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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the Las Vegas Metropolitan Region is the fastest growing region in the United States and has been for several years. The same source lists Henderson as the fastest growing large city (over 100,000 population) since 1990.

To mitigate the effects of growth, the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority (SNSPA) was created in 1997. It was tasked with creating a 20 year plan for growth and presenting that plan to the 1999 legislature. The purpose of this paper is to determine if the residents of Henderson agree with the contents of the plan, as it was submitted to the legislature in 1999.

Henderson and Clark County Growth

Since 1977, Southern Nevada's population has grown from 405,376 to 1,246,193 (Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority, 1999), a 207% increase. During this same time period, the City of Henderson's population
increased from 24,736 (1980) to 176,667 (City of Henderson Demographer, 1999), a 614% increase (see Table 1).

Table 1 Historical Population Growth
Source: City of Henderson Demographer
Clark County Demographer

Recent statistics by state and local demographers indicate that the growth rate in Southern Nevada and Henderson is currently at approximately 7%, and the overall trend in growth is expected to continue for at least the next 20 years.

According to Henderson’s demographer, by the year 2020, Henderson is expected to have a population of
approximately 335,000, a 101% increase over its current population. In the same time period, Southern Nevada’s total population is estimated to reach approximately 2.3 - 2.8 million, an increase of 84%-125% (see Table 2).

Table 2 Projected Population Growth
Source: City of Henderson Demographer
Clark County Demographer

The Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority
With these dramatic increases in growth comes quality of life concerns. In 1997, lawmakers in the 69th Session of the Nevada Legislature approved Senate Bill No. 383 (Appendix C), which established the Southern
Nevada Strategic Planning Authority (SNSPA) and called upon it to (SNSPA plan, 1999):

A. Identify and evaluate the needs of Clark County relating to its growth.

B. Prioritize the objectives and strategies relating to the growth of Clark County.

C. Recommend to the 70th session of the Nevada Legislature strategies for meeting the growth needs and objectives of Clark County.

The SNSPA consisted of 21 members. These members included elected representatives from the local jurisdictions (Clark County (2 reps.), Las Vegas, Henderson, North Las Vegas, Boulder City, Mesquite); Southern Nevada business leaders (Nevada State AFL-CIO, Nevada Resort Association, Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association, Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce, Nevada Taxpayers Association, Environmental Concerns, Nevada Development Authority, Racial and Ethnic Minorities Group); and citizen representatives from Clark County, Mesquite, Las Vegas, Henderson, North Las Vegas and Boulder City. In addition, the SNSPA hired a consultant
and a facilitator. With the short deadline and huge task before them, the SNSPA created several committees to work concurrently. These committees included (SNSPA plan, 1999):

A. Executive Council which managed the committee assignments and provided administrative oversight
B. Master Plan and Capital Improvement Plan Review Committee which assessed Southern Nevada service provider Master and Capital Improvement Plans
C. Needs Assessment Committee which identified 20 year growth related needs of Southern Nevada
D. Infrastructure Financing Committee which matched revenue sources to needs assessment and identified gaps
E. Strategic Plan Committee which developed a strategic plan to address growth needs
F. Legislative Committee, which developed legislative recommendations
G. Technical Committee, which provided technical support and staff support and provided administrative oversight
H. Finance Subcommittee which provided technical and staff support

One of the first objectives of the SNSPA was to define the scope of work and the specific areas that it would study and make recommendations with respect to growth. It was determined that the committee would examine 12 areas, including (SNSPA Plan, 1999):

1. Economy/Economic Development
2. Schools/Education
3. Air Quality and the Environment
4. Housing
5. Land Use and Growth Strategies
6. Parks and Recreation
7. Public Safety
8. Transportation
9. Water Supply/Distribution
10. Water Quality/Wastewater
11. Flood Control
12. Health Care

The final plan, as it was adopted by the SNSPA as part of SB 436 (Appendix D) on November 5, 1998, included
key recommendations for each of these 12 areas. These recommendations were determined in large part by public input and participation. This paper will examine the efforts and results of the SNSPA Public Information Subcommittee, specifically those efforts conducted within the City of Henderson.

