Pursuant to Declaration of Emergency Directive 033 issued on September 30, 2020, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) will limit the number of in-person attendees and practice social distancing at the meeting of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee. Attendees will be required to wear facemasks. Additionally, the meeting of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee will be available via livestream at the following link: https://www.rtcsnv.com/about/meetings-agendas/southern-nevada-strong-steering-committee/.

The RTC encourages citizen participation at its public meetings. The first citizens participation period is dedicated to those wishing to speak on an item appearing on this agenda. If you wish to speak to the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee about items under the Steering Committee’s purview, but not appearing on the agenda, you must wait until the last citizens participation comment period listed at the end of the agenda. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes for both citizens participation comment periods. Please step up to the speaker’s podium, clearly state your name and please spell your first and last names for the record.

The Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee will also be accepting public comment via email. Public comment relating to the Steering Committee may be submitted via email to PublicComments@rtcsnv.com. Public comment via email submission received by 5:00 p.m. (Pacific Daylight Time) on the business day prior to the meeting will be read into the record by RTC staff at the meeting. Public comment submissions received after 5:00 p.m. (Pacific Daylight Time) on the business day prior to the meeting will be included in the written record of the meeting. Please be sure to include your name and the agenda item number you wish to comment on. Also, indicate if you would like your comment read aloud on 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 meeting room is accessible to the disabled. Assistive listening devices are available for the hearing impaired. A sign language interpreter for the deaf will be made available with 48 hours advance request to the RTC 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 dубоism@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:

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

BY: Marin DuBois
Items 2, 3, 4, 6, and 8 are items for possible action. Items 1, 5, 7, and 9 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 July 30, 2020 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

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

4. **RECEIVE A PRESENTATION OF AND APPROVE THE SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING TOOLS AND TECHNIQUE REPORT LED BY REGIONAL PLANNING STAFF (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

5. **RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON STRATEGIC VISIONING FROM THE SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION**

6. **DESIGNATE OFFICERS FOR 2021 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

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

8. **DISCUSS FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

9. **CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION**

During the initial Citizens Participation, any citizen in the audience may address the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee on an item featured on the agenda. During the final Citizens Participation, any citizens in the audience may address the Steering Committee on matters within the Steering 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 Steering Committee can direct that the matter be placed on a future agenda.

Citizens attending the meeting in person who wish to comment must be recognized by the Chair. The citizen is then asked to approach the microphone at the podium, to state his or her name, and to spell the last name for the record. The Chair may limit remarks to three minutes’ duration.

Public comment relating to the Steering Committee may also be submitted via email to PublicComments@rtcsnv.com. Public comment via email submission must be received by 5:00 p.m. (Pacific Daylight Time) on the business day prior to the meeting and will be read into the record by RTC staff at the meeting. Public comment submissions received after 5:00 p.m. (Pacific Daylight Time) on the business day prior to the meeting will be included in the written record of the meeting. Please be sure to include your name and the agenda item number you wish to comment on. Also, indicate if you would like your comment read aloud on 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.

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 of Southern Nevada.*
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OF
SOUTHERN NEVADA

AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT: CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETITIONER: M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER</td>
<td></td>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: 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:
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
October 29, 2020
Non-Consent
MINUTES
SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA
JULY 30, 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.

THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED
IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS ON JULY 23, 2020

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:

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 1:04 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
Shane Ammerman, Conservation District of Southern Nevada
Nicole Bungum, Southern Nevada Health District (Alternate)
Mike Casey, Clark County School District
Joselyn Cousins, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco
Michael Dishari, Southern Nevada Water Authority (Alternate)
Robert Fielden, Urban Land Institute
Shawn Gerstenberger, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Delen Goldberg, City of North Las Vegas (Alternate)
Brian Knudsen, Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition
M.J. Maynard, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Michael Mays, City of Boulder City (Alternate)
Andrew Roether, City of Henderson (Alternate)
Robert Summerfield, City of Las Vegas (Alternate)
Chad Williams, Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Nancy Amundsen, Vice Chair, Clark County (Alternate)
Tracy Larkin-Thomason, Nevada Department of Transportation
Jonas Peterson, Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
Deborah Reyes, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Alternate)
Janet Quintero, United Way of Southern Nevada

RTC STAFF (via teleconference):
Francis Julien, Deputy Chief Executive Officer
Craig Raborn, Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization
Rae Lathrop, Manager of Regional Planning
Aileen Pastor, Government Affairs Supervisor
Michelle Larime, Senior Regional Planner
Paul Gully, Management Analyst
Marin DuBois, Management Analyst

SNS Item #2
October 29, 2020
Non-Consent
INTERESTED PARTIES (via email submission):
Mario Burmudez, Clark County Comprehensive Planning
Marco Velotta, City of Las Vegas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments were made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No motion was necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote/Summary:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vote was taken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Meeting of May 28, 2020 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Craig Raborn, Director of the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), remarked that there was an error in the posted minutes as Councilman Brian Knudsen, Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition, was inadvertently omitted from the list of Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee member attendees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Summerfield, City of Las Vegas, made a motion to approve the minutes with the noted inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote/Summary:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Ayes. 0 Nays. The motion carried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayes: Shane Ammerman, Nicole Bungum, Mike Casey, Joselyn Cousins, Michael Dishari, Robert Fielden, Delen Goldberg, Brian Knudsen, Debra March, M.J. Maynard, Michael Mays, Andrew Roether, Robert Summerfield, Chad Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nays: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent: Nancy Amundsen, Shawn Gerstenberger, Tracy Larkin-Thomason, Jonas Peterson, Deborah Reyes, Janet Quintero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE REGIONAL WORK PROGRAM (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Ms. Rae Lathrop, Manager of Regional Planning for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), provided an update on the Regional Work Program (Program). She reminded the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Steering Committee (Committee) of the activities related to the RTC’s role as administrator of the SNS Regional Plan. She then highlighted the Outreach and Communications activity, noting her team’s involvement with several coalitions and working groups such as the Nevada Housing Coalition, the Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD), and the Southern Nevada Food Council. She said her team would provide an update on the three studies staff had discussed at a previous Committee meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lathrop introduced Mr. Paul Gully, Management Analyst for the RTC, to provide an update on the Extreme Heat Study (Study). Mr. Gully began by saying that the purpose of the Study is to identify concentrations of populations who are particularly vulnerable to heat events in the region and develop strategies and resources to mitigate the impacts of these issues. The Regional Planning team created a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
website as a hub to contain much of this pertinent information, as well as a fact sheet. Earlier in July 2020, the first Technical Advisory Group (TAG) for the Study was held. This included stakeholders from across jurisdictions weighing in on these issues, which is important to developing resources that will be helpful to each community in the region.

Next, Mr. Gully reviewed the Future Housing Needs Analysis, which would help forecast regional housing shortfalls or surpluses over time. Since the previous Committee meeting, the team had updated some data and reached out to stakeholders for more insight. Additionally, a TAG meeting for this study is being scheduled, with plans to focus the research and the development of products that will be of use to partners. This study could potentially look at several components of future housing and needs: the balance of population with housing, affordability across income levels, and/or estimating future demand by housing type.

From there, Ms. Michelle Larime, Senior Regional Planner for the RTC, continued the report, updating the SNS Steering Committee on the Inventory of Regional Sustainability Planning Tools and Techniques. She stated that the team was near completion of the research project. Since the last SNS Steering Committee meeting, the team has met twice with a TAG and incorporated feedback into the draft report that was shared in the backup material. After the report is finalized, there will be three products for use by the jurisdictions, which include a final report, a planning process decision tree, and a plan comparison matrix.

Ms. Larime shared some additional information about each of the three planned products. The final report includes an overview of two approaches to sustainability practice and also details several best practices for sustainability planning. The best practices were presented in three categories: building a foundation, collaborative processes, and final plan components. Additionally, the research highlighted the need for sustainability and climate action to be addresses through multi-jurisdictional approaches.

Ms. Larime then presented the sustainability decision tree, which shows differences between a local “sum-of-parts” approach versus multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approaches. The plan comparison matrix is still in progress. The Regional Planning team will continue to work with the TAG and other stakeholders to finalize the report and deliverables and plan to present the finished project at the next steering committee meeting.

Councilman Brian Knudsen, Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition, asked a question regarding Assembly Bill 73 committee work and housing needs. He was curious how SNS engaged with this process. Ms. Lathrop replied that the team had not had communication with this committee, but staff would look at what was being done to ensure all research is consistent.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

**Item:**
4. RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE ON BOARD REGIONAL MOBILITY 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), described the outreach and engagement efforts undertaken by the On Board Mobility Plan (On Board or Plan). These efforts were extensive, including over 80,000 in-person contacts, hundreds of
speaking engagements, and online surveys with nearly 30,000 responses. The RTC also held a long series of Technical Advisory Group (TAG) meetings over the past several years. He noted that On Board is aspirational and is intended to lay out a long-term vision for mobility and transit in Southern Nevada. However, the RTC is facing unprecedented challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the recession it has triggered. As such, it is important to note that this Plan proposed visionary changes for the future alongside possible service reductions to help manage budgetary problems. Outlining these goals ahead of time would be an important part of recovery throughout the region.

From there, Mr. Raborn outlined the Plan’s eight “Big Moves” and their associated projects. This includes the following: 1) Build High-Capacity Transit (HCT) Plan; 1) 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. He briefly described the goals of each move before moving on to an assessment of the economic impact methods. Several criteria studied included spending impacts, performance benefits and impacts, societal/economic impacts, and land value and local development impacts. These impacts were based on the above Big Moves and strategies identified in the Plan. He provided several data points on these assessments. For example, for the first Big Move (build an HCT plan), every dollar spent would produce a 1.5 to 1.6 multiplier in the local economy.

In terms of final results, Mr. Raborn explained that it was a priority to ensure that On Board captured the needs of the community and key stakeholders. To do so, staff performed a stakeholder survey in which respondents were asked to rate each strategy on its effectiveness. This survey was conducted from January 2020 to March 2020, with 11,221 total responses. Overall, all eight recommended strategies received a rating between 4.3 and 4.5 on a five-point scale. Mr. Raborn provided a more detailed breakdown of ratings for each strategy, noting that staff had also collected demographic data on respondents to further understand the community’s preferences.

Moving forward, Mr. Raborn provided a list of upcoming meetings and key events for Plan adoption. First, On Board would be presented to the RTC’s Executive Advisory Committee at its July 30, 2020 meeting. Upon approval there, it would be presented to the RTC Board of Commissioners at its August 13, 2020 meeting. The costs and funding estimates would be developed between June 2020 and November 2020. It would then be presented with costs to the RTC Board of Commissioners for approval in November 2020. Implementation would then occur sometime after that.

Chair Debra March mentioned that this Plan was started before the COVID-19 pandemic and asked how much flexibility there was in the Plan to accommodate these new demands. Mr. Raborn replied that the COVID-19 pandemic would delay implementation in some ways, but it would not change the aspirational recommendations much. The various aspects of the Plan could be foundational elements of helping the region recover.

Motion:
No motion was necessary.

Vote/Summary:
No vote was taken.

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

Comments:
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. Marco Velotta, City of Las Vegas (Las Vegas or City), shared progress on the City of Las Vegas 2050 Master Plan (Plan). This Plan was designed to replace the currently adopted 2020 Master Plan with the goal of developing a clear vision and framework for the future of Las Vegas as well as providing strong direction and practical guidelines for future development. According to estimates, Las Vegas will have over 300,000 new residents and over 100,000 new housing units within the City in 2050. Mr. Velotta detailed this trend and provided data on the projected growth of the region. The Plan also includes implementation strategies to provide insight on how to guide this development. To better understand how to address these needs, City staff had solicited public input across 5,200 people, along with 70 community events, 1,700 surveys, and 35 stakeholder interviews.

Mr. Velotta then detailed how the Plan was split across 16 unique areas in the region to facilitate geographical-based implementation for both strategies and teams. Each area of the City will have specific goals to boost conservation, increase access to opportunities, and support transit in a manner that is equitable, health-minded, and livable. He noted that the land use elements were a big part of this plan and detailed several of the classifications developed. These included regional center, mixed-use centers, neighborhood centers, mixed residential, traditional neighborhoods, subdivision retrofit and new subdivisions, and rural preservation.

Mr. Velotta explained that the Plan also addresses environmental issues such as extreme heat events, drought tolerance, natural features, and forestry, as well as how to mitigate negative impacts on the region. He then detailed goals related to bolstering the local economy and workforce. Part of this will include expanding access to housing and addressing problems with homelessness throughout the region. The Plan will address sustainability issues, Complete Streets, and the long-term viability of the transit network over time. He described several of the public health initiatives included in the Plan and how the Plan would approach mitigating specific hazards and public safety issues, stressing that region-wide collaboration will be important.

In terms of next steps, Mr. Velotta said that the City would explore ways to create greater alignment within the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan, as well as further internal reviews of the Plan. He briefly detailed how the Plan would incorporate this alignment with SNS, part of which includes collaborations on the Maryland Parkway transit-oriented development (TOD) planning grant. He said public reviews of the Plan would be prepared within the month, aiming for a final adoption date by December 2020.

Councilman Brian Knudsen, Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition, praised these efforts and said there would be many efforts to ensure collaboration with this Plan and SNS.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

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

**Comments:**
Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. Mario Bermudez, Clark County Comprehensive Planning, provided background on the Clark County development code update. He described how the original development code was adopted in 2000. Clark County had requested an
update to this code to make it more user-friendly and easier to understand across both the development code and Master Plan, along with creating better alignment between policies and regulations.

In terms of overall timeline, Mr. Bermudez continued, the plan is currently in stages two and three, related to visions and goals. However, the COVID-19 pandemic has delayed these efforts. Mr. Bermudez described the role of the Master Plan and how it is a guide for implementation through 2050. For the update, there were several rewrite objectives discussed. First was to review and consolidate Land Use Categories and supporting policies where possible. Next was to evaluate the review cycle and process for Planning Area updates. The last was to create a plan that is easier to understand, administer, and implement.

