existing service and expedite the development of full BRT service.

FUTURE-PROOF THE PLAN

On Board reflects the best and most up-to-date information about consumer and transportation system technologies available at the time it was developed. It reflects insights into short-term consumer technologies, such as Mobility as a Service (MaaS), fare capping, and application-based reservation systems, and recommends projects that will take advantage of emerging technologies related to autonomous and connected vehicles, electrification, and clean energy. The pace and schedule for advancing these systems and technologies is not well known. Other factors not directly considered by On Board include the region's desire to be at the leading edge of technology development and the extent to which some of the interest in leading may be hampered by economic factors resulting from COVID-19.

In all cases, however, as implementation progresses, transportation stakeholders in Southern Nevada need to monitor emerging technologies and transportation disruptions, identify “trigger points” for when to make course corrections, and keep the plan “future proof” as it is implemented.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITY

On Board was prepared with input from stakeholders (representatives from local governments, business and tourist organizations, nonprofit agencies, and regional authorities), elected officials, and over 80,000 Southern Nevada residents. Stakeholders were involved in numerous meetings, workshops, and presentations, while residents participated in multiple surveys and attended over 250 events. This input revealed how residents feel about existing and emerging technologies, like ride-hailing, autonomous vehicles, and using mobile applications to plan, book, and pay for more of their trips. Input from stakeholders and the public also provided information on impressions of high capacity transit and the importance of investments in expanded mobility options. Community engagement activities were organized around three phases with reports available for each phase:

- **Phase 1: State of the System** – The initial round of engagement focused on understanding residents’ perceptions of Southern Nevada’s existing transportation network. Surveys asked questions about the types of improvements needed and where additional services are required, and tested attitudes about technology. The findings and insights were used to develop the State of the System.

- **Phase 2: Mobility Vision** – The second round of engagement focused on understanding residents’ vision for the future of mobility in Southern Nevada. Questions posed at pop-up events, community meetings, and surveys asked about future modes of travel, investment preferences, and their goals and priorities for Southern Nevada’s transportation network.

- **Phase 3: Draft Recommendations** – The third round of engagement focused on understanding residents’ attitudes and opinions on the draft recommendations emerging from On Board. In part because of the COVID-19 pandemic, most community engagement in this final round was conducted virtually, using an online survey that asked respondents to rate individual strategies and projects. Over 12,000 people completed the surveys, which included a broad cross section of Southern Nevada’s population.
The future of Southern Nevada Transportation and mobility is here.
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OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

- RTC presence at 100s of events
- 100+ speaking engagements
- 80,000+ in person contacts
- Hundreds of online & physical comments
- 3 Online Surveys; nearly 30,000 responses
## Technical Advisory Group & Community Stakeholder Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAG meetings (3/2017 – 2/2020):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) 03/30/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 05/25/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 08/03/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 09/28/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) 11/30/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) 01/05/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) 04/05/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) 05/31/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) 07/26/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) 08/23/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) 10/18/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) 03/28/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) 05/02/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) 05/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) 06/27/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) 08/01/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) 09/26/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) 02/27/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Stakeholder meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder meetings (7/2017 – 2/2020):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) 07/26/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 02/07/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 04/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 02/12/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Agenda

**Outreach and Engagement**

**Overview of the OnBoard Mobility Plan**

**Economic Impacts**

**Final Survey Results**

**Final Steps and Timeline**
ONBOARD MOBILITY PLAN

8 Big Moves

1: Build High Capacity Transit Plan
2: Expand Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing
3: Make All Travel Options Safer and More Secure
4: Make Short Trips Easier
5: Expand Service for Seniors, Veterans, and People with Disabilities
6: Improve Connections to Major Destinations
7: Provide Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees
8: Leverage New Technology to Improve Mobility

64 Projects

BIG MOVE #1: HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT

Individual Projects and Strategies

- Phase One Projects:
  - Charleston (LRT or BRT)
  - Cross-Valley Connector (BRT or LRT) [Boulder Highway-Flamingo-Decatur]
  - North 5th (BRT or LRT)
  - 6 Rapid Bus (Rancho, Craig, Nellis, Eastern, Sunset, Paradise)