The SNSPA Public Information Subcommittee consisted of 11 members and 7 support staff members. The members included representatives from Clark County, the SNSPA (2 reps.), Nevada Department of Transportation, Southern Nevada Water Authority, Henderson, North Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Regional Transportation Commission, and the Clark County School District. Support staff members included four from Clark County, two from Las Vegas and one from Henderson. The author and researcher of this paper was the City of Henderson support staff member and is named in the SNSPA plan. The mission of this group was to coordinate a variety of outreach efforts to involve Southern Nevada residents in the SNSPA process (SNSPA Plan, 1999).
Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this paper is to evaluate the public outreach efforts conducted within the City of Henderson and determine, based on the results of those efforts, if the citizens of Henderson support the contents of the SNSPA strategic plan as it was presented to the 70th Session of the Nevada State Legislature.

The upcoming chapters will review literature on public participation in government and strategic planning; provide the methodology in which the researcher conducted this study; highlight the findings of that study; and determine the level of support within the City of Henderson.

The chapter relating to literature review will review the most effective ways to obtain public input and provide the reasons for obtaining public input in the planning process.

The methodology chapter presents the methods of conducting this study and writing this professional paper.
The findings chapter goes into detail on the results of the Henderson public outreach efforts. The results of their efforts are detailed in this chapter which enables the author to determine if Henderson citizens support the plan.

The summary chapter will state the overall findings of this paper and present the author’s opinion on the effectiveness of the outreach efforts and her evaluation of such. This chapter will also summarize this paper.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of current literature in the areas of citizen participation in local and regional planning, and government in general, answers two major questions: why involve citizens; and how (methods) to involve citizens. This chapter will review literature that answers those questions.

Why Should Henderson Residents Be Heard?

Rosenberg (1993) listed Henderson, Nevada as one of "50 Fabulous Places to Raise Your Family." Rosenberg talks about Henderson's strong economic outlook; exceptional public school education and access to nearby colleges; diversified housing market; ample recreation, culture and family fun; abundance of community services and programs; affordable living costs; low taxes; low crime; quality medical care; environmentally aware attitudes; religious/ethnic diversity; fast-growing area/welcoming attitude toward newcomers; scenic beauty;
access to airports/highways; and hospitable climate. With that stated, it is vital for the citizens of Henderson to have input on a 20-year strategic plan that includes goals and objectives that directly affect their quality of life.

Zehner (1977) surveyed residents of 15 new communities, and 21 comparison communities, about their quality of life and presented his findings in his book, "Indicators of the Quality of Life in New Communities." The components defined by residents were: economic security; family life; personal strengths and values; social relationships; physical environment; contentment, well-being and happiness; job satisfaction; leisure and recreation activities; health; religious values; being a good parent; and housing. Zehner grouped these into five categories: housing; community facilities; physical environment; social environment; work, transportation and living costs. Many of these components are part of the SNSPA plan.

Challenge of the 1990s.” He writes about the role of government, looks at alternative state approaches to growth management, and balancing planning needs in several key areas. Stein (1993) says that “public participation is an important part of the planning process.” He goes on to point out that “Oregon, Florida and Georgia require public hearings prior to local plan adoption. Florida law provides citizens the opportunity to formally enter the plan adoption process and challenge the compliance determinations.”

Healey (1997) defines the process for collaborative planning and talks about citizen involvement in such. Healey mentions the work of sociologist-planner Herbert Gans. Gans felt planning had dual clients: a customer of the planning process and the citizens affected by it. Gans’ work led to citizen participation in the planning process. Gans and Paul Davidoff saw planning as “a tool which citizens could use in extracting a more democratic pluralistic polity from the clutches of dominant elites.”

So, Hand, and McDowell (1986) co-edited “The Practice of State and Regional Planning.” In this work,
So et al. outline the entire regional planning process, including public support. They state it is important for the public to support a regional plan since the local governments will be required to implement it. Furthermore, they warn that not involving the public is a mistake.

Combs and Nimmo (1993) talk about the Machiavellian approach. They write about Machiavelli's concept of ruling through public opinion. "Rulers must master the skill of communicating to each and every relevant human imagination, thereby shaping multiple private realities into a singular public reality."