Mr. Bermudez then shared the various opportunities for input that were included in the process, including online questionnaires, stakeholder interviews, Planning Commission updates, and Technical Advisory Committee meetings. Overall, about 200 people had been engaged in the process. He briefly described these outreach efforts before detailing next steps, which would include further online questionnaires, more research and analysis, and more community and stakeholder engagement.

Motion: No motion was necessary.

Vote/Summary: No vote was taken.

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

Comments: Following a detailed PowerPoint presentation [attached], Mr. Francis Julien, Deputy Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), reviewed the proposed service changes for the Fall 2020 transit schedule. He began with a description of the COVID-19 pandemic and how it has affected global transportation infrastructure. The RTC was already facing budget issues before the pandemic, which has worsened in the interim. The RTC’s previous revenue and expense projections showed a $6 million shortfall in the transit fund for Fiscal Year (FY) 2020, and future year projections show the shortfall could be as high as $20 million per year. In response, the RTC has adopted several changes to cut $40 million from its budget. This included eliminating and postponing capital projects; eliminating, suspending, and cutting contracts; implementing a hiring freeze; cut management and staff pay; laying off or furloughing nearly 15 percent of the workforce; and proposing a significant reduction to the current transit system for the fall.

Mr. Julien explained that part of the challenge lies in how the RTC is primarily funded by fare revenue and sales tax revenue, which will make recovery efforts different from the RTC’s peers. Thanks to the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, the RTC will receive $112 million in federal funds. Although this is a temporary solution, the RTC plans to use $24 million of CARES funding to fill the gap in FY 2020, $64 million of CARES Act funding in FY 2021, and the remaining $24 million in FY 2022.

In terms of direct changes to RTC services, Mr. Julien reported that the adjustments could be split up into three categories: proposed eliminations to Routes 207, 209, Strip Downtown Express (SDX) and the Westcliff Airport Express (WAX); proposed adjustments to Routes 104, Centennial Express (CX), the Deuce, the Henderson Downtown Express (HDX) and the Sahara Express (SX); and proposed frequency decrease to Route 122.
Mr. Julien stated that a 60-day public comment period began in June 2020 and would end on August 28, 2020. This had received more than 2,700 responses to date. The system-wide tactics considered to educate the public about these changes included elected official outreach, public relations, marketing, and community engagement. Specifically, the RTC is targeting residents on the affected routes with outreach to inform them of the update. He then provided a more detailed overview of the route service changes. The changes included the following:

- **Route 104** – Modifications are being proposed to the route on Valley View Boulevard between Russell Road and Twain Avenue. The RTC is proposing for Route 104 to remain on Valley View Boulevard between Russell Road and Twain Avenue due to the construction of a major bridge in the area.
- **Route 122** – Route frequency will be reduced from every 30 minutes during weekdays, to every 50 minutes. However, the 60-minute weekend frequency will remain.
- **Route 207, Alta Drive/Stewart Avenue** – The RTC proposes discontinuing this route and replacing it with Silver Star service three to four days per week.
- **Route 209, Vegas Drive/Owens Avenue** – The RTC proposes discontinuing this route and replacing it with Silver Star service three to four days per week.
- **Sahara Express (SX)** – This route will be restructured and shortened, eliminating the SX-A branch of the A/B lines.
- **Westcliff Airport Express (WAX) and Centennial Express (CX)** – The RTC proposes eliminating WAX, Westcliff Transit Center to McCarran International Airport, and modifying the CX.
- **Henderson Downtown Express** – Proposed changes include shortening the line to run only between Water Street and Boulder City, meaning it will no longer run to Downtown Las Vegas.
- **Strip and Downtown Express (SDX) and Deuce on the Strip** – Discontinue the SDX, while increasing Deuce service to 24 hours, and increasing frequency on the route.

Mr. Julien then described the paratransit-specific tactics used to raise awareness of these changes. When the HDX is eliminated, the paratransit service will decrease by 0.3 miles. Currently there are 12 certified customers in that area, and only one has ridden since the beginning of 2020. Mr. Julien stated that staff would be doing personal outreach to affected customers to inform them of their options.

Mr. Julien then informed of a few of the public meetings and outreach efforts occurring soon before moving into a review of the project timeline. The public comment period will end on August 28, 2020 with the RTC seeking RTC Board of Commissioners approval on September 10, 2020. This would put the service changes into effect as early as October 2020.

Mr. Mike Casey, Clark County School District, asked about the deficit forecasts and how the RTC would reconcile these efforts with capacity constraints related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Mr. Julien said the RTC was already facing fiscal imbalances before the pandemic, and would be exploring new sources of funding to expand transit operations. Ms. M.J. Maynard, RTC, agreed with this and reiterated that the RTC would be looking into new ways to handle the ongoing deficit in the coming years. Part of this will include coming up with new ways to grow the system as well as managing the deficits as much as possible.

Mr. Andrew Roether, City of Henderson, asked about the changes to the Henderson Downtown Express and whether Water Street will be the last stop on the line. He said that the City of Henderson provided a parking incentive that related to these stop locations. Mr. Julien said staff was getting community feedback on this issue and that he could clarify the issue with Mr. Roether if he reached out at a later
date. Chair Debra March stated that areas around the discontinued routes would need to be monitored to ensure that the RTC is serving the needs of the community members who lived there.

Councilman Brian Knudsen, Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition, stated the importance of developing sources of funding for future transit initiatives, particularly as it pertains to transit-oriented development. Chair March agreed and said the RTC may need to prepare for the next legislative session in that regard.

**Motion:**
No motion was necessary.

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

| Item: 8. DISCUSS CURRENT WORK ACTIVITIES AND PRIORITIES RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN |
| Comments: Mr. Craig Raborn, Director of the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), described how this item provided an opportunity to let any regional partners discuss pertinent issues related to the implantation of the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan. No partners provided comment, but Mr. Raborn described how RTC staff will be reaching out to regional stakeholders to test out new frameworks for prioritizing implementation and plan elements. He said this activity could help local partners identify ways in which to keep SNS Regional Plan activities in mind during other initiatives. |
| **Motion:**
No motion was necessary. |
| **Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken. |

| Item: 9. DISCUSS FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) |
| Comments: Chair Debra March, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC), described how the RTC is exploring additional funding sources to help manage its fiscal deficits. She noted that the submittal date for legislation for the next legislative session was drawing near, so it would be a good time to discuss transit-related issues in that regard. Mr. Robert Summerfield, City of Las Vegas, referenced the Assembly Bill 73 Working Group and asked for an update on the stakeholders’ progress. Chair March concurred that she would like an update on this as well. Then, Mr. Michael Mays, City of Boulder City, suggested discussing issues related to the COVID-19 pandemic and how various disaster planning and housing initiatives could be tied into the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan. Chair March agreed and said the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee could possibly have a compiled presentation from multiple jurisdictions on this issue. |
| **Motion:**
No motion was necessary. |
| **Vote/Summary:**
No vote was taken. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item:</th>
<th>10. CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>No comments were made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion:</td>
<td>No motion was necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote/Summary:</td>
<td>No vote was taken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marin DuBois, Recording Secretary

Marek Biernacinski, Transcription Secretary
Item #1

CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

E-MAIL:
PublicComments@rtcsnv.com

Item #2

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: MEETING OF MAY 28, 2020 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
Item #3

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

Extreme Heat Vulnerability

EXTREME HEAT VULNERABILITY

437
104°F

23
84

WHAT IS THE NEW DRISSI PLAN? (GET THE FACTS)

The 308th PGR provides you with information on the upcoming 308th PGR Project, including:

- A brief overview of the project
- Benefits of the project
- Project timelines
- Contact information

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT THE PROJECT:

- The project will include:
  - Upgrades to the existing airfield
  - Improvements to the runway
  - New lighting and signage

- The project is expected to be completed by the end of 2023.
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

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.)
Extreme Heat Vulnerability

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

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

**Research Questions**
- Conduct an inventory of sustainability planning processes and best practices.

**Methodology**
- Literature review
- Interview past communities
- TAG and workshop review

**Findings**
- Findings consist of two sections: sustainability concepts and principles for sustainability planning

**Final Report**
- General approaches to sustainability planning
- Regional approaches
- Foundation
- Process
- Components

Final report
Outcomes

- Final report
- Planning process decision tree
- Plan comparison matrix

Planning Process Decision Tree
Sum of Parts Approach

- Determine local goals and priorities
- Create a local carbon reduction plan
- Create a local resiliency plan
- Create local policies and programs
- Evaluate progress and resilience plans and policies needed to reach desired outcomes

Multi-jurisdictional approach

- Develop a regional action plan or guiding document
- Create a regional action plan
- Create a regional climate adaptation plan
- Create a regional sustainable development plan
- Create a regional resilience collaboration
- Create a regional climate adaptation plan
- Develop a regional action plan
- Regional implementation
- Regional implementation
- End Stage: programs and policies needed to reach desired outcomes
Item #4

RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE ON BOARD REGIONAL MOBILITY PLAN
The future of Southern Nevada Transportation and mobility is here.
# Agenda

**Outreach and Engagement**

- Overview of the OnBoard Mobility Plan
- Economic Impacts
- Final Survey Results
- Final Steps and Timeline

## 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

Technical Advisory Group meetings

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

Community Stakeholder meetings

Stakeholder meetings (7/2017 – 2/2020):
4 meetings
1) 07/26/2017
2) 02/07/2019
3) 04/30/2019
4) 02/12/2020

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

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 ad Connected Vehicle Technologies

AGENDA

Outreach and Engagement
Overview of the OnBoard Mobility Plan

Economic Impacts
Final Survey Results
Final Steps and Timeline
**BENEFITS AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS**

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

   **Performance Benefits and Impacts:**

2. **Societal Benefit:** Any form of societal value delivered by transportation, monetized based on either actual costs or willingness to pay.

3. **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).

4. **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>
</tbody>
</table>

- **1.5-1.6** Multiplier in the Local Economy for Every $ Spent
- Benefits exceed costs within the first 20 years
- **>$2B** Added business output over 20 years of implementation
- **+1-6%** property value increase in HCT corridors, **+10-15%** for commercial office rents. **$1-4 x** private investment per public $
AGENDA

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

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Move</th>
<th>1 Star</th>
<th>2 Stars</th>
<th>3 Stars</th>
<th>4 Stars</th>
<th>5 Stars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Build High Capacity Transit System</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>6,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Expand Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>6,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Make All Travel Options Safer and More Secure</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>7,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Make Short Walking Trips Easier</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>6,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5: Expand Dedicated Service for Seniors, Veterans and People with Disabilities</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>7,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6: Improve Regional Connections to Major Destinations</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>7,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7: Provide Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>6,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8: Leverage New Technology to Improve Mobility and Sustainability</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>6,636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Does not include duplicate respondents.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Move</th>
<th>1 Star</th>
<th>2 Stars</th>
<th>3 Stars</th>
<th>4 Stars</th>
<th>5 Stars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Build High Capacity Transit System</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>6,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2: Expand Transit Service to Maximize Access to Jobs and Housing</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>6,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3: Make All Travel Options Safer and More Secure</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>7,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Make Short Walking Trips Easier</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>6,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5: Expand Dedicated Service for Seniors, Veterans and People with Disabilities</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>7,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6: Improve Regional Connections to Major Destinations</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>7,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7: Provide Reliable Transit for Resort Corridor Employees</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>6,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8: Leverage New Technology to Improve Mobility and Sustainability</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>6,636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<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>1,266</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>

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

Ratings of Respondents Earning Less than $35,000 Income (Sample size: 2,541)
Survey Responses by Income Group

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

Survey Responses by Race/Ethnicity

Ratings of Racial and Ethnic Minority Respondents
(Sample size: 3,824)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Big Move</th>
<th>High-Income</th>
<th>Low-Income</th>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Minorities</th>
<th>Low Income Minorities</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Age 29 and under</th>
<th>Age 60 and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1: Build High Capacity Transit System</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</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>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</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>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4: Make Short Walking Trips Easier</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</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>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</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>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</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>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</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>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</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
Item #5

RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL POLICY PLAN FROM THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
THE LAS VEGAS 2050 MASTER PLAN

- Develops a clear vision and framework for the future of Las Vegas
- Provides strong direction and practical guidelines for future development
- Provides recommendations that are implementation-focused, relevant, clear, and adaptable to change
- Included public involvement that is inclusive and transparent and is broadly-supported by community consensus
- Consistency with the goals of the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan

BUILDING ON ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- 2020 Master Plan at end of life-cycle
- Changes between 2000 & 2019
  — Population growth: 485,000 to 650,000
  — Demographic, socio-economic, and land use
  — Need for new infrastructure and services
  — Economic challenges post the Great Recession
- Recently completed plans & resolutions
- Integration of various City efforts
IN 2050, LAS VEGAS WILL LIKELY HAVE:

300,000+
New Residents

• A total city population of approximately 900,000+
• A total regional population of 3 million (in line with UNLV estimates)

100,000+
New Housing Units in the City

• 550,000+ total housing units in the region

9,500+
Acres of New Parks Needed

• Tule Springs National Monument included

72 MILLION
Square Feet of New Commercial Space

And at least:

600
New LVMPD Officers

2,500
New Teachers

30
New CCSD Schools

450
New Public Safety Employees

1,100
New City Employees

SOUTHERN NEVADA POPULATION
PUBLIC INPUT

5,200 PEOPLE REACHED

— 3,400 individual input responses
— 1,700 surveys, equally distributed across all wards
— 70 community events in all wards
— 35 stakeholder meetings

WHAT WE’VE HEARD: TOP CHALLENGES

EDUCATION
CRIME/SAFETY
HOMELESSNESS

OPEN SPACE PRESERVATION
WATER AVAILABILITY DROUGHT
Las Vegas in 2050 will be...
- Bold
- Innovative
- Iconic
- Working
- Smart
- Accessible
- Collaborative

The city of Las Vegas will be a leader in resilient, healthy cities - leveraging the pioneering innovative spirit of its residents to provide equitable access to services, education, and jobs in the new economy.