- Phase Two Projects (10+ years):
  - Sahara (BRT)
  - Craig Road (BRT)
  - Eastern BRT
  - 6 Rapid Bus (Jones/Rainbow, Tropicana, Martin Luther King Blvd, Nellis/Stephanie, North Las Vegas Blvd, South Las Vegas Blvd)
  - Resort Corridor Euro Tram
**BIG MOVE #2: EXPAND TRANSIT SERVICE TO MAXIMIZE ACCESS TO JOBS AND HOUSING**

**Individual Projects and Strategies**
- Expand Transit Access and Improve Service Quality
- Pilot/Develop New Service Models for High Need, Low Density Areas
- Offer Transit Service Buy-Up Options
- Implement Transit Fare Capping Program
- Reduced Fare Program for Students, Seniors, and Veterans

**BIG MOVE #3: MAKE ALL TRAVEL OPTIONS SAFER AND MORE SECURE**

**Individual Projects and Strategies**
- Traffic Crash Review and Countermeasures Program
- Bus Stop Safety & Security Improvements
- Utilize Established “Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design” Strategies During Design of Transit Facilities
- On-Bus Security Enhancements & Presence
BIG MOVE #4: MAKE SHORT TRIPS EASIER

Individual Projects and Strategies
- Complete Streets Program
- Walkability Infrastructure and Education Program
- Improve Amenities at Bus Stops
- Pedestrian Safety Investments with Mid-Block Crossings, Intersection Improvements
- Develop Regional and Neighborhood Mobility Hubs
- Improve Wayfinding in High Volume Pedestrian Locations

BIG MOVE #5: EXPAND SERVICE FOR OLDER ADULTS, VETERANS AND PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Individual Projects and Strategies
- Increase Service for Older Adults, Veterans and People with Disabilities
- Provide App-Based Reservations and Fare Payment for Dedicated Services
- Provide App-Based Vehicle Tracking for Dedicated Services
BIG MOVE #6: IMPROVE CONNECTIONS TO MAJOR DESTINATIONS

Individual Projects and Strategies
- Improve Airport Service and Connections (extend Strip Rapid Bus, serve both terminals)
- Develop Airport Mobility Hub
- Improve Transit-Related Wayfinding and Onsite Information

BIG MOVE #7: PROVIDE RELIABLE TRANSIT FOR RESORT CORRIDOR EMPLOYEES

Individual Projects and Strategies
- Implement Express Routes to Resort Corridor or Downtown
- Improve Commuter Facilities & Services
- Develop Park and Ride Lots w/ Express Service Connections to Major Destinations
BIG MOVE #8: LEVERAGE NEW TECHNOLOGY TO IMPROVE MOBILITY

Individual Projects and Strategies

- Transit Passenger Technologies (real-time information, fare payment options, Mobility as a Service)
- Electrification Strategies (transit vehicles EV charging networks, install solar arrays at RTC facilities)
- Expand Travel Demand Management (TDM) Programs
- Implement “FAST OS” (FAST Technology Roadmap)
- Advance Autonomous and Connected Vehicle Technologies
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**BENEFITS AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS**

1. **Spending Impacts (Multipliers):** Regional economic impact of $s spent on building, operating, and maintaining the system

2. **Performance Benefits and Impacts:**
   - **Societal Benefit:** Any form of societal value delivered by transportation, monetized based on either actual costs or willingness to pay
   - **Economic Impact:** Tracing how a subset of transportation performance improvements produce changes in employment, income, business sales, or gross regional product (changes in flow of $s)

3. **Land Value and Local Development:** Capitalization of transportation performance improvements into local land value and new private investment to take advantage of reduced travel costs and improved access.
   - Highly dependent on both transportation performance gains AND on local real estate market conditions and supportive investments.