DeSario and Langton (1987), who did case studies on citizen participation in administrative decision making and policy making found that citizens often lack technical expertise, may be unfamiliar with bureaucratic routines, and could get emotionally involved rather than being detached and rational. They also found that citizens are outside the hierarchy and hard to control. As a result, participation may increase the level of conflict and time needed to reach decisions.
Kagan and Cohen (1996) edited a book focused on education and how to increase America's dedication to our youth. It has a chapter, authored by Christopher Howard, that looks at "Citizen Participation - Transforming Access into Influence." This article talks about the effect of citizen participation on public policy and highly recommends that citizens be intimately involved in public decision making.

Salisbury (1980) wrote about citizen participation as an obligation to participate. In the public schools, participation is strong. Public involvement in this forum has the highest active participation rate amongst American public life. The author suggests that one reason people feel obligated to participate is that it involves children. Parents feel a strong desire to be involved in decisions that will affect the well-being of their children. They become involved through associations like PTA (parent-teacher association), which were formed to provide public support to the schools. Attendance is high at PTAs, and it is an effective method of generating public support.
Langton (1978) wrote that "it is essential, therefore, in planning for citizen participation to select methods that meet objectives and are within the resource capabilities of the government agencies and citizens that will be involved."

In Nyden and Wiewel (1991), Luther Kildegaard Snow writes that "the most promising direction for community input into land-use today is community-based planning. The most important area for further exploration is the support and development of specific community-based planning efforts."

In Clark, Hoffmann-Martinet & Gromala (1998), Mark Baldassare wrote an article entitled "Citizen Preferences for Local Growth Controls: Trends in U.S. Suburban Support for a New Political Culture Movement." Baldassare writes that community attitudes are the best predictors of support for local growth control.

In the American Society of Civil Engineers (1986), it states that public involvement in planning decisions is mandated in some areas and has become, or should
become, an integral and constructive part of any planning endeavor.

A Review, as cited in Johnson (1984), by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of participation in all forms of governmental activity, not just planning, called it a two-way street, producing both better governments and better citizens.

"Its ultimate objective from the citizen point of view is to change governmental behaviors so that governmental units respond better to citizens' needs and desires and refrain from the arbitrary, capricious, insensitive, or oppressive exercise of power. On the other side, governments use citizen participation to help change citizen behavior by (a) providing therapy to alienated and socially disturbed citizens, (b) affording participation opportunities for citizens through which they can exercise and enhance their vigilance over governments, and (c) helping citizens to develop their participative and leadership capacities. (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, 1979.)"

Kellogg & Liliquist (1999) write that citizen participation improves relations with citizens, overcomes misconceptions, and improves the community's image.

Fulton (1996) writes that "citizens have to be more engaged in the planning process...have to have real decision-making power as well. But in return, they have
to be real citizens. They have to be willing to hang in there for the long haul, learning all the while.” He goes on to write that people must look beyond their own wants and demands toward what is good for the community as a whole. It means they must understand that good community planning means balancing many competing interests, and occasionally, taking a “hit” on something that might be important to them or their neighborhood.

Mathews (1996) feels that citizens have some undelegable responsibilities, and making decisions about what is in the public’s interest is one of them. He says that “people take more responsibility for what they have chosen than for what others have chosen for them.”

Arai and Pedlar (1997) say that when visioning, citizen participants imagine what they would like the community to look like twenty years in the future, and then to begin to share visions with each other.
How Do We Obtain Input From the Public?

So et al. mention several ways to involve the public, citing mass media and contact with interest groups as the most effective.

Turnier (1999) writes about land use planning and public participation. In his work he reviewed the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development model of citizen participation. He points out that participation models without the intent of involving the public are likely to fail. He makes reference to the requirement of public participation in the majority of jurisdictions in the United States. This includes public hearings.

The American Planning Association program, GROWING SMART (1998) includes an element that says that statutes should expressly provide for citizen involvement.

Glasser and Salmon (1995) go into detail on public opinion, its nature, institution, social and psychological contexts and surveying the public. They discuss how to gain support of the public using media and how to determine public opinion using surveys. They
recommend polling, face-to-face communication and using technology to reach the public and receive their input.