Guiding Principles
The foundation of strategies
- Measure success
- Weigh recommendations
- Foster community-driven implementation
- Improve quality of life for all residents

Equitable
inclusive, fair, welcoming

Resilient
sustainable, adaptable, flexible

Healthy
strong, accessible, well

Livable
unique, complete, enjoyable

Innovative
smart, diverse, bold
**AREAS OF THE CITY**

- 16 unique areas comprised of neighborhoods that can build identity and a sense of place.
- Implement an infill, redevelopment, and transit-oriented development (TOD) land use strategy that incorporates considerations from other
- Geographical-based implementation teams + strategies
EACH AREA OF THE CITY WILL...

- Conserve resources and water
- Preserve historic buildings and neighborhoods
- Have affordable and market rate housing
- Be served by City services, utilities, and public infrastructure
- Have parks and community centers
- Have schools (new/existing) of different levels and places for workforce training
- Have jobs and employment opportunities of all types for all skill sets, including on our primary industries and those that are developing

- Be safe and be protected from hazards, and within close proximity to LVFR and LVMPD
- Be connected by highways, streets, trails, bike lanes, and transit
- Have community gardens and won’t be in a food desert
- Consist of place types
- Emphasize the uniqueness of the community

...all in a manner that’s equitable, innovative, health-minded, livable, resilient; whether existing, in the months in years ahead, or by 2050.

CHARLESTON

Las Vegas 2050 Master Plan

Las Vegas 2050 Master Plan
PARK ACCESS
Areas of accessible park spaces per 10,000 residents within 1/2 mile of the planning district

JID DISTRICT IN DISTRICT
Average job opportunity per residential unit in the planning district

TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & EQUITY
Percent area prime planning district within 0.2 mile prime facilities

VEHICLE OWNERSHIP
Percentage of households without car within the district

COMMUTE TIME TO WORK
Average commute time per worker within the district

2050 GENERAL PLAN & FUTURE LAND USE

- Prioritize transit corridors – present and future
  - Mixed-Use Nodes
  - Corridor Connectors

- Expect less change to neighborhoods
  - Recommendations are provided, but not location specific yet
  - These will be identified in future subarea plans

Las Vegas 2050 Master Plan
**REGIONAL CENTER**

**DOWNTOWN, SUMMERLIN CENTER, CENTENNIAL HILLS TOWN CENTER**

- Regional hubs
- Greatest density and intensity
- Employment centers
- Visitor destinations

**MIXED-USE CENTER**

**PLANNING AREA HUBS**

- Prioritize mid-rise density to support transit stops
- Commercial retrofit, often repurposed shopping centers
- Transit-oriented development priority areas
CORRIDOR MIXED-USE
RETROFIT WITH INFILL HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT USES

- Maximize the potential of existing corridors
- Improve walkability and aesthetics
- Gradually reduce the number of auto-oriented uses
- Build transit-supportive density
- Integrate linear park spaces, connections, and connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods
- Retrofit with infill housing and employment uses
- Retrofit of existing suburban commercial corridors with a broader mixture of uses and infill
- Connect Regional Centers with Mixed-Use and Neighborhood Centers

NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER
FROM STRIP CENTERS TO MAIN STREETS

- Integration of non-detached houses should be gradual and context sensitive
- Some homes that have converted to offices could be re-converted back to homes.
- Consider infill of cottage-style, smaller single-family units.
MIXED RESIDENTIAL

- The “multi-family” of the future, more than just apartment buildings
- More units in less space, but emphasis on place and walkability
- Easy transit access
- Permit a variety of attached housing types
- Accommodate a variety of income levels
- Opportunities for pathway to ownership (rent to own) for condo/townhouse style developments
- Complementary to mixed-use corridor but less of a commercial emphasis

TRADITIONAL NEIGHBORHOODS

STRENGTHEN OLDER NEIGHBORHOODS

- Integration of non-detached houses should be gradual and context sensitive
- Some homes that have converted to offices could be re-converted back to homes.
- Consider infill of cottage-style, smaller single-family units.
SUBDIVISION RETROFIT & NEW SUBDIVISIONS

- Prioritize improving non-motorized connectivity
- Minimize dominance of parking by locating garages behind the front facade or along an alley
- Consider integrating 2, 3, and 4 unit attached single-family as infill in existing neighborhoods
- Explore integrating additional open space, especially in planning areas lacking the acreage

RURAL PRESERVATION

- Urban agriculture
- Trails
- Ranch estates
LAND USE - EXISTING

Existing Land Use
- Single-Family Residential
- Attached Residential
- Multi-family Residential
- Group Housing
- Commercial
- Industrial
- Infrastructure
- Open Space Public
- Quasi-Public Open Space
- Educational
- Institutional
- Public
- Reservation
- Vacant Private

LAND AVAILABILITY 2000

2000 Vacant Land
LAND AVAILABILITY TODAY

Las Vegas 2050 Master Plan

LAND USE – DRAFT PROPOSED

- Prioritize transit corridors – present and future
  — Mixed-Use Nodes
  — Corridor Connectors
- Future Neighborhood area plans will provide recommendations for grey areas
ENVIRONMENT

- Natural Features
  - No net loss of species and landforms
  - Use of SNPLMA

- Urban Forestry
  - 100,000 native and adaptive trees that increase the canopy

- Parks and Connectivity
  - Increase park acreage to 7 acres / 1,000 residents
  - > 85% dwelling units within walk of park and trail

ENVIRONMENT

- Food and Urban Agriculture
  - No food deserts and reduce food swamps by increasing healthy food access
  - Ensure supply chain security and redundancy
  - Provide accessibility to community gardens and increase allowable agricultural uses

- Environmental Justice
  - AQI of 100 or better
  - No brownfields within the City
  - Reduce exposure and risk to low-income and minority communities
  - Improve stormwater pollution prevention efforts
ECONOMY & WORKFORCE

- **Education**
  - Equitable improvement of overall educational outcomes for K-12
  - Enhance YDSI early education and support efforts with CCSD
  - Attract or educate new teachers
- **Link school facilities with land use**
  - Improve development process for new schools
  - Prioritize construction of 30 new schools and classroom additions to address growing student population and alleviate overcrowding

ECONOMY & WORKFORCE

- **Economic and Workforce Development**
  - Align efforts with CEDS to diversify the economy
  - Promote and attract occupations in target industries
  - Develop new partnership with UNLV and CSN, expand campuses
  - Request development of a new 2-4 year NSHE institution tailored toward workforce development in target sectors
- **Redevelopment**
  - Coordinate infill and redevelopment with land use goals
  - Refine criteria to attract appropriate development
- **Public Finance**
  - Balance business friendliness with government efficiencies, property tax cap reforms, and reduced dependence on C-TAX sources with consensus developed enabled revenue options
  - Align the CIP and budget making process with City Council priorities and Master Plan outcomes

Las Vegas 2050 Master Plan
ECONOMY & WORKFORCE

- **Housing**
  - Improve the diversity of housing types with TOD, infill, and “Missing Middle” options identified for each area of the city
  - Remove zoning barriers and incentivize and integrate affordable housing
  - Increase affordable housing options and barriers to affordability
  - Provide financial tools and strategies for developers, homeowners, and investors

- **Homelessness**
  - Reduce total unsheltered homeless population by 50%, with functional zero homelessness in 2050
  - Employ a “Housing First” approach
  - Reduce number of individuals below AMI
  - Continue and enhance coordinated provision of early and direction prevention and diversion measures with CoC and stakeholders
  - Continue to play an intervention role with the City's Courtyard and MORE team

SYSTEMS AND SERVICES

- **Complete Streets**
  - Layered Complete Street network
  - Improvement of Modal Share
  - Jobs-Housing balance
  - Complete major projects
    - Downtown Access Project
    - Sheep Mtn Pkwy – I-11
    - Summerlin Pkwy improvements
    - System-to-System interchanges

- **Transit**
  - Develop and implement recommendations from RTC’s On Board Mobility Plan
  - Coordinate improvements with the City’s 2050 Future Land Use Plan

- **Smart Systems**
  - Citywide fiber network
  - Transportation electrification
SYSTEMS AND SERVICES

- **Water**
  - Reduce consumption to 90 GPCD
  - Make corresponding code changes to meet SNWA's Water Resources and Conservation goals

- **Energy**
  - Increase municipal and community share of renewable energy in line with RPS

- **Waste**
  - Improve municipal and community recycling rate and reduce MSW

- **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**
  - Attain municipal carbon neutrality and community reductions from stationary and mobile sources of emissions

---

Las Vegas 2050 Master Plan

---

SYSTEMS AND SERVICES

- **Public Facilities and Services**
  - Ensure access to city facilities
  - Coordinate above and below-ground wet and dry utilities
  - Dedicate more space and future growth for cultural activities, libraries, and the arts

- **Public Health**
  - Improve community health indicators
  - Adopt Health-in-all-policies and strengthen partnerships with SNHD
  - Increase hospital and ICU capacity, as well as health care access in medically underserved areas
  - Complete build-out of UNLV School of Medicine and leverage Las Vegas Medical District
SYSTEMS AND SERVICES

- Hazards
  - Complete All Hazard vulnerability assessment factoring adaptive capacity and sensitivity
    - Drought, Extreme Heat, Flooding
    - Terrorism, Civil Disobedience-Riots-Social Disturbances
    - Seismic activity
    - Hazardous Materials
    - Infectious Disease
  - Developed framework for mitigation, adaptation, response, and recovery

- Public Safety
  - Develop a proactive, collaborative Safe Communities strategy for each area that is community oriented and inclusive
  - Maintain Fire and Rescue accreditations
  - Decreasing crime rates, but concentrated in specific areas
  - Maintain LVMPD sworn officer strength
  - Add new LVMPD area command and fire stations

IMPLEMENTATION

- Fifty by ‘50: Outcomes of the Plan achieved by implementing key actions
- Plan serves as a policy guide for future development requiring:
  - Maximize staff capacity led by City Council / Planning Commission vision, coordinated by City Manager’s Office and the City’s departments
  - Commitment to work with the public, other Federal, state, regional, and local public agencies, utilities, developers, and the private sector
  - Integration with project design
- Specific tools and implementation strategies are recommended for each goal to achieve a stated outcome over time
  - Balance of regulations (Las Vegas Municipal Code), incentives, programs, and specific projects
  - Budget and CIP process aligned with Master Plan outcomes
- Development of Two-Year action plans
ALIGNMENT WITH SNS

- Las Vegas Medical District
- Part of the Downtown Las Vegas Masterplan
  - Provide options around mobility
  - Create more parks and green streets
  - Create mixed use hubs around LRT/BRT stops
  - Create streets for people
  - Expedite implementation, such as adopting a form-based code and building catalytic projects

ALIGNMENT WITH SNS

- Mixed-Use Hubs & Form-Based Zoning Code
  - Increase density – more residential
  - Supportive uses
  - Utilization of RDA tools
- Key Infrastructure Planning & Programming Strategies
  - Downtown circulator(s)
  - High Capacity Transit
  - Complete street enhancements
  - Bicycle network expansion
  - Pedestrian Improvements / Urban Trails
  - Parking Management
ALIGNMENT WITH SNS

- Medical District Projects
- Major Catalytic Projects
  - UMC
  - Valley Hospital
- New Parking garage
- GoMED
- Bike share
- Project NEON
- UNLV School of Medicine

Maryland Parkway TOD Planning Grant:
- $400k grant from FTA
- Connecting the campus with a TOD mixed-use corridor
- Review of Existing conditions, market analysis
- Workforce housing
- TOD Focus Area plans: Bonneville Transit Center
- Value capture and performance measures
- Final plan anticipated by 2021
Item #6

RECEIVE A PRESENTATION ON THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND A DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE FROM CLARK COUNTY (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)
Clark County Master Plan & Development Code Rewrite

Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee: July 2020

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

- Community vision and values
- New topics/emerging issues

- 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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Project Initiation &amp; Orientation</td>
<td>January - April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>State of the County</td>
<td>February - June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Vision &amp; Goals</td>
<td>April - October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Policy Directions/Code Assessment</td>
<td>October 2020 - February 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan</td>
<td>January - May 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Master Plan Adoption &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>June - October 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Draft Development Code</td>
<td>January 2022 - August 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Development Code Adoption &amp; Implementation</td>
<td>September - December 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

www.transformclarkcounty.com
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)
Item #7

RECEIVE A PRESENTATION REGARDING PROPOSED FALL 2020 TRANSIT SERVICE CHANGES

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Transit Service Changes
Fall 2020
Financial Situation

CURRENT TRANSIT BUDGET DEFICIT

FY2020

- $6M
- $24M

FY2021

- $20M
- $63M
- $102M

~$40M Internal Cuts

PRE-COVID  POST-COVID
INTERNALLY ADDRESSING DECLINING REVENUES

- Eliminated and postponed capital projects
- Eliminated, suspended, and cut contracts
- Implemented a hiring freeze
- Cut management pay
- Negotiated collected bargaining agreement to cut staff pay
- Laid off or furloughed nearly 15% of our workforce
- Proposing significant reduction to our transit service

PROJECTED FUNDING DEFICIT

NOTE: Based on current projections, which could vary, assuming 3.5% average annual growth in sales tax.
**Service Change Overview**

**Proposed eliminations:**
Routes 207, 209, SDX & WAX

**Proposed adjustments:**
Routes 104, CX, Deuce, HDX & SX

**Proposed frequency decrease:**
Route 122

---

**Community Engagement**

60-day public comment period
June 29 – August 28
System-Wide Tactics

- Internal Communication
- Elected official briefings & outreach
- Community Engagement
- Public Relations
- Marketing

Additional efforts for impacted routes

- Targeted Community Engagement
- Geo-targeted Advertising
- Targeted Marketing
Specific Route Details

Route 104 – Valley View/Arville

- Facebook Ads
- Postcards and door hangers
- In-person at transit stations
Route 122 – Maryland Pkwy/Horizon Ridge

Facebook Ads
Ride daytime route
Apartment, church & community center flyers

Route 207, Alta/Stewart Discontinued

Residential Postcards & business flyers
Hispanic markets, fast food & loan centers
Facebook Ads
In-person at transit centers
Route 209, Vegas/Owens
Discontinued

Residential Postcards & business flyers
Hispanic markets, fast food & loan centers
Facebook Ads
In-person at busiest stops

SX – Sahara Express

Facebook Ads
In-person at busiest stops
Postcards & door hangers
Apartments, churches & street teams
WAX – Westcliff Airport Express & CX – Centennial Express

- Facebook Ads
- In-person at transit centers

HDX – Henderson Downtown Express

- Apartment, community center, library, church & business fliers
- Postcards & door hangers
- Facebook Ads
- Ride daytime route
SDX – Strip & Downtown Express
Deuce on the Strip

Facebook Ads
LVCVA media team & Culinary Union
Stakeholder briefings
TVM Signage

Tactics for Paratransit

Additional Public Engagement
Targeted Marketing
Public Meetings

- **YouTube Live**
  - July 28
  - 5-7 p.m.