---

**BIG MOVE #1: HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spending Impact</th>
<th>Societal Benefits</th>
<th>Economic Growth</th>
<th>Land Value &amp; Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supporting business in SNV</td>
<td>monetized social benefits</td>
<td>from more efficient transportation</td>
<td>capitalization &amp; transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5-1.6</strong> Multiplier in the Local Economy for Every $ Spent</td>
<td>Benefits exceed costs within the first 20 years</td>
<td><strong>&gt;$2B</strong> Added business output over 20 years of implementation</td>
<td>+1-6% property value increase in HCT corridors, +10-15% for commercial office rents, $1-4 x private investment per public $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SURVEY BACKGROUND

- Live: January 2020
- Closed: March 31, 2020
- 11,221 Total Responses
  - 741 responses were duplicate responses from the same email
  - Analysis is of remaining 10,480 responses
Overall Ratings of Each Big Move (Sample size: 10,480)

**#1: Build High Capacity Transit System**
- 336 1 Star
- 282 2 Stars
- 956 3 Stars
- 2,015 4 Stars
- 6,890 5 Stars

**#2: Expand Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing**
- 293 1 Star
- 365 2 Stars
- 1,219 3 Stars
- 1,995 4 Stars
- 6,608 5 Stars

**#3: Make All Travel Options Safer and More Secure**
- 214 1 Star
- 270 2 Stars
- 896 3 Stars
- 1,586 4 Stars
- 7,514 5 Stars

**#4: Make Short Walking Trips Easier**
- 305 1 Star
- 399 2 Stars
- 1,295 3 Stars
- 1,895 4 Stars
- 6,586 5 Stars

**#5: Expand Dedicated Service for Seniors, Veterans and People with Disabilities**
- 250 1 Star
- 289 2 Stars
- 992 3 Stars
- 1,545 4 Stars
- 7,404 5 Stars

**#6: Improve Regional Connections to Major Destinations**
- 220 1 Star
- 238 2 Stars
- 887 3 Stars
- 1,695 4 Stars
- 7,439 5 Stars

**#7: Provide Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees**
- 363 1 Star
- 439 2 Stars
- 1,470 3 Stars
- 2,042 4 Stars
- 6,165 5 Stars

**#8: Leverage New Technology to Improve Mobility and Sustainability**
- 299 1 Star
- 370 2 Stars
- 1,243 3 Stars
- 1,930 4 Stars
- 6,636 5 Stars

**Count of Ratings by Each Big Move (Sample size: 10,480)**

**#1: Build High Capacity Transit System**
- 336
- 282
- 956
- 2,015
- 6,890

**#2: Expand Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing**
- 293
- 365
- 1,219
- 1,995
- 6,608

**#3: Make All Travel Options Safer and More Secure**
- 214
- 270
- 896
- 1,586
- 7,514

**#4: Make Short Walking Trips Easier**
- 305
- 399
- 1,295
- 1,895
- 6,586

**#5: Expand Dedicated Service for Seniors, Veterans and People with Disabilities**
- 250
- 289
- 992
- 1,545
- 7,404

**#6: Improve Regional Connections to Major Destinations**
- 220
- 238
- 887
- 1,695
- 7,439

**#7: Provide Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees**
- 363
- 439
- 1,470
- 2,042
- 6,165

**#8: Leverage New Technology to Improve Mobility and Sustainability**
- 299
- 370
- 1,243
- 1,930
- 6,636

*Does not include duplicate respondents.
Ratings of Respondents Earning Less than $35,000 Income (Sample size: 2,541)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>% of Survey Sample</th>
<th>% of Clark County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,000</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include duplicate respondents.
Survey Responses by Income Group

Ratings of Respondents Earning at Least $100,000 Income
(Sample size: 2,133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>High Income</th>
<th>Overall Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Build High Capacity Transit System</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Expand Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Make All Travel Options Safer and More Secure</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Make Short Walking Trips Easier</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5: Expand Dedicated Service for Seniors, Veterans and People with...</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6: Improve Regional Connections to Major Destinations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7: Provide Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8: Leverage New Technology to Improve Mobility and Sustainability</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Responses by Race/Ethnicity