DeSario and Langton used two methods (public meetings and surveys) to determine citizen problems and priorities. They found that the advantages of these methods are that they can be inclusive because all individuals and groups have the opportunity to provide input. They also found, unfortunately, that these processes often do not work as they are designed. Public meetings have low attendance and those who attend may not represent the community. They discovered that surveys are more useful in determining what a cross section of the public wants, but surveys, too, present problems. For one thing, surveys are expensive and time-consuming. In addition, the public does not always have clearly developed opinions, thus, responses may not be well thought out, and may not reflect the true feelings of the community. A third method of obtaining citizen input, according to DeSario and Langton, are advisory boards or committees. They discuss how these boards are an effective way of structuring citizen input but the
downside is the time and effort they require and the
tendency for them to be dominated by those of high
socioeconomic status.

Fagence (1977) looked at the process of involving
citizens in planning. He did three studies (Chicago,
Milwaukee and Minneapolis-St. Paul) and noted that there
was a "similar chronological order, which could be
outlined as follows:

1. Citizen attitudes and goals were sought early in
   the process
2. The information collection process involved
   external participants
3. The publication of the reports were for public
   review and study
4. Public meetings were held
5. Seminars were held with "expert" panelists
6. Continuous review and refinement of alternatives,
   with weight attributed to citizen preferences"

Fagence recommends conventional means such as
displays, exhibits, public meetings, leaflets, brochures,
surveys, and information centers. He also suggests
innovative means, i.e., group meetings, task forces,
neighborhood councils, and modern technology.
Cahn and Passett (1971) recommend informing citizens one-way via flyers, news media, posters, and responses to inquiries. They suggest avoiding meetings that provide superficial information.

Langton recommends these "steps for involving citizens:

1. Identify the individual/group who will/should be involved in the program being planned
2. Decide where the policy process would participate (development, implementation, evaluation, or a combination)
3. Articulate the participation goals/objectives for all involved (public, elected officials, public administrators)
4. Identify participation methods or techniques
5. Analyze the resources required for those techniques
6. Match alternative methods to objectives in terms of resources available
7. Select an appropriate methods(s) to be used to achieve the objective(s)
8. Implement the activities
9. Evaluate the implemented methods to see to what extent they achieved the goals/objectives"

The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) recommends several methods of obtaining public input,
including the standard use of newsletters, public
meetings, workshops, hearings, review or advisory
committees. In addition, the ASCE suggests surveys
because survey research "enables planners to assess
people's attitudes in order to determine the levels of
public awareness, understanding, and feeling towards
complex and sometimes emotional issues." ASCE writes
that the public opinion survey has been used successfully
for years. It's more successful when mailed along with
other pertinent information and recommends using this
technique whenever possible.

Luton (1996) suggests the use of newsletters,
surveys, meetings, and press conferences. The most
productive methods are meetings, publications, and the
media. He says that the community should be reached
directly and unfiltered and states that government
officials must go beyond meeting only the legal
requirements for citizen participation, and welcome
substantive citizen contributions.

Johnson recommends the use of interest groups,
surveys, citizen planning commissions, public hearings,
and informal meetings between groups and elected officials.

Kellogg & Lilliquist recommend conducting research via surveys, personal interviews, focus groups, and Internet surveys.

Kissier, Fore, et al recommend that state policy makers utilize a bottom-up approach involving regional meetings, because it engages the public, increases awareness of the complexity and interrelatedness of the region's issues, and generates new insights into the status of the state.

Hoover (1998) says the principals for gaining public support include: careful design of a public involvement program to make it an integral part of the decision-making process; use a wide variety of specific strategies and techniques to involve the community; be as responsive as possible to public opinion.

Hoover recommends a variety of strategies, to include involvement with clusters of residents and business people who help to promote further public involvement and inform people about the subject matter;
mass advertising, fairs, booths at malls and at special events, windshield notices, surveys and questionnaires, and videos; community leader interviews, advisory committees, forums, roundtables and special-issue task forces; partnering with other agencies and organizations.