- **TAAC Committee Meeting**
  - July 29
  - 1:30-3:30 p.m.

- **BTC In-person**
  - Aug. 5
  - 7-9 a.m.

- **BTC In-person**
  - Aug. 5
  - 5-7 p.m.

Timeline

- **Public Comment Period**
  - June 29 – Aug. 28

- **Board Approval**
  - Sept. 10

- **Service Change**
  - Fall, as early as October
Item #8

DISCUSS CURRENT WORK ACTIVITIES AND PRIORITIES RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REGIONAL PLAN
Item #9

DISCUSS FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Item #10

CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD
FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION

E-MAIL:
PublicComments@rtcsnv.com
MEETING HAS ENDED
# 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:** 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, is a part of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Department of the RTC. In early 2020, the regional planning function developed 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:
- Updating progress and metric tracking online
- Initial discussions related to the Inventory of Future housing study
- Methodology to the Extreme heat and vulnerability assessment

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG RABORN  
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

---

SNS Item #3  
October 29, 2020  
Non-Consent
**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**
**OF**
**SOUTHERN NEVADA**

**AGENDA ITEM**

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

**SUBJECT:** SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING TOOLS AND TECHNIQUE RESEARCH PROJECT

**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 OF AND APPROVE THE SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING TOOLS AND TECHNIQUE REPORT LED BY REGIONAL PLANNING STAFF (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 within the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Department of the RTC administers the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan. In early 2020, the Regional Planning function developed a regional planning work program that guides staff in effective administration of the Regional Plan.

Within the work program, staff identified a regional research project to develop a report to guide and inform processes by which the region can develop environmental sustainability plans. Staff researched best planning practices and interviewed peer communities with existing plans and experience in this area. This report is presented in its final version for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG RABORN
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

SNS Item #4
October 29, 2020
Non-Consent
Regional Environmental Sustainability: Inventory of Planning Tools & Techniques

FULL REPORT
PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
AUGUST 2020
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A note about language:
Many of the terms used in this report have broad meanings based on time (history), context, location, community, and evolution of environmental planning theory and policy. Such terms have been highlighted in bold throughout the report and are defined in the glossary in Appendix A.
Environmental sustainability and climate change are widely considered among the defining challenges of the 21st century. In a recent publication on current trends in regional planning, the American Planning Association (APA) notes a growing focus on sustainability and resiliency concerns.¹ Urban areas currently account for 70% of both global energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, primarily in the transportation, industrial, building, and energy sectors.² In Nevada, the transportation sector alone contributes 35% of gross GHG emissions across the state.³ Continued urbanization, specifically in Clark and Washoe counties, threatens to intensify these impacts. As such, the Southern Nevada urbanized region will need to play a major role in planning for environmental sustainability if we are to meet the state’s goals for reducing carbon levels across the state.

In the past year, there has been substantial discussion about the need for environmental sustainability planning in Southern Nevada. These discussions have been a reaction to both public input as well as recent state legislation. As a result, there are new opportunities for environmental sustainability planning (and climate action planning) at the local, county and state levels in Nevada.

In response, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada’s (RTC) Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) researched environmental sustainability planning to better understand how other large metropolitan regions have and are approaching this work. This report compiles these findings, identifying specific approaches and 12 principles for best practices that can inform environmental sustainability planning in Southern Nevada.

Background

In the past, sustainability and environmental planning have been motivated by public or political encouragement to tackle the impacts of specific local concerns that are perceived to be within government control. In the 1960s, public concern over water and air pollution led to federal and state regulations, implicating multiple facets of planning at local levels. The climate challenges of today have caused many states to again adopt legislation that looks to solve environmental concerns, mandating coordinated environmental sustainability planning at state and local levels. For example, California’s SB 375 directs regional and local governments to set regional targets for achieving the state’s goals for reducing GHG emissions.⁴ The senate bill builds on earlier sustainability-focused legislation, tying together regional housing needs and transportation planning in an effort to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and GHG emissions. In general, regional and local responses to environmental concerns, such as those specified in California’s legislation, are usually documented in environmental sustainability or climate action plans.

How sustainability and climate action planning occurs varies by region, but generally these plans are developed in response to local or regional concerns, such as unanticipated or rapid growth, economic inequalities, environmental threats, etc. Due to widespread concern over these types of issues, the term sustainability is now commonly used and accepted as a framework for long-range planning efforts.⁵ Thus, sustainability plans typically address a large spectrum of issues. They generally set a broad vision for the future of a region and propose holistic approaches for coordinating regional effects of development choices on the economy, social equity, and environment.⁶ Conversely, climate action plans focus primarily on the environmental aspects of sustainability. Specifically, climate action plans look to mitigate the causes (e.g., GHG emissions) and adapt to the threats (e.g., extreme heat events) of
climate change. Robust climate action plans may (and should) address economic and social issues as well, typically through discussions on co-benefits, environmental justice, and threats to frontline communities, but generally climate action plans are not as broadly focused as sustainability plans.

In many ways, the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan, adopted by the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC) as the regional policy plan, acts as a sustainability plan for the region. The plan, funded through the Partnership for Sustainable Communities Initiative, an interagency partnership between the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), was created through a collaborative effort that resulted in a regional vision for future quality of life in Southern Nevada. It describes a future where residents have access to quality, livable communities where jobs, education, housing, transit, urban and natural resources, and opportunities are available for all. This plan has since been adopted by all of Southern Nevada’s local municipalities, aligning local efforts for achieving a sustainable future. In the past decade, many of the region’s local agencies have also adopted more specific climate action plans (or similar), but these plans focus primarily on local, individual priorities and have not been coordinated around regional environmental goals. Recent legislation in Nevada, specifically SB 254, SB 358, and Executive Order 2019-22, has further encouraged a regional approach for addressing environmental sustainability and climate concerns in Nevada.

Methodology

In response, the RTC MPO researched various methods and best practices for environmental sustainability and climate action planning to understand how this work might move forward in Southern Nevada in the future. The MPO’s regional planning staff conducted an academic literature review as well as examined several existing climate action plans from peer communities to understand the breadth of work that’s taking place around the country. Additionally, multiple local and regional governments were interviewed to gain insight into how other large regions have addressed and engaged their peers in environmental sustainability and climate action planning work. The following four agencies discussed their past and present planning efforts:

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

Of the four communities interviewed, three had recently developed climate action and resiliency plans and one recently created a regional resiliency collaborative.

Through this research, regional planning staff identified two primary approaches to regional sustainability planning (Part I). Several best practices also emerged through plan reviews and interviews as well (Part II). Findings of the plan review and interviews are incorporated throughout this report and a detailed breakdown of this component of the research is available is in Appendix B. Additionally, earlier drafts of this report were reviewed by members of a technical advisory committee and individual regional stakeholders, all of whom provided feedback that was incorporated into the final report.
This Regional Environmental Sustainability: Inventory of Regional Planning Tools and Techniques report synthesizes our research and provides a robust description of our findings, including examples from readings and from the communities interviewed. Conversely, the Regional Environmental Sustainability Inventory: Key Findings is a separate document that offers an abbreviated summary of our findings.

PART I: General approaches to environmental sustainability planning

Approaches to environmental 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 more multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approach. Overwhelmingly, our research finds that collective rather than individual approaches are necessary for effective and successful environmental sustainability work.

Appendix C includes a detailed overview of processes and decision points for the approaches described below.

Local “sum of parts” approaches

Regional collaboration around sustainability is still a new concept. Ten years ago, there was almost no discussion at the regional level concerning sustainability, resiliency, 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 a local “sum of parts” approach with respect to environmental sustainability and climate action planning. In this approach, local agencies adopt resolutions or plans that are manageable within the boundaries of their local agency and hope that, when all local efforts are added together, they contribute to a broader regional impact. Thus, sustainability issues are addressed solely as local issues, not as shared environmental values and goals for the region. This is the approach that has been taken thus far in Southern Nevada.

While these efforts can yield some positive localized results, our research did not find any examples where local “sum of parts” approaches had significant regional impacts on environmental concerns. Most local organizations recognize the importance of regional sustainability, but research suggests that local governments often fail in practice to think regionally, having a tendency to “forget” their interdependence to the region and pursue their local missions instead.

A critical and obvious challenge for local agencies when individually approaching this work is that many of the issues pertaining to environmental sustainability and climate action extend beyond the boundaries in which the agency works. One of the major themes in sustainability and resiliency planning is identifying synergies and trade-offs so that regional strategies maximize synergies and reduce trade-offs. When agencies go at this work alone, it’s unlikely that synergies and trade-offs will align throughout the region. Thus, there is a tendency to end up inadvertently counteracting or negating one another’s work. It can also be extremely difficult to measure progress and track results, since issues related to sustainability and climate action are rarely confined to jurisdictional boundaries.

Similarly, local “sum of parts” approaches are also hampered by a lack of resources. Smaller agencies often don’t have the technical expertise, staff, or funding to effectively respond to environmental concerns, meaning that some agencies within the region may not have the resources to effectively address environmental concerns at all. Additionally, issues of environmental justice and system
inequalities extend beyond jurisdictional boundaries as well. In the absence of a regional, collaborative approach, these issues are rarely adequately addressed.11

As such, recent research by the U.S. Sustainability Directors Network (USDN) finds that local “sum of parts” approaches to environmental sustainability and climate action planning have not been very successful.12 Instead, our research strongly emphasizes the need for multi-jurisdictional collaboration around sustainability and climate action planning.

Multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approaches
Multi-jurisdictional, collaborative sustainability planning is not easy work. Regional planning and sustainability are inherently complex concepts, which makes collaborative approaches for environmental sustainability and climate action planning difficult to begin and maintain. Sustainability itself is an ambiguous concept, which inevitably leads to different ideas for achieving environmental progress – ideas that range from short-term solutions to long-term transformations.13 These differences, which are often defined at an organizational level, can make regional consensus in planning difficult to achieve. Despite these challenges, many municipalities are finding ways to work together to advance environmental sustainability and climate action planning in their regions.

Generally, the research found two broad methods for collaborative sustainability planning. The first method is to develop a regional sustainability plan or document that guides local sustainability planning efforts, while the second approach is to form a regional collaborative group that works toward common goals through shared resources and knowledge.

Regional sustainability plans
In the first method, a regional sustainability or climate action plan seeks to guide the goals, strategies, implementation, and evaluation of sustainability practices within a region. The focus is primarily on developing shared regional goals and committing to achieving these goals through local adoption of the plan. Each jurisdiction within the region will then likely create their own plan, programs, and/or policies to address these goals within their own boundaries. Implementation of the plan occurs through the actions of local agencies, where the regional goals and targets influence the goals and strategies of each local jurisdiction’s individual plans or programs. Additionally, this method often includes agreement around specific goals and targets. For example, the regional collaborative may agree to reduce GHGs by 25% in the next 5 years. Ideally, each jurisdiction would then create their own plan on how to do this within their own boundaries. The strategies are local, but the outcomes contribute to meeting the regional goals. A tagline that has become common for reflecting this approach is “think globally, plan regionally, and act locally.”14

Benefits of this approach include the opportunity to seek community input as well as build consensus around goals and values for the region. Additionally, a collaborative approach for developing a regional sustainability plan allows local agencies to learn about specific program and policy opportunities and work together to create a more unified approach in advocating for local resources for implementation at the state and federal levels. 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. There is little, if any, consequence if local jurisdictions fail to adopt or implement the plan, undermining other
efforts throughout the region. Additionally, once the planning stage of developing a regional sustainability plan is complete, there can also be a tendency for collaboration to diminish, leaving local agencies to fend for themselves when it comes to implementation of the plan. Jurisdictions often have varying levels of resources and technical capacity for implementation, which can cause the region to fall back into individualized, local “sum of parts” mindsets that do little to advance the plan at the regional level.

**Regional collaboratives**

In lieu of traditional regional plans, many communities have approached multi-jurisdictional, collaborative planning work through the formation of “collobaratives,” commonly called regional climate collaboratives (RCCs) or regional resiliency collaboratives (RRCs). This method emphasizes consensus-oriented decision-making and relationship-building, and seeks to build consensus around shared environmental goals for the region. The focus here 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. Specifically, this approach looks to address the challenges of working beyond jurisdictional boundaries and tiers of governance by acknowledging that collaboration is a relationship-building process that requires time, patience, and commitment for the long-term.\(^{15}\)

The work of collaboratives differs around the country, but all RCCs and RRCs focus on building a network and capacity for sustainability work within their respective region. Collaborative members often include local leaders and practitioners, connecting key individuals across jurisdictional boundaries to organize local activities around common goals. Other key roles of the collaborative may include convening and public engagement, policy and planning recommendations, federal and state engagement and advocacy, obtaining funding for regional work, or providing technical assistance for member agencies.\(^{16}\)

Ultimately, the role and work of the collaborative is designed to meet the needs of local agencies and fill gaps in current environmental sustainability and climate action planning efforts in the region.

Benefits of this approach typically include more efficient implementation of shared goals. Improved efficiency through continued coordination and consensus building have been shown to improve implementation across regions.\(^{17}\) Collaborative work can also leverage scarce financial resources and assist smaller agencies in progressing work they may not be able to address on their own. Shared resources can also provide for expertise or technical assistance that may not be feasible for local jurisdictions to complete alone.