Ratings of Racial and Ethnic Minority Respondents
(Sample size: 3,824)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity Group</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>% of Survey Sample</th>
<th>% of Clark County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin American</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Island</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Move</td>
<td>High-Income</td>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td>Racial/Ethnic Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1: Build High Capacity Transit System</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Expand Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Make All Travel Options Safer and More Secure</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Make Short Walking Trips Easier</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5: Expand Dedicated Service for Seniors, Veterans and People with Disabilities</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6: Improve Regional Connections to Major Destinations</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7: Provide Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8: Leverage New Technology to Improve Mobility and Sustainability</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGENDA**

- Outreach and Engagement
- Overview of the OnBoard Mobility Plan
- Economic Impacts
- Final Survey Results
- Final Steps and Timeline
NEXT STEPS

- Consultant Contract Ended (6/30)
- Local Agency Meetings (6/30–7/14)
- TAG Webex briefings (7/8, 7/9, 7/10 and 7/13)
- Metropolitan Planning Subcommittee (7/14) - APPROVED
- Executive Advisory Committee (7/30)
- RTC Board (Update 8/13)
- Costs and funding estimates developed (June – Nov)
- RTC Board (Approve w/Costs – Nov)
- Implementation begins – TBD
**AGENDA ITEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECT:</strong> REGIONAL PARTNER IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE FROM CITY OF LAS VEGAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PETITIONER:</strong> M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</td>
<td></td>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</strong> THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL POLICY PLAN FROM THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL:</strong> SUPPORT REGIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC VITALITY AND EDUCATION AND INVEST IN COMPLETE COMMUNITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
None

**BACKGROUND:**
Implementation of the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan is ongoing, collaborative, and coordinated work between local governments, other public agencies, and community stakeholders. As core administrators of SNS, the Regional Planning team at the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) assists and supports each of these partners in their implementation.

One such partner is the City of Las Vegas (City), which is implementing many aspects of the SNS Regional Plan during its update of the City’s Master Plan, redevelopment of the Las Vegas Medical District, and adoption of new zoning ordinances throughout the City.

Staff from the City will provide an update on this implementation and its progress in furthering the SNS Regional Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG RABORN
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

SNS Item #5
July 30, 2020
Non-Consent
AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: REGIONAL PARTNER PRESENTATION: CLARK COUNTY

PETITIONER: M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND A DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE FROM CLARK COUNTY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

GOAL: SUPPORT REGIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC VITALITY AND EDUCATION AND INVEST IN COMPLETE COMMUNITIES

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

BACKGROUND:
Implementation of the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan is ongoing, collaborative, and coordinated work between local governments, other public agencies, and community stakeholders. As core administrators of SNS, the Regional Planning team at the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) assists and supports each of these partners in their implementation.

One such partner is Clark County, which has recently begun the process to update its Comprehensive Plan and Development Code.

Staff from Clark County will provide an update on this implementation and its progress in furthering the SNS Regional Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG RABORN
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

SNS Item #6
July 30, 2020
Non-Consent
Background

• Board of County Commissioners requested a more user-friendly code
• Development Code adopted – 2000
• Subsequent discussions centered on updating both the master plan and code
• Last comprehensive update to the master plan – 1983
Purpose & Goals

• Integrated Plan and Code rewrite
• Streamlines process
• Results in closer alignment between policies and regulations
• Implement the SNS Regional Plan

Project Timeline
Purpose of the Master Plan

- Long-range plan (through 2050)
- Guides where and how unincorporated Clark County will grow
- Establishes County policies—advisory, not regulatory
- Serves as an “umbrella” document for other more detailed plans
- Supports regional plan objectives

Required Elements (NRS 278.160)
- Land Use
- Housing
- Conservation
- Historic Preservation
- Public Facilities and Services
- Recreation and Open Space
- Safety
- Transportation

Master Plan Rewrite Objectives

- 8 Master Plan Elements
- 11 Specific Area Plans
- Various of other County and regional plans and studies, e.g. SNS Regional Plan and On Board

- Community vision and values
- New topics/emerging issues

Overarching Vision and Goals
Regional Goals
Countywide Policies
Planning Area-Specific Policies
Implementation Strategies
Master Plan Rewrite Objectives