Hoover also recommends techniques for obtaining citizen input, such as targeted media for communication, including advertisements in minority newspapers; innovative recruitment tactics such as flyers on the doorknobs of apartment dwellers, outreach efforts in neighborhood stores, churches and workplaces.

Melkers and Thomas (1998) say that developing citizen satisfaction data through citizen surveys can provide important benchmark data for municipalities.

Rambeau and Thornton (1995) recommend market research tools such as polling/surveys, community leader meetings, on-line/email responses, employee/union meetings, business leader meetings, informal questioning, and town meetings.
The upcoming chapter will discuss the methodology of determining if the citizens of Henderson support the contents of the SNSPA plan for growth.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine the efforts and results of the City of Henderson public outreach efforts regarding the SNSPA draft plan; evaluate those efforts; and determine, based on the results of those efforts, whether the residents of the City of Henderson support the contents of the SNSPA plan. Research was conducted in three areas: review of current literature on citizen involvement; review of the methods of Henderson’s citizen involvement in the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority Plan; and review of the results of Henderson’s citizen involvement efforts.

This chapter will discuss the methodology for this paper and the subject matter.

Review of Current Literature on Citizen Involvement

The review of literature on the subject of citizen involvement included research on the Internet; published and unpublished professional papers; books on
policymaking, urban planning, citizen involvement; articles on planning and citizenship, community support, public participation and community relations. All of these references answered the two questions posed in the literature review: 1) why involve citizens, and 2) how to involve citizens.

Review of the Methods of Henderson's Public Outreach Efforts

The method of reviewing Henderson's public outreach efforts was personal involvement. As a member of the public outreach sub-committee, the researcher was intimately involved in the planning, implementation, creation, and presentation of all Henderson's public outreach efforts. This included the creation, distribution and tabulation of the citizen survey; coordination of collateral material and presentation of such at town hall meetings, parent-teacher meetings, and an information fair at the Galleria at Sunset Mall.
Review of the Results of Henderson's Public Outreach Efforts

A review of the results of Henderson's public outreach efforts indicated that 70,000 surveys were distributed through newspapers, meetings, major employers within Henderson, on Henderson's Internet web site, through Henderson's Library District, and all schools within Henderson. Of the 70,000 distributed, 2,142 were returned, a 3% return rate. The researcher entered all survey results using Survey Pro 2.0, by Apian Software Company. This program is similar to the more commonly used SPSS. Survey Pro allows the feedback to be cross-tabulated, printed in graph and/or pie chart format and thoroughly analyzed.

The researcher, and/or other city representative(s), presented information at 17 parent-teacher meetings, one town hall meeting, and one 2-day information fair at the Galleria at Sunset shopping mall. Since surveys were distributed at these meetings, the results of these efforts are collectively measured with the overall survey results.
In the following chapter, the City of Henderson SNSPA public outreach efforts will be examined.
CHAPTER FOUR

CITY OF HENDERSON PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS

This chapter will discuss the public outreach efforts of the City of Henderson and the results of those efforts.

When faced with the task of obtaining Henderson resident input on the SNSPA plan, the City of Henderson Public Information Office determined that it would need to use a variety of methods. The employees of this office decided to use time-proven effective methods for obtaining citizen input in planning issues. Through their experience in public outreach and public relations, the efforts were determined to consist of a survey, presentations at town hall meetings, parent-teacher association meetings, and an information fair at the local shopping mall.

The City of Henderson conducted extensive public outreach considering that the public input period was only a 30-day period. Each entity within the SNSPA was asked to do its own public outreach (Appendix E). The
outreach efforts included a citywide survey, a town hall meeting, parent-teacher association meetings, and an information fair at the Galleria Mall at Sunset in Henderson. The following sections of this chapter will examine those efforts and their results.