Drawbacks are similar to that of creating a regional sustainability plan. A collaboratives’ success depends on the level of participation from the region. Consensus and relationship-building is hard, time-consuming work and some local agencies may not have the ability to participate long-term. Additionally, building a consensus may also be difficult to achieve, limiting the actual work and success of the collaborative. Political realities between local jurisdictions may limit the scope of issues that the collaborative can agree to work on. Generally, collaboratives have been successful in improving the availability of data (i.e., inventories) and forecasting, but less successful in navigating complex issues such as land use and development, which are essential components of environmental sustainability planning.\(^{18}\) Funding and staffing of a collaborative can also be difficult to sustain.

Regardless of the approach, our research emphasizes the need for regions to adopt multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approaches towards environmental sustainability and climate action planning work. Still,
local context and political realities will shape the type of approach and the scale of work that is best for a region. In discussing multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approaches with the interviewed communities, we learned that collaborative approaches are still quite young and that there are many different ways in which collaboration occurs. No peer community’s work neatly fit into one approach or the other. Generally, the interviewed communities were just starting to move beyond local “sum-of-parts” approaches, beginning collaborative work with limited and focused priorities (e.g. resiliency). (Examples of their work is more fully described in the best practices section below.) Yet, our research also finds that without a commitment to truly integrated, long-term collaborative approaches, regions will not fully address concerns related to environmental sustainability and climate action.19

PART II: Best practices

Our research identified several best practice planning principles. Interviewees shared firsthand experiences with their work and, while each region defined and approached their work differently, several common themes emerged. Three broad categories help organize these principles: (1) Build a foundation, (2) support collaborative planning processes, and (3) adopt a best practice framework for planning and implementation. Building a foundation focuses on principles for getting started, supporting collaborative planning processes addresses the work that will be done during the initial planning phase, and adopting a best practice framework discusses the common elements that other communities have followed in developing and implementing shared plans and goals. Overall, 12 principles were identified as best practice for considering and conducting environmental sustainability and climate action planning work.

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. Four basic principles emerged, highlighting the importance of building a foundation as a key first step for engaging in collaborative environmental sustainability work.

1. Determine overall goals and purpose

It’s inevitable that different agencies have different priorities and foci, making it extremely important to clarify the purpose of collaborative work. Defining shared goals early in the process when beginning environmental sustainability work is essential. It will likely take time and involve a good deal of compromise and consensus building to agree on shared priorities and goals, but this will lay the groundwork for lasting relationships that are essential for the work to come.

It may be necessary to focus on consensus building as a key early step in the process. Many interviewees recommended preparing for negotiations, tensions, and passions that are inherent to environmental sustainability and climate action work from the beginning. In their work with establishing a RRC, the ECFRPC worked with the Institute for Sustainable Communities to facilitate a consensus-building process. It was stated that this process was essential for laying the early groundwork for their collaborative, building trust and new relationships among members from the different participating agencies. By prioritizing the consensus-building process, ECFRPC’s participating agencies were able to work through tensions and conflicts, and eventually agree on a shared purpose and goal for their work. This provided a stable foundation before moving into their long-term work together.
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.

Developing a common language allows all agencies to participate without risk of political fallout. In many communities, the concept of climate change has become a polarizing topic. Reframing this concept using alternative language, such as “sustainability,” may be necessary to break down silos and ensure that collaboration is not railroaded by political realities. Many communities have found that resiliency and adaptation work is generally more politically acceptable, but that mitigation efforts (i.e., carbon reduction) often created conflicts that could not be easily resolved.

Almost all of the communities found that their local agencies had varying levels of knowledge and understanding of the environmental issues at hand. Thus, many of the interviewed agencies found it necessary to provide some early educational opportunities to build an equal foundation of knowledge for their working group members. In some instances, creating educational opportunities became the first priority in their collaborative work. Additionally, understanding where gaps in knowledge occur can also inform where regions may need to seek technical assistance or other services in order to move forward.

In their work developing a Regional Resiliency Assessment, TJCOG found that many of their participating agencies had political differences when it came to the concept of climate change and mitigation work. Alternatively, resiliency and adaptation work was something that was politically acceptable. Thus, their work focused primarily on identifying climate threats and developing resiliency strategies for their communities. While mitigation strategies were not discussed in these early efforts, the Regional Resiliency Assessment project increased collaboration and discussion within the TJCOG region beyond these initial efforts.

3. Begin with data

Sustainability planning requires a strong fact-based foundation using the best data available. Each interviewed community stressed the importance of beginning the planning process with an assessment of the available data, including data on current conditions, future projections, and modeled impacts, if available.

Assessing availability of current data will help establish a baseline for the region as well as identify where gaps in data collection have occurred. Ultimately, the data can help to clarify the existing conditions of a community, informing the priorities and goals for a region. If the data is incomplete, goals may be as simple as improving the data that’s available. Additionally, establishing a baseline of data is essential for determining specific strategies when the planning process begins. Data will guide future implementation efforts and provides an opportunity to create performance-based goals for evaluating progress of plans and actions. Of the communities that had established metrics for tracking progress of their work, these metrics were directly informed by the baseline data at hand.

Agreeing on baseline data and specific sources for data will also make local agencies and organizations more likely to use what’s provided and less likely to duplicate data collection efforts, produce
contradictory metrics, or forge their own path. Conflicting information from multiple planning efforts can confuse and hinder efforts throughout the region.

4. Consider opportunities to align with existing plans and efforts

Best practice planning for environmental sustainability and climate action planning is to also consider how new work can align and contribute to existing plans and strategies. Strong environmental sustainability efforts and climate action work needs diverse representation – by different levels and departments of government, neighboring jurisdictions, non-profits, local universities, and the private sector – in order to be successful.\(^{21}\) Coordinated efforts across actors, sectors, and plans can help ensure such diverse representation is achieved. Additionally, research suggests that aligning and mainstreaming environmental sustainability and climate action work into many sectors and plans increases adoption and implementation.\(^{22}\)

Existing plans and efforts provide a starting point for determining shared values and goals relevant across many organizations and sectors. Many communities have existing legislation or sustainability frameworks that can guide priorities and strategies for environmental sustainability or climate action 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 plan. California legislation also guided the priorities for developing WRCOG’s climate action plan, ensuring that the work contributes to state goals. Regardless of whether there is guiding legislation, existing plans and documents provide an opportunity to identify shared values around the region and state. Many of the interviewed communities acknowledged that consensus started with earlier work and recognizing overlapping priorities, values, opportunities, and threats from previous efforts.

Additionally, aligning new efforts with existing plans and work ensures that new strategies and actions are adopted and coordinated across the many agencies and actors working in this space. By following existing plans, it’s possible to seek win-win strategies that are then included in various efforts, effecting the responsibilities and actions of many agencies (and internal departments) and organizations. This improves implementation efforts overall and outcomes are 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 growing like-minded efforts, increasing overall participation in environmental sustainability and climate action work.

Support collaborative planning processes

In addition to building a foundation for sustainability planning, our research also found several similarities in how communities approached their collaborative planning processes. Three key principles emerged for supporting collaborative planning processes.

1. Determine an advisory process for oversight and validation

Planning agencies typically have advisory processes in place, something that is also essential for collaborative planning processes. Each interviewed agency had an advisory committee that ultimately provided oversight and made difficult decisions for their collaborative work. Additionally, their advisory committees also helped to vet data, create buy-in among local partners, and position their work for success once the initial collaborative planning phases were over. While these advisory structures looked
slightly different for each region, communities stressed the important role their advisory groups played in their process.

It’s important to determine the right people to invite to the advisory group. 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. Generally, advisory groups 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 that could provide feedback from local experiences. In some cases, public health officials, social workers, emergency response personnel, and other professionals with working experience of vulnerable communities were also included in the advisory groups, playing an essential role in informing environmental and social justice aspects of the work.

Ultimately, it’s important that members of the advisory committee have attributes that contribute to successful planning processes and moving work along. Members should have working knowledge of environmental issues and climate action work, relationships and experiences that can contribute diverse perspectives, and the political acumen for making sure the work is “seen and heard.”

2. Incorporate community engagement and equity
Minority and low-income communities typically contribute the least to climate change yet they are often disproportionately burdened by the causes of climate change and environmental degradation (e.g., polluting industries).\(^{23}\) Additionally, these communities are also likely to be more vulnerable to the consequences of our climate crisis, such as extreme heat and flooding events. As such, community engagement and equity consistently came up in our research as essential components for engaging in collaborative environmental sustainability and climate action work.

All the interviewees acknowledged the importance of community engagement and equity in developing their plans, although some acknowledged that there was room for improvement in their initial efforts. Most of the communities interviewed relied on their advisory groups or technical assistance partners to represent the needs of their local jurisdictions and vulnerable populations. The City of Tempe, however, acknowledged that equity work is slow and instead focused on laying a foundation for changing the decision-making processes for future work. Generally, the interviewed communities used one of two approaches to determine how community needs and equity can be incorporated into planning processes.

The first approach is to incorporate past community engagement efforts, data, and/or spatial analysis into the environmental sustainability or climate action planning process. In many instances, the interviewed agencies’ climate action plans grew out of earlier sustainability work, which often included significant community. This earlier work was used to guide their priorities for their new environmental work (climate action planning). In cases without recent engagement efforts, 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 into their stakeholder
advisory group, ensuring that the needs of their vulnerable populations were heard during their planning process.

Other efforts using this approach saw some of the interviewed communities include spatial analysis for identifying vulnerable populations and frontline communities, prioritizing these areas in their plans and assessments. This focus on frontline communities seeks to identify what factors contribute to the inequitable burdens that are experienced due to climate change. 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 in their region (e.g., extreme heat and flooding). Such analysis does require expertise in GIS or other spatial analysis tools, but the EPA’s Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping tool is a user-friendly platform that helps communities who lack access or expertise in these tools.

A second approach towards community engagement and equity prioritizes inclusive and ongoing engagement and seeks to change the planning and decision-making processes so that equity is centered in the project. This approach recognizes that there is room to improve procedural equity and fair participation in all planning and decision-making processes, including environmental sustainability and climate action planning. By employing different and more inclusive participatory approaches to engagement, environmental sustainability and climate action plans can better recognize and address injustices.24

In a 2021 update to their climate action plan, the City of Tempe is moving towards such an approach. They are currently deploying a new Equity in Action plan that seeks to embed equity in their city planning and decision-making processes. Their plan includes developing a new advisory body made up of community members who live and work in low-income and minority communities, providing training and education for vulnerable communities so that they are more equipped to participate in public processes, and to begin implementing plans and projects based on recommendations that come directly from these groups. Tempe’s 2021 climate action plan update will go through this process, and updated strategies and implementation actions will come directly from this equity coalition and Tempe’s frontline communities.

Regardless of the approach, environmental sustainability and climate action plans should reflect the community’s concerns. Engagement processes and their outcomes should be clearly communicated in the plans themselves, showing how engagement informed the development of goals and strategies in the plan. Equity should also guide implementation of the plan, highlighting how future investment in collaboration, capacity building, and continued engagement will lead to more equitable outcomes for low-income and minority communities. All of the interviewed agencies agreed that environmental sustainability and climate action 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, timely, and inclusive.

3. Determine project scope and staff capacity

In discussing how agencies went about doing the actual planning work, it was learned that each 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 their project scope and staff expertise dictated
whether 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 through a regional agency, utilizing agency staff and resources, was the preferred method for this type of work. Conducting the work in-house was preferred not only due to cost and time savings, but because staff tend to be more knowledgeable about 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 take ownership of the plan, ensuring that staff are committed to the daily, on the ground work required to make the plan a success. 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 it, was key for building relationships and creating a foundation for implementation and future environmental 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. These partnerships allowed Tempe, TJCOG and ECFRPC the ability to incorporate technical expertise into their planning processes, while still developing their own plans in-house.

Adopt a best practice framework

Finally, our research found many similarities in how communities developed and structured their final plan and work. Five key principles emerged for developing and implementing shared plans and goals.

1. Keep it simple and set achievable goals

Key advice 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.

Keeping the plan simple is essential. Limiting the goals to only the few that emerge as the top priorities among stakeholders ensures that participating agencies “buy-in,” making implementation by local agencies much more likely to occur. Creating plans with too many goals and strategies can unintentionally create competing priorities within the region. This can make implementation and tracking unmanageable, ultimately effecting the success of the plan. By limiting the goals to a few select priorities (e.g., carbon reduction, transitioning to renewable energy, seeking environmental justice, etc.), it ensures that local agencies can make measurable progress on the shared priorities 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 undertakings. By setting expectations up front that the resulting plan will be a “phase I” document, the interviewed
agencies found that it helped to ease tensions, pressures, and expectations on the local agencies. Knowing that there will be future phases 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.

In Tempe’s initial undertaking of their climate action plan, they acknowledged that their timeline did not allow for certain aspects to be addressed. Instead, they positioned their plan as a first phase, and specifically documented when future updates would occur, and what missing elements would be addressed. Missing components include fiscal responsibility, enterprise, and equity and engagement. These will all be addressed in a 2021 update to their plan, just two years after the original work took place. This timeline has allowed Tempe to establish an Equity in Action plan, as well as lay some other groundwork that is needed to incorporate these missing elements into the plan. Similarly, the interviewees all agreed it was more important to get something started rather than to see efforts stalled because of conflicts that may arise from attempting to create an all-inclusive, “perfect” 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 and political realities, the strategies for environmental sustainability and climate action work will look very different from place to place. Generally, this work requires diverse and flexible strategies that focus on both mitigation and adaptation, but some regions may only focus on one for various reasons. Either way, strategies may include efforts to change planning processes, policies and design standards, land use, physical infrastructure, green infrastructure, and individual behavior, among others. Strategies may also 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 and 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 ensure they are directed towards frontline and vulnerable communities, who are often disproportionately impacted by climate change.

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 environmental sustainability and climate action strategies. Strategies should be developed that strengthen and reinforce one another, ensuring positive results when measuring regional impacts against climate change and environmental degradation.

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 TJCOG’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. Similarly, 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 resiliency, 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 memorandum of understanding (MOU) ensures each agency embeds the RRC’s work within their own agency’s policies and programs. While there are no documented strategies, the local agencies ongoing collaboration and commitment to shared goals ensures local actions are working together to make their region more resilient.