- Review and consolidate Land Use Categories and supporting policies where possible
  - Clarify distinction between Countywide vs. Planning Area specific considerations
  - Shift regulatory language to Development Code
- Evaluate review cycle and process for Planning Area updates
- Create a plan that is easier to understand, administer, and implement

Purpose of the Development Code

- Regulations that guide how development should occur in unincorporated Clark County
- Procedures for subdividing property or undertaking a larger development project
- Primary tool for implementing the Master Plan
Development Code Rewrite Objectives

- Create a new, modern, user-friendly code
- Improve alignment between zoning district and Master Plan land use categories
- Establish efficient and predictable regulations
- Address County priorities such as housing diversity and sustainable development

Development Code Rewrite Process
Opportunities for Input

- Online questionnaires
- Stakeholder Interviews/Focus Groups
- Citizens Advisory Council and Town Advisory Board Outreach
- Planning Commission updates
- County Commission updates
- Technical Advisory Committee (Development Code)
Online Questionnaire #1: Vision and Values

Key takeaways:
1. Learn about Clark County residents.
2. Identify and prioritize issues and opportunities.
3. Identify a vision for the future of Clark County.

Follow the Process

Sign-up to receive project updates
Email us: TransformClarkCounty@ClarkCountyNV.gov
Next Steps

- Online Questionnaire #1: Vision and Values (Through end of July)
- Summarize Kick-off Meeting and Online Questionnaire Results (July-August)
- State of the County Research and Analysis: (Ongoing)
- Community and Stakeholder Engagement: Preliminary Vision and Goals (September)
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OF
SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

| Metropolitan Planning Organization  [X] | Transit  [ ] | Administration and Finance  [ ] |

**SUBJECT:** PROPOSED FALL 2020 TRANSIT SERVICE CHANGES

**PETITIONER:** M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

**RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:**
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE RECEIVE A PRESENTATION REGARDING PROPOSED FALL 2020 TRANSIT SERVICE CHANGES

**GOAL:** ENHANCE MOBILITY BY IMPROVING TRANSPORTATION CHOICES AND FACILITATING MULTI-MODAL CONNECTIVITY

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
None

**BACKGROUND:**
Due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) has seen a severe drop in critical revenue. As a result, the RTC is considering system-wide transit service changes, including route eliminations, routing adjustments, and frequency decreases.

Prior to implementing any service changes, the RTC is seeking input from the community through a 60-day comment period, from June 29, 2020 through August 28, 2020. Transit and non-transit users throughout the community are encouraged to provide feedback via a brief survey.

RTC staff will provide a presentation on the proposed transit service changes to the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee and members of the public.

Respectfully submitted,

FRANCIS JULIEN
Deputy Chief Executive Officer

SC/fj

SNS Item #7
July 30, 2020
Non-Consent
**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA**

**AGENDA ITEM**

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

**SUBJECT:** REGIONAL PARTNER UPDATES

**PETITIONER:** M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

**RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:**
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE DISCUSS CURRENT WORK ACTIVITIES AND PRIORITIES RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN

**GOAL:** SUPPORT REGIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC VITALITY AND EDUCATION AND INVEST IN COMPLETE COMMUNITIES

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
None

**BACKGROUND:**
Collaboration and coordination are critical to the implementation of the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan. Regional partners may share recent work activities, challenges, and opportunities related to implementation of the SNS Regional Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG RABORN
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

SNS Item #8
July 30, 2020
Non-Consent
AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS

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

GOAL: SUPPORT REGIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC VITALITY AND EDUCATION AND INVEST IN COMPLETE COMMUNITIES

FISCAL IMPACT:
None by this action

BACKGROUND:
The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), as core administrator of the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan, 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,

CRAIG RABORN
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

SNS Item #9
July 30, 2020
Non-Consent
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OF
SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

Metropolitan Planning Organization [ ] Transit [ ] Administration and Finance [X]

SUBJECT: CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

PETITIONER: M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

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

GOAL: SUPPORT REGIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC VITALITY AND EDUCATION AND INVEST IN COMPLETE COMMUNITIES

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,

[signature]
CRAIG RABORN
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

SNS Item #10
July 30, 2020
Non-Consent