Survey

To reach a wide majority of residents, it was determined that a survey would be the primary tool for receiving feedback. The City of Henderson Public Information Office, including the author of this work, created a two-sided, self-addressed survey (Appendix A). The front of the survey included a series of questions pertaining to each of the twelve variables of the SNSPA plan. There were three questions per variable. While the SNSPA plan had more than three recommended solutions per variable, it was determined that only the top three recommendations for each area would be on the survey. This was based on the need to keep the survey to one page in length. Also for the purpose of cross-tabulation, a question about the person's length of residence in
Henderson and zip code was included on the front of the survey. Lastly, they were offered the results of the survey if they included their name and address. In the end, more than 600 people requested the results in this manner. (The specific results are discussed in the Summary chapter of this paper. A copy of what was sent to the respondents is Appendix B.)

The opposite side of the survey asked the resident to rank the 12 growth topics in order of importance, 1 being most important, 12 being least important. This was included because the researcher wanted to be able to prioritize the needs of the residents. This side of the survey also included the business reply, postage-paid information and a few blank lines for additional comments.

The City of Henderson produced 70,000 of these surveys for distribution. The majority of these were distributed as inserts in four newspapers, as follows:

1. Henderson Home News (all zip codes), totaling 15,000 subscribers
2. Las Vegas Review-Journal and Las Vegas Sun (all subscribers in zip codes 89011, 89012, 89014, 89015), totaling 25,000 subscribers

3. View News, 20,000 non-subscribers throughout Henderson (these are left on the doorsteps of residents who do not subscribe to the Las Vegas Review Journal or the Las Vegas Sun)

The remainder of the surveys (10,000) was distributed, along with copies of the SNSPA draft plan, as follows:

1. Henderson Home Owner Associations
2. Henderson and Green Valley Libraries
3. Every K-12 School in Henderson
4. 17 PTA Meetings
5. Galleria Information Fair
6. Town Hall Meeting
7. Major Employers in Henderson (reaching 6,600 employees), including Ocean Spray, Sunset Station, Good Humor-Breyers, St. Rose Hospital, the Reserve, Levi Strauss, Berry Plastics, L'eggs, Ethel M Chocolates
Along with the surveys, Henderson distributed more than 100 copies of the SNSPA draft plan, including a copy sent to every school, Parent-Teacher Association (PTA), Homeowner's Association, library, and all major employers. It was added in full (without the need to download and use Adobe Acrobat) on the City of Henderson web site, and city departments with public contact were given a copy for their front counters.

The deadline for survey responses was December 11, 1998. By that date, 2,142 surveys had been returned. Of those 2,142, 621 provided their addresses and requested the results of the survey.

Town Hall Meeting

The second method of determining if the Henderson residents supported the contents of the SNSPA plan was a town hall meeting. The meeting was posted in the newspaper and in public places according to the open meeting law. The format was similar to a convention exposition. There were 12 tables, one for each section of the SNSPA draft plan. Each table had a display with
handouts and a Henderson city staff representative present to provide information, field questions, disperse the surveys and receive feedback. Approximately 35 people attended this meeting.

**Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) Meetings**

The third method of determining if the Henderson residents supported the contents of the SNSPA draft plan was presenting the plan and distributing surveys to all PTAs within the City of Henderson. During the 30-day public input period, approximately 17 PTA meetings were scheduled. The author and researcher presented the draft plan and distributed surveys at 10 of these meetings.

**Galleria Mall Information Fair**

The fourth method of reaching Henderson residents and obtaining their input on the SNSPA draft plan was an information fair at the Galleria Mall at Sunset. This was held over a two-day period, during regular mall hours. The researcher and Henderson city staff representatives manned information booths at the Galleria
Mail. The format was similar to the town hall meetings in that a separate table, display and staff member was present for each section of the plan. During this information fair, the surveys were distributed, feedback was received via survey (as previously stated), and SNSPA draft plans were available for review. Approximately 250 people attended the fair.

In the next chapter, the results of the outreach efforts will be evaluated and examined to determine if the residents of the City of Henderson support the contents of the SNSPA plan as it was presented to the 70th Legislature.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY

This chapter will summarize the findings of Henderson's public outreach efforts and state whether the study met its objectives.

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the public outreach efforts conducted within the City of Henderson and determine, based on the results of those efforts, if the citizens of Henderson support the contents of the SNSPA strategic plan as it was presented to the 70th Session of the Nevada State Legislature. In this chapter, the results of the efforts, in the form of survey responses, will be evaluated to make the determination on the level of support.