3. Include a clear process for implementation and monitoring

Providing a clear process for implementation is one of the most important aspects of environmental 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. In our own research, it is still too early to know whether 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 (e.g., 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 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 20 years before they are achieved. It’s critical, then, to monitor whether or not interim benchmarks are being met in order to evaluate whether proposed strategies are achieving their intended outcomes. In some cases, strategies may need to be updated or significantly altered if progress is not being made.
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 environmental sustainability planning efforts and additional adaptation strategies or protective policies may be necessary 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 climate action efforts in a region are being 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 environmental sustainability work. Typically, this occurs by monitoring baseline data and the changes that occur in that data over time (e.g., emissions levels). While process goals are usually tracked, outcomes have historically not been. However, our research finds that communities that have recently engaged in environmental sustainability and climate action planning work have adopted explicit and quantifiable goals and have clear strategies for tracking these goals. Evidence of sustained progress in meeting a region’s goals can help to increase visibility, motivation, excitement, and resources for the work.

The interviewed agencies shared that establishing metrics for their work was the most difficult aspect of 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, interviewees agreed that in an ideal planning scenario, the working group would agree to measurable goals as well as a process for tracking progress towards these goals over time.

5. Utilize human-focused communication and public education strategies

Finally, many of the interviewed communities also emphasized the need to publicize and communicate the plan to the general public to increase awareness and acceptance of environmental sustainability work in their communities. This is often done with other, more high-profile planning efforts (e.g., comprehensive master plans and regional transportation plans) but is less common for environmental sustainability and climate action work. However, research finds that many residents need to develop a better understanding of the regional sustainability issues facing their communities to truly take long-term perspectives into account. Educating and training the public on pertinent issues can increase engagement for future work as well as increase the number of potential advocates in the community. Indicators that are used to measure progress of the plan can also be used as public education devices, communicating how investment and community buy-in are contributing to the success of the plan.
Without increased visibility for this work, individual behaviors and community culture around large scale sustainability issues (e.g., single occupancy vehicles and VMT) are unlikely to change.

Additionally, increased visibility and communication will 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 flashy marketing, and more on human-centered messaging to show residents what implementation of the plan would look like (e.g., jobs closer to home, more open/green space). Specifically, humanizing communication 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, many of the interviewed agencies deployed messages that tied their environmental sustainability work to issues such as public health, housing, economic development, and education so that it was pertinent and relevant to their residents. Some communities have found that developing personas assists residents with understanding the inequities that occur throughout their region. These personas highlight the disparities between lived experiences and resources of different community members and communicates why actions and funding are prioritized for certain communities over others. Not only does this create support for the plan at hand, but human-focused communication helps increase engagement and political buy-in for future environmental efforts as well.

**Conclusion and recommendations**

There is not a one-size-fits-all approach to environmental sustainability and climate action planning but there are many things to be learned from communities that have already gone through this work. The conclusion is clear: Successful environmental sustainability and climate action planning requires integrated, coordinated, and collaborative approaches for planning and implementation.

Through a series of interviews, existing plan reviews, and academic literature research, our regional planning staff learned that many communities are moving beyond local “sum of parts” approaches, instead adopting multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approaches for addressing environmental issues. These approaches require local agencies and decision makers to take a more comprehensive view of environmental sustainability planning, recognizing that regions need to adopt shared values and goals, and create solutions for mitigating and adapting to climate change that are realistic for all local jurisdictions to adopt and implement.

Several best practices were also identified in this research, providing regions and local agencies with a roadmap for collaboration and successful implementation of environmental sustainability and climate action work. These best practices highlight the need to determine achievable and measurable goals and strategies as well as the importance of creating clear performance-based implementation and evaluation processes. They also focus on the need for broad and inclusive community engagement where equity and environmental justice are centered in environmental sustainability and climate action work. Ultimately, the work should reflect the community’s vision for quality of life and communicate how sustainability efforts will positively impact the community’s future.
Our research also finds several recommendations for improving the landscape of multi-jurisdictional, collaborative work around environmental sustainability nationwide. These recommendations include the following:

- Increase federal- and state-level funding for regional planning and implementation that prioritizes development of visions, plans, and performance-based implementation. Prioritize planning projects that align with existing federal, state, and local strategies, and that progress state and regional goals and strategies.
- Create state level incentive frameworks that encourage regions to align regional plans with state goals and develop funding for guiding local actions and maximizing coalition, grassroots, and private sector involvement.
- Prioritize the development of effective regional institutions, coalitions and advocacy groups and support collaboration efforts between implementation partners.
- Prioritize the development of effective incentivizes for encouraging the growth of green sector economy and jobs, and expand private sector partnerships for environmental sustainability and climate action planning and implementation.
- Support consistency through plan alignment that penetrates all policy levels and government agencies.
- Use participatory planning, consensus building, and long-term strategies for improving inclusive engagement, social learning, and public education.

In conclusion, Lady Bird Johnson reminds us, “the environment is where we all meet; where we all have a mutual interest; it is the one thing all of us share.” Ultimately, we all must work together to ensure an environmentally sustainable future.
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Appendix A: Glossary

**Adaptation:** Adaptation in this report refers specifically to “climate adaptation,” or the anticipation of the adverse and unavoidable effects of climate change and the actions taken to try to prevent or minimize these effects.

**Best practices:** Planning practices that have been shown by research and experience as being correct or most effective and are thus suitable for widespread adoption.

**Climate action:** Climate action refers to a two-part planning initiative: mitigation and adaptation. Mitigation seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and other causes of climate change, and adaptation looks to strengthen a community’s resilience and capacity for responding to climate-induced impacts. (See adaptation, mitigation, and resiliency.)

**Climate change:** A significant and long-term shift in global or regional climate patterns, primarily attributed to the increase in carbon in the Earth’s atmosphere, produced by the use of fossil fuels. Climate change refers specifically to the rise in global temperatures from the mid-20th century to present.

**Co-benefits:** Co-benefits in the context of this report refer specifically to the secondary, positive benefits that occur as a result of environmental sustainability and climate action work. Co-benefits may include: cleaner air, greener land, safe and secure energy, less waste, stronger economies, and improved quality of life.

**Emissions:** Emissions are generally substances, especially pollutants, discharged into the air (such as by a smokestack or automobile). This report largely refers to carbon (greenhouse gas) emissions, which is the release of carbon into the atmosphere. Carbon emissions are the primary contributor to climate change.

**Environmental justice:** Environmental justice is the fair treatment, meaningful involvement, and right to equal environmental protection for all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income. Environmental justice work seeks to ensure that all people have the right to live, work, and play in communities that are safe, healthy, and free of life threatening conditions.

**Environmental sustainability:** Acting in a way that ensures future generations have the natural resources needed to live an equal, if not better, way of life as current generations.

**Equity:** See social equity.

**Executive Order 2019-22:** Order directing the executive branch of the Nevada Governor’s Office to advance state climate goals. The directive includes the following actions: To create a state climate strategy by December 2020, to evaluate policies and strategies for how state agencies can contribute to meeting Nevada’s goals, to prepare agency risk assessments for all state agencies, to prepare priority lists for state agencies to implement building energy efficiency projects, and to encourage collaboration between state, local governments, and tribal organizations.

**Frontline communities:** Communities that are most impacted by climate change and other crises such as public health and economy. More often than not, frontline communities are communities of color, including Indigenous, African-American, Latinx, and Asian, and low-income.
**Greenhouse gas (GHG):** A gas that absorbs and releases radiation within the Earth’s atmosphere. Instead of letting the sun’s energy re-radiate back into space as infrared radiation after it’s entered our atmosphere, greenhouse gases absorb infrared radiation and trap it in the atmosphere. This is known as the greenhouse effect and it is the primary contribution from human activities to climate change.

**Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO):** An agency, created by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962, to provide local elected officials input into the planning and implementation of federal transportation funds to metropolitan areas having a population of more than 50,000. MPOs plan for regional transportation expenditures and are responsible for transportation planning throughout their metropolitan area. In Southern Nevada, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) oversees the region’s MPO. In addition to transportation planning, RTC’s MPO is also responsible for administering the regional policy plan known as Southern Nevada Strong. (See region and Southern Nevada.)

**Mitigation:** Mitigation in this report refers to “climate change mitigation.” Climate change mitigation seeks to reduce or prevent the emission of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and to limit the effects of climate change.

**Peer communities:** Peer communities is a term commonly used among planners and like-professionals to describe the process of learning, knowledge sharing, and collaborating with other similar communities across jurisdictional (oftentimes state) boundaries. This process provides planners with the opportunity to connect and share information with other professionals who would otherwise likely not interact. Planners and like-professionals typically connect with peer communities to learn from more experienced communities about the successes and challenges that can inform their own policies and practices in a particular issue area (e.g. climate action planning).

**Personas:** Personas are used in planning as a way to understand and describe the basic needs, experiences, behavior, and goals for different users and residents of a city. Research, demographics, and general data are used to create fictional characters and stories that represent broad types of people living within a particular focus area or city. It helps planners and their community identify that different types of people have different needs and expectations, and that plans are created to respond to these various needs.

**Region:** In this report, region refers to a geographic, metropolitan area that has fixed boundaries defined by the political subdivisions of a state. Regions typically have some level of governmental authority and are often made up of several municipalities and unincorporated counties. Locally, region refers to the political subdivision of Clark County, which includes the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, and Boulder City, as well as unincorporated Clark County and Mesquite.

**Regional Climate Collaborative (RCC):** A network for public and semi-public agencies to advance climate change solutions. RCCs typically focus on strategy development and implementation for climate change mitigation and adaptation. (See adaptation, climate action, and mitigation.)

**Regional planning:** The American Planning Association (APA) defines regional planning, most simply, as the act of collaborating to plan for common issues within a common geographic area.
Regional Resiliency Collaborative (RRC): A network for public and semi-public agencies to advance resiliency solutions. RCCs typically focus on strategy development and implementation for climate change adaptation only. (See adaptation and resiliency.)

Resiliency: Resiliency is the capacity to recover from or adjust to adversity or change. In this report, resiliency is discussed in the context of “climate resiliency,” which is the ability to recover from and adjust to hazardous events, trends, and disturbances that occur because of climate change (e.g. extreme heat). (See adaptation and climate action.)

SB 254: Nevada State Senate legislation that requires an 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: Nevada State Senate legislation that raises Nevada’s renewable energy portfolio standard to 50% by 2030.

Social equity: The American Planning Association (APA) defines social equity as the fair and just inclusion into society in which all people, regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential.

Southern Nevada: Southern Nevada is the term used locally to describe our region. (See region.)

Sustainability: Sustainability refers to the practice of meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. In planning, planners work to maximize the benefits of environment, equity, and economy, the three “Es,” for the current population, while ensuring that these qualities are not compromised for future generations to come.

Vulnerable populations: Groups and communities that are at a greater risk for poor health due to barriers they experience to social, economic, political, and environmental resources, as well as limitations due to age, illness, disability, or language proficiency.

Quality of life: General well-being of individuals and societies including access to clean, healthy, and adequate air, water, land, food, education, transportation, safety, and housing.
Resources


## Appendix B: Sustainability and climate action plan comparison matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization, Location, &amp; Title of Plan</th>
<th>Data &amp; Previous Planning Efforts</th>
<th>Stakeholders/Partners</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Mitigation Components</th>
<th>Adaptivity/Resiliency Components</th>
<th>Equity &amp; Engagement</th>
<th>Implementation &amp; Evaluation</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Other Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Vegas Climate Action Plan (2019)</td>
<td>2019 community emissions inventory, Municipal CO2e inventory</td>
<td>City’s Sustainability Committee oversees the planning process. City partnered with Bureau of Land Management, and community engagement. Federal Title IX research on ozone-creating conditions in Vegas to inform future projects.</td>
<td>Increase urban and green infrastructure to reduce emissions.</td>
<td>Increase use of renewable energy and reduce energy emissions (4 actions).</td>
<td>Reduce transportation emissions and VMT (4 actions).</td>
<td>Equity is recognized as a priority.</td>
<td>High-light groups city’s core priorities, key partners for collaboration, and relevant community feedback that justifies action.</td>
<td>Plan helps to justify staff additions for implementation as well as other city investments for climate action planning. 2021 CMP update is currently underway. Participation in ATAC (plan for centering equity in city planning prompts) is underway and will center equity in the 2021 CAP update.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG); Regional Climate Action Plan (2016)</td>
<td>California legislation; WRCOG Sustainability Frameworks (2012); GHG emissions report (2011)</td>
<td>California legislation; WRCOG Sustainability Frameworks (2012); GHG emissions report (2011)</td>
<td>Reduce GHG emissions to meet levels required by California legislation.</td>
<td>Reduce VMT, cleaner fuel requirements, expanded public transit, and discourage single occupancy vehicles, and improve electric vehicle infrastructure.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Collaborative as it existed during the planning process was discontinued. But all the participating agencies have continued resilience work in their jurisdiction and in partnership with one another on various projects. TDCOG continues to be active in furthering resilience work throughout the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization, Location, Title of Plan</td>
<td>Data &amp; Previous Planning Efforts</td>
<td>Stakeholders/Partners</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Mitigation Components</td>
<td>Adaptive/Resiliency Components</td>
<td>Equity &amp; Engagement</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Denver Climate Action Plan (2016)</td>
<td>Denver’s Climate Action Plan (2007); Western Water Assessment report</td>
<td>City and county put together a working group made up of various municipal department to identify Denver’s top vulnerabilities to climate change. Denver’s Climate Resilience Committee works to prepare the region for climate change.</td>
<td>Prepare, mitigate and plan for risks associated with climate change - hotter more variable weather.</td>
<td>Denver’s Climate Action Plan addresses mitigation efforts (see below).</td>
<td>Priority waterbodies are: current heat and urban heat island; increased frequency of extreme weather events, reduced snowpack and earlier snowmelt. Sections addressed in the plan are buildings and energy, health and human services, land-use and transportation, urban natural resources, water conservation, and food and agriculture. Each sector has short-, mid-, and long-term strategies for adapting to climate change.</td>
<td>Addressed in the health and human services component; prioritizes community assistance to vulnerable populations; implemented a “Road Home” program - 10 year program to provide permanent housing, shelters, and services to Denver’s homeless population; a “Cold Weather Plan” which provides emergency shelters during extreme cold. Explores an extreme heat shelter plan.</td>
<td>Plans include short-, mid-, and long-term strategies as well as a responsible agency. City agencies are held accountable through a city-wide Environmental Management System (EMS). EMS targets are audited annually. Denver’s Climate Resilience Committee meets on a regular basis to discuss how strategic and long-range planning efforts can incorporate adaptation strategies.</td>
<td>Next phase will continue the Climate Action Plan and the Climate Adapation plan into one document. Future actions will focus on establishing metrics for risk- and long-term actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Denver Climate Action Plan (2015)</td>
<td>City established a 2020 Climate Goal. In 2012 CH4 emissions reduction below 2005 levels by 2030.</td>
<td>Denver’s Climate Action Plan (2015): CH4 emissions inventory; 2030 CH4 emissions inventory; state’s Clean Air; Clean Jobs and Renewables Portfolio Standard.</td>
<td>Meet Denver’s 2020 climate goal of reducing GHG emissions by 10% below 2005 levels in 2030. Identify strategies for meeting long-term goal; reduce GHG emissions below 2005 levels by 2030.</td>
<td>2013 inventory highlighted the following sectors as primary sources of GHG emissions: buildings and energy, land use and transportation, waste and consumption, urban natural resources, and food and agriculture.</td>
<td>RIA - see Denver Climate Adaptation Plan</td>
<td>Strategies highlight co-benefits to environmental, health and safety, and economy, and plans state that climate equity and environmental justice is prioritized in climate action planning. Collaborative processes involve multiple city agencies: Office of Sustainability, Sustainable Advisory Council, and other external agencies to identify short-, mid-, and long-term strategies; hosted two community meetings and meeting for local non-profits.</td>
<td>City release an annual GHG emissions inventory to report on progress and forecasts future progress to determine if it’s on track. Consistently updates CAP with new climate science, strategies, policies, and programs. City continued certification in ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems (EMS) to incorporate environmental considerations into day-to-day operations. EMS system helps to hold agencies accountable.</td>
<td>2015 stakeholder process produced recommendations for long-term action; 2018 Denver BOS/Denver Climate Action Plan prioritized long-term strategies and sets interim benchmarks for achieving long-term goals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization, Location, &amp; Title of Plan</td>
<td>Data &amp; Previous Planning Efforts</td>
<td>Stakeholders/Partners</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Mitigation Components</td>
<td>Adaptive/Resiliency Components</td>
<td>Equity &amp; Engagement</td>
<td>Implementation &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Mesa, NV: Resilience Sustainability and Climate Action Plan 2016-2020</td>
<td>2014 community-wide GRI emission inventory; 2017 Sustainability Report; Certified 3-STAR community; baseline GRI inventory will be conducted in 2019/20</td>
<td>2014 community-wide GRI emission inventory was done through partnerships with: Valdez County Health District, Mesa County Health Department, University of Nevada, City established a Sustainability and Climate Advisory Committee to oversee planning process (over 200 stakeholders)</td>
<td>Meet承诺s to 2014 Climate Agreement, Global Covenant of Mayors on Climate and Energy, and America’s Climate Pledge to reduce GHG emissions by 2050, 40% reduction by 2030, and 80% reduction by 2050.</td>
<td>Lots to reduce GHG emissions through increased use of renewable energy, increasing energy efficiency, and to preserve working landscapes and increase urban food sources.</td>
<td>Lots to increase resiliency planning within city operations and within the region. Increase the urban tree canopy, encourage green building and efficiency, and to preserve working landscapes and increase urban food sources.</td>
<td>Plan was developed through extensive stakeholder input (over 100 stakeholders contributed to the plan).</td>
<td>Adopted a 2-year monitoring and reporting cycle conduct a community-wide GHG emissions inventory; report progress yearly; conduct community-wide GRI emission inventory at end of 2-year period and assess progress towards goals. Also adopted specific metrics for each of 3 priority areas that can be used to measure progress. Implementation strategy matrix identifies lead agency, time frame, funding, and resources needed.</td>
<td>Improving the city’s commitment to climate action is a contributing factor to Mary’s success and will enhance the city’s credit rating. No specific outcomes reported at this time. (likely too early in the process for progress reporting to occur).</td>
<td>The Resilience Plan also includes general elements related to sustainability. Many of the 5 priorities focus on improving the overall sustainability of the city and region. Additional priorities include: protecting green building as standard practice, creating livable, low-carbon neighborhoods, and developing a plan for zero waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Climate Action Plan: Draft sustainable LA County Plan: 2019</td>
<td>Our Country Sustainability Plan (Resilient LA County: March 2020)</td>
<td>Our Country Sustainability Plan (Resilient LA County: March 2020); Community-wide GRI emissions report; LA County Climate Agreement</td>
<td>Worked closely on stakeholder engagement from the Our Country Sustainability Plan. Community-based organizations reviewed the report and included input collected through an online survey.</td>
<td>To reduce GHG emissions and achieve carbon neutrality by 2025, 50% before 2030, and 205% before 2050, and achieve carbon neutrality by 2051.</td>
<td>Lots to promote water conservation and smart growth building practices, conserve forests and wetlands and achieve a very low footprint, and making sustainable improvements to industrial processes; County will lead by example and prioritize these actions in municipal operations and maintenance.</td>
<td>Each strategy addresses the 5 guiding principles of Our Country’s plan, one of which is to promote healthy, just, and equitable communities, implementation efforts will follow the Community’s Equity Development Work Program.</td>
<td>Implementation strategies are prioritized as major, minor, or enabling actions. Each strategy includes specific reduction targets and benchmarks; each strategy lists a lead agency, timeline and cost. Will create a CAP and implementation team to track progress and identify funds. Will publish an annual progress report as part of the General Plan Annual Progress Report. Will update the GRI inventory and CAP every 5 years.</td>
<td>Established a GRI emissions baseline and targeted benchmarks for achieving goals.</td>
<td>[Each strategy reflects whether or not it is aligned with the Our Country’s Sustainability Plan and acknowledges possible co-benefits; all are aligned with the 5 guiding principles of Our County’s plan]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Environmental sustainability planning decision tree
Environmental sustainability planning and climate change are widely considered among the defining challenges of the 21st century. In a recent publication on current trends in regional planning, the American Planning Association (APA) notes a growing focus on sustainability and resiliency concerns.¹ Urban areas currently account for 70% of both global energy use and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, primarily in the transportation, industrial, building, and energy sectors.² In Nevada, the transportation sector alone contributes 35% of gross GHG emissions across the state.³ Continued urbanization in Southern Nevada threatens to intensify these impacts. As such, the Southern Nevada urbanized region will need to play a major role in planning for environmental sustainability and climate action.

In the past year, there has been substantial discussion about the need for environmental sustainability planning in Southern Nevada. These discussions have been a reaction to both public input and to recent state legislation. As a result, there are new opportunities for environmental sustainability planning (and climate action planning) at the local, county and state levels in Nevada.

In response, the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada’s (RTC) Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) researched how other large metropolitan regions are approaching environmental sustainability planning and to get a better sense for how this work might move forward in Southern Nevada in the future. Regional planning staff conducted an academic literature review as well as reviewed several existing climate action plans from peer communities in order to understand the breadth of environmental sustainability work that’s taking place around the country. Additionally, we interviewed multiple local and regional governments to gain insight into how other large regions have addressed and engaged their peers in this recent work. The following four agencies were available to discuss their past and present planning efforts with us:

- 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

Draft reports were also reviewed by members of a technical advisory committee as well as individual regional stakeholders, all of whom provided feedback that was incorporated into our final reports.

This Regional Environmental Sustainability Inventory: Key Findings offers an abbreviated report on our research findings. A robust report detailing our research, including several examples of this work in action, can be found in our full-length Regional Environmental Sustainability: Inventory of Planning Tools & Techniques report. Through this research, regional planning staff identified two primary approaches to regional sustainability planning and several best practices that can serve as a roadmap for communities and agencies who are beginning their own environmental sustainability and climate action planning work.
Recent climate action in Nevada

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

- The primary goal of the U.S. Climate Alliance is to reduce carbon emissions by 28% below 2005 levels by 2025.
- SB 254 also commits Nevada to reducing carbon emissions by 45% below 2005 levels by 2030.

Executive order 2019-22
Order directing 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

What does the SNS Regional Policy Plan say?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVEST IN COMPLETE COMMUNITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCREASE TRANSPORTATION CHOICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING CAPACITY FOR IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals in this section broadly state the need for the region to enhance collaboration around regional planning priorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SB 254
SB 254 requires an 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
SB 358 raises Nevada’s renewable energy portfolio standard to 50% by 2030.
Background

In the past, sustainability and environmental planning, such as water and air quality, have been motivated by public or political encouragement to tackle the impacts of specific local concerns that are perceived to be within government control. The climate challenges of today have also caused many states to again adopt legislation that looks to solve a broad spectrum of environmental issues. Recent legislation in Nevada, specifically SB 254, SB 358, and Executive Order 2019-22, are again encouraging local governments to work together to address environmental concerns, most notably GHG emissions, reducing carbon levels across the state, and resiliency concerns.

Sustainability and climate action planning are two common planning practices for addressing these types of concerns. Sustainability plans typically address a large spectrum of issues and generally set a broad vision for the future of a region. They usually propose comprehensive, holistic approaches for addressing development issues related to the economy, social equity, and the environment (the “3 Es”). Conversely, climate action plans (or environmental sustainability plans) focus primarily on the environmental aspects of sustainability. Specifically, climate action plans look to mitigate the causes (e.g., GHG emissions) and adapt to the threats (e.g., extreme heat events) of climate change. Robust climate action plans may (and should) address economic and social issues as well but generally climate action plans are not as broadly focused as sustainability plans.

In many ways, the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan, adopted by the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC) as the regional policy plan, acts as a sustainability plan for the region. It describes a future where Southern Nevada’s residents have access to quality, livable communities where jobs, education, housing, transit, urban and natural resources, and opportunities are available for all. It provides a variety of strategies for coordinating regional responses to these issues, but it does not specifically address climate action head on. Many of our region’s local agencies have created specific climate action plans (or similar), but these plans focus primarily on local, individual priorities and have not been coordinated around regional environmental goals.

Diagram of potential climate action strategies. Source: LA County Climate Action Plan, 2020
PART I: General approaches to environmental sustainability planning

Approaches to environmental 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 others are coming together for a more multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approach.

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, including Southern Nevada. 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.

While these efforts may yield some positive results, many potential problems 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 U.S. Sustainability Directors Network (USDN) found that standalone plans at the local level are not very successful. Ultimately, our research confirmed these findings and, instead, strongly emphasized the need for multi-jurisdictional collaboration around environmental sustainability and climate action planning.

Multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approaches

Many regions around the country are finding ways to work together to develop multi-jurisdictional, collaborative solutions for tackling issues related to environmental sustainability and climate action. Specifically, our research found two types of collaborative approaches to this work. In the first approach, communities such as the Triangle J region in North Carolina and the Western Riverside region in California developed regional sustainability plans or documents that guide local implementation and action. Deploying a different method for collaboration, the Eastern Central Florida region developed a regional resiliency collaborative. In this second type of collaborative planning, the group works toward common goals through shared resources, knowledge, and local action.

In the first method, a regional sustainability plan seeks to guide the goals, strategies, implementation, and evaluation of climate action practices within a region. Here, 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. Thus, this method requires agreement around specific goals and targets. Benefits of this approach include the opportunity to seek community input, build consensus around goals and values for the region, and gain 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 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 traditional regional environmental sustainability plans, many communities have approached this work through the formation of collaboratives, commonly called regional climate collaboratives (RCCs) or regional resiliency collaboratives (RRCs). 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 and local commitment to this work can be difficult to sustain.

Both approaches to collaboration have seen some signs of early success, but fully understanding their long-term impacts and whether collaborative work will be more successful than sum-of-parts approaches, are somewhat unknown at this time. Ultimately, however, our research found an emphasis on the need for regions to adopt new, transformative, integrated approaches towards environmental sustainability and climate action planning work.

**PART II: Best practices for environmental sustainability and climate action planning**

Our research identified several best practice planning principles. Interviewees shared first hand experiences with their work and, while each region defined and approached their work differently, several common themes emerged. Three broad categories help organize these principles:

1. **Build a foundation**
2. **Support collaborative planning processes, and**
3. **Adopt a best practice framework for planning and implementation.**

Building a foundation focuses on principles for getting started, supporting collaborative planning processes addresses the work that will be done during the initial planning phase, and adopting a best practice framework discusses the common elements that other communities have followed in developing and implementing shared plans and goals. Overall, 12 principles were identified as best practice for considering and conducting environmental sustainability and climate action planning work.

**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. Four basic principles emerged, highlighting the importance of building a foundation as a key first step for engaging in collaborative sustainability work.

1. **1. Determine overall purpose and goals**

It’s inevitable that different agencies have different priorities and foci, making it extremely important to clarify the purpose of collaborative work. Therefore, defining shared goals early on in the process when beginning environmental sustainability work is essential. It will likely take time and involve a good deal of compromise and consensus building to agree on shared priorities and goals, but this will lay the groundwork for lasting relationships that are essential for the work to come.

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

In many communities, issues such as climate change and environmental degradation are polarizing topics. Thus, collaborative work may require groups to adopt a common language. Less politically-charged language, such as “sustainability” planning can break down barriers and ensure that collaboration is not railroaded by political realities. Additionally, there may be large differences in the levels of expertise and understanding between the staff and decision-makers of different local agencies. It may be necessary to prioritize education and training early on to ensure that all participants have a similar understanding and foundation for addressing the issues at hand before moving forward.
3. Begin with data

Environmental sustainability and climate action planning requires a strong foundation of facts, using the best data available. This includes data on current conditions and future projections. Current data will help establish a baseline for the region as well as identify where gaps in data collection have occurred. Ultimately, the data should help to establish priorities, goals, and strategies for a region, ensuring that performance measures are quantifiable and measurable for future implementation and evaluation of the work.