The Henderson public outreach program efforts were developed to occur simultaneously to obtain the greatest impact. Creation of collateral material, a web page on the City web site, citizen meetings and a resident survey were created to effectuate cross-promotion. For example, at citizen meetings, collateral material was distributed
which referred residents to the Strategic Plan document at public libraries as well as to the city's web site. Surveys also referred respondents to the libraries, and to the web site. The saturation of different ongoing efforts provided a greater reach and awareness than any single element could provide. To support Henderson's efforts, a 20-minute and 40-minute presentation was developed on the SNSPA and Strategic Plan. Each element of the Strategic Plan was rewritten to provide an easy to understand overview of the subject's goals and objectives. These were created as handouts, so residents could choose information on those topics in which they had the most interest, without the necessity of reading through the entire plan. A separate web page was created on the city's web site, which allowed the reader to easily browse through the entire strategic plan. This page was constructed so that information could be downloaded without the need to use Adobe Acrobat, a distinct and positive difference from the SNSPA web site. The City survey was also added to the web page, allowing residents to respond via the Internet.
There were 70,000 surveys distributed and 2,142 returned. The results represent 1.5% of the population of the City of Henderson at the time of the public input period (December, 1998). While 1.5% may seem an insignificant response rate, given the time constraints and the cost limitations of the Henderson public outreach efforts, this was determined by the City Manager to be a successful return rate. The City Manager accepted the results of the survey as representative of Henderson residents. In fact, these survey responses were the first-ever citizen survey done within Henderson and the results were subsequently used to create baselines for benchmarking city services.

The SNSPA draft plan was extremely comprehensive and detailed. It measured more than 100 pages in length. In order to capture the essence of the plan's goals and objectives in the 12 areas which it focused, the survey was drafted to include only those goals which were considered significant within the City of Henderson. This determination was made by the City Manager's Public Information Office.
In the subject of air quality, Henderson supported the three recommendations in the plan, which included: meet EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) and clean air standards; reduce urban haze; and coordinate land use and environmental planning.

With regards to public safety, Henderson residents were in support of all three goals: build fire and police facilities as new development occurs; build fire and paramedic facilities within a 1.5 mile response radius; and adopt a standard of two police officers per 1,000 population.

In the matter of water quality and wastewater, Henderson residents agreed with the plan’s goals to: meet federal, state and local regulations; improve water quality management; and provide adequate wastewater facilities. In the subject of water supply and distribution, again, the residents supported the plan, including: increase water supplies; meet water distribution needs; and provide quality water treatment.

For the subject of health care, Henderson residents agreed with plans to: improve access to affordable health
care; impose state mandated performance standards for health insurance plans; and update computers to better administer Medicaid and measure health care quality.

In the matter of schools, only one of the goals received high support and that is to provide sufficient number of qualified teachers. The other two goals (build more schools more quickly; and provide necessary higher education facilities) were rated as somewhat, but not very, important.

The subject of land use and growth received high support for providing adequate infrastructure to support future growth; and preserving and enhancing the individual character of neighborhoods. The goal of coordinating regional land use policies was rated somewhat important.

All three Economy and Economic Development goals received ranks of very important. These goals included: promote business-friendly tax and regulatory environment; encourage economic diversification and investment; and develop a skilled, professional and technical workforce.
Two of the flood control goals ranked as very important: improve storm water runoff quality; and use flood control facilities for multiple purposes. The goal of building projects more quickly rated as somewhat important.

Transportation had the widest swings in response. It had very high support for expediting road construction and very low support for a monorail. The goal to expand the bus system was considered somewhat important.

The three Parks and Recreation goals were rated as very important. The goals included: adopt a standard of 2.5 park acres per 1,000 residents; reserve open space in land use and parks and recreation master plans; and preserve the cultural and historical heritage in Southern Nevada.

The subject of housing was just about evenly split on two of the three goals: encourage development of master planned communities; and increase different types and prices of available housing. The third goal, promote neighborhood stability and revitalization was ranked as very important.
The demographics of the respondents were sorted by zip code and length of Henderson residency. The 89014 (Green Valley) and 