4. Consider opportunities to align with existing plans

Successful environmental sustainability and climate action work needs diverse representation across different actors, sectors, and plans. Existing plans and work can provide a starting point for determining broader shared values and goals across the region and state. Aligning priorities with existing work ensures that strategies are coordinated not only locally and across the state, but among different levels and departments of government, neighboring jurisdictions, non-profits, local universities, and the private sector as well. Additionally, coordination with existing plans and efforts can reduce duplication and inconsistencies, and at the same time, increase the ability to allocate resources to like-minded efforts throughout the region and state.

Support collaborative planning processes

In addition to building a foundation for sustainability planning, our research also found several similarities in how communities approached their collaborative planning processes. Three key principles emerged for supporting collaborative planning processes.

1. Determine an advisory process for oversight and validation

Local municipalities and agencies typically have advisory processes in place for planning and policy development, which is necessary for collaborative environmental sustainability and climate action planning work as well. Advisory committees provide oversight and validation for the work being done, helping to vet data, create buy-in, and position the work for success in years to come. It’s important that members of the advisory committee have working knowledge of local environmental issues and climate action work, as well as relationships and experiences that can contribute diverse perspectives to the work.

2. Incorporate community engagement and equity

Minority and low-income communities typically contribute the least to climate change and environmental degradation, yet are often disproportionately burdened by their causes (e.g., polluting industries) and typically possess the least amount of resources for adapting to potential threats and extreme events. Acknowledging and addressing
these inequities should be front and center in environmental sustainability and climate action work. Communities are doing this in a number of ways, including incorporating data and spatial analysis on vulnerable populations as well as prioritizing inclusive and ongoing engagement, actively informing decision-making at all levels of their process. Regardless of the approach, engagement processes and their outcomes should be clearly communicated and documented, highlighting how engagement and equity informed the priorities of the plan and work to come.

3. Determine project scope and staff capacity

Environmental sustainability and climate action planning can encompass a variety of priorities and goals and, ultimately, the project scope will inform whether outside partners and services are needed for the work. However, our research found that communities recommended that in-house staff develop the plan or conduct the work if time, capacity, and expertise allows. In-house staff tend to be more knowledgeable about local conditions and are more likely to “own” the work once the planning phase is finished. This ensures that staff are committed to the daily, on-the-ground work that’s required to make the plan a success. Moreover, successful environmental sustainability and climate action planning requires building strong relationships and trust, making in-house plan development an ideal scenario for building a long-term network of agencies and persons who will ultimately oversee implementation of the plan.

Adopt a best practice framework for planning and implementation

Finally, our research found many similarities in how communities developed and structured their final plan and work. Five key principles emerged for developing and implementing shared plans and goals.

1. Keep it simple and set achievable goals

Key advice from many communities is to keep the plan and work simple, and to set achievable goals. Plans and initiatives that are overly ambitious are not implemented well. Limiting the goals to only the few that emerge as the top priorities among stakeholders ensures that participating agencies “buy-in,” making implementation by local agencies much more likely to occur. Communities also described value in adopting a phased approach to their work. Phasing this work can help ease tensions, pressures, and expectations, allowing participants to focus on their shared priorities and to let go of the notion of developing a “perfect plan.” Areas of conflict can continue to be negotiated and incorporated into future versions of the plan.

A recent study by Deetjen, Conger, Leibowicz, and Webber (see endnotes) compared 29 climate action plans from cities across the U.S. and identified 22 different climate planning policies. These planning policies were grouped into three categories: Essential, priority, and additional.

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.
2. Create flexible strategies that encourage synergies

Environmental sustainability and climate action work will require diverse strategies that focus on both mitigation and adaptation. Our research found that many strategies and policies related to mitigation and adaptation have numerous dependencies, trade-offs, and synergies between them. These relationships create important considerations for developing environmental sustainability and climate action strategies. Synergies should be maximized so that strategies strengthen and reinforce one another, instead of inadvertently counteracting each other. Additionally, strategies should be flexible enough that local agencies can adopt them in a way that fits with their agencies political realities and resources, encouraging broad participation in the work. Strategies may include efforts to change planning processes, policies and design standards, land use, physical infrastructure, green infrastructure, and individual behavior, as well as seek to increase education, capacity building, technology, and research.

3. Include a clear process for implementation and monitoring

Providing a clear process for implementation is one of the most important aspects of environmental sustainability and climate action planning. Plans need clear and reliable timelines, funding sources, and responsible organizations. Additionally, plans should outline the method of evaluation, responsible parties, and requirements for reporting progress and updating the plan. Monitoring implementation and progress of the plan also plays a key role.

It’s critical to monitor interim benchmarks and to evaluate whether proposed strategies are achieving their intended outcomes. Strategies may need to be updated 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.

4. Include benchmarks and performance measures for tracking progress

Benchmarks and metrics will ultimately tell the story of whether progress is being made on a community’s environmental sustainability priorities and goals. Ideally, both progress tracking and outcome tracking methods will be used. Process tracking refers to actions that increase the capacity or operationalization of the plan, whereas outcome tracking refers to measurable regional impacts that may occur as a result of environmental sustainability work. Process goals are typically tracked while outcome goals are not. Many communities are now adopting explicit and quantifiable goals with clear strategies for tracking the progress of these goals. Evidence of sustained progress in meeting a region’s goals can help to increase visibility, motivation, excitement, and resources for the work.

5. Utilize human-focused communication and public education strategies

Publicizing and communicating the priorities and intended outcomes of a community’s environmental sustainability work is essential for increasing awareness and acceptance of this work with community members. Research finds that many residents need to develop a better understanding of the regional sustainability issues facing their communities to truly take long-term perspectives into account. Additionally, increased visibility and communication will help residents understand how public investment contributes directly to their quality of life and experiences within the city. Humanizing communication strategies can connect residents to local issues and outcomes. Many of the interviewed agencies deployed messages that tied their environmental sustainability work to issues such as public health, housing, economic development, and public education. Educating and training the public on pertinent issues can increase engagement for future work as well as increase the number of potential advocates for environmental sustainability and climate action in the community.

Conclusion and recommendations

There is not a one-size-fits-all approach to environmental sustainability and climate action planning but there are many things to be learned from communities that have already gone through this work. The conclusion is clear: Successful
environmental sustainability and climate action planning requires integrated, coordinated, and collaborative approaches for planning and implementation.

Through this research, our regional planning team found that many communities are moving beyond local “sum of parts” approaches, instead adopting multi-jurisdictional, collaborative approaches for addressing environmental issues. Additionally, several best practices were also identified in this research, providing regions and local agencies with a roadmap for collaboration and successful implementation of environmental sustainability and climate action work. These best practices highlight the need to determine achievable and measurable goals and strategies as well as the importance of creating clear performance-based implementation and evaluation processes. They also focus on the need for broad and inclusive community engagement where equity and environmental justice are centered in environmental sustainability and climate action work. Ultimately, the work should reflect the community’s vision for quality of life and communicate how sustainability efforts will positively impact the community’s future.

Our research also finds several recommendations for improving the landscape of multi-jurisdictional, collaborative work around environmental sustainability nationwide. These recommendations include the following:

- Increase federal- and state-level funding for regional planning and implementation that prioritizes development of visions, plans, and performance-based implementation. Prioritize planning projects that align with existing federal, state, and local strategies, and that progress state and regional goals and strategies.
- Create state level incentive frameworks that encourage regions to align regional plans with state goals and develop funding for guiding local actions and maximizing coalition, grassroots, and private sector involvement.
- Prioritize the development of effective regional institutions, coalitions, and advocacy groups and support collaboration efforts between implementation partners.
- Prioritize the development of effective incentivizes for encouraging the growth of green sector economy and jobs, and expand private sector partnerships for environmental sustainability and climate action planning and implementation.
- Support consistency through plan alignment that penetrates all policy levels and government agencies.
- Use participatory planning, consensus building, and long-term strategies for improving inclusive engagement, social learning, and public education.

In conclusion, Lady Bird Johnson reminds us, “the environment is where we all meet; where we all have a mutual interest; it is the one thing all of us share.” Ultimately, we all must work together to ensure an environmentally sustainable future.

Prepared by the Southern Nevada Regional Transportation Commission
Metropolitan Planning Organization
August 2020
Endnotes


6 Ibid.


Many of the terms used in this report have broad meanings based on time (history), context, location, community, and evolution of environmental planning theory and policy. Such terms have been highlighted in bold throughout the report and are defined in the glossary in Appendix A.
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AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT: REGIONAL PARTNER PRESENTATION FROM SNRPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETITIONER: M.J. Maynard, Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</td>
<td>THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON STRATEGIC VISIONING FROM THE SOUTHERN NEVADA REGIONAL PLANNING COALITION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL: 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:
The Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Regional Plan is the adopted regional policy plan of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition (SNRPC) as required by Nevada Revised Statute (NRS). The SNRPC is a body made up from representatives of each local government in urbanized Clark County along with the Clark County School District.

The SNRPC has been engaged in strategic visioning in order to refine its structure, membership, and strategy. The Vice Chair of the SNRPC will share recent changes and updates to its structure and priorities.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG RABORN
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SUBJECT:** SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE OFFICERS  
**PETITIONER:** M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA  

**RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:**  
THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE DESIGNATE OFFICERS FOR 2021 (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 Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada’s (RTC) Policies and Procedures as they relate to the Southern Nevada Strong (SNS) Steering Committee provide that the Chair and Vice Chair be selected by a majority of the SNS Steering Committee annually at its October meeting. The new Chair and Vice Chair are to serve for the following 12 months.  

Attached to this item are the responsibilities of the Chair and Vice Chair as identified in the SNS Steering Committee Policies and Procedures.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG RABORN  
Director of Metropolitan Planning Organization

SNS Item #6  
October 29, 2020  
Non-Consent
19.0 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE

19.1 CREATION AND PURPOSE
The Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee (Steering Committee) will coordinate and support implementation of the Southern Nevada Strong Regional Plan (Regional Plan). The Steering Committee will engage, educate and empower member organization’s constituencies in Regional Plan implementation. The Steering Committee will assist RTC staff by providing valuable insight and guidance on 1) how Southern Nevada Strong can support his or her organization; and 2) region-wide activities and strategies Southern Nevada Strong can take to support implementation.

19.2 MEMBERSHIP
A. The membership of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee shall consist of a senior management representative from each of the thirteen regional partners identified in the Regional Plan:
   1. City of Las Vegas
   2. City of Henderson
   3. City of North Las Vegas
   4. Clark County
   5. City of Boulder City
   6. Clark County School District
   7. Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition
   8. Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC)
   9. RTC Board Liaison
   10. University of Nevada Las Vegas
   11. Southern Nevada Water Authority
   12. Southern Nevada Health District
   13. Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority
   14. Southern Nevada Conservation District

B. The membership of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee shall also consist of the following community and special interests representatives:
   1. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco
   2. Las Vegas Global Economic Alliance
   3. Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
   4. Nevada Department of Transportation
   5. United Way of Southern Nevada
   6. Urban Lands Institute
   7. Brookings Mountain West

C. Members of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee shall be selected by the entity, firm or agency they represent.

D. Southern Nevada Strong Member Absences
   1. Excusal of an absence may be obtained by contacting the Steering Committee Chair, the RTC General Manager or his or her designee prior to the meeting at which the absence will occur.
   2. Steering Committee members must attend 75% of meetings over the course of a calendar year. If not, recommendations by the Chair, in consultation with the Vice Chair may be made to replace a Steering Committee member to ensure adequate representation and participation.

E. Each Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee member shall have one vote.

F. The terms of the members of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee shall be indefinite.
G. For each member provided for in paragraphs (A) and (B), one alternate member may be appointed. Such alternate members will exercise all functions of the member in the member's absence. All members and alternates must be designated, in writing, to the RTC General Manager.

19.3 OFFICERS AND DUTIES
A. A chair and vice-chair shall be elected annually, at the first meeting in October, from the voting membership of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee.

B. The succeeding chair will officiate at the October meeting and will serve for 12 months.

C. The chair shall preside at all meetings, call the meetings, and represent the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee at all meetings.

D. In the event that the chair is unable to perform these duties, the vice-chair shall act in the place of the chair.

19.4 MEETINGS
A. The Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee shall meet quarterly or as needed. Special meetings of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee may be called as directed by:
   1. The RTC
   2. The Chair of the Steering Committee
   3. The request of more than one-half of the membership
   4. The Chair of the RTC

B. A simple majority of the Steering Committee's members shall constitute a quorum.

C. The Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee shall follow a prepared agenda, subject to a publicly posted notice of public meeting as required by the Nevada State law. Items for discussion or action at a Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee meeting must be submitted to the General Manager at least 12 working days prior to the meeting date. The General Manager may waive the 12 day requirement, in accordance with his or her authority pursuant to the RTC Administrative Procedures for Agenda Processing. The recommendations of the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee will be forwarded to the Regional Transportation Commission Board of Commissioners.

D. The Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee has the authority to appoint working groups to serve a specific and exclusive purpose, which should be memorialized before it begins conducting its business. These working groups shall make recommendations to the Southern Nevada Strong Steering Committee for action.

19.5 ROBERT’S RULES OF ORDER
Robert’s Rule of Order will be used except as follows:
1. Seconds will not be required for any motion.
2. The chair can make motions and can vote on any motion.
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AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</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 #7
October 29, 2020
Non-Consent
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SUBJECT: SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS

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

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 on future agenda items. Staff desires to keep meetings of the SNS Steering 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 #8  
October 29, 2020  
Non-Consent
# REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

## AGENDA ITEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Planning Organization</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Administration and Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBJECT:</strong> CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PETITIONER:</strong> M.J. MAYNARD, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION OF SOUTHERN NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION BY PETITIONER:</strong> THAT THE SOUTHERN NEVADA STRONG STEERING COMMITTEE CONDUCT A COMMENT PERIOD FOR CITIZENS PARTICIPATION</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:**

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

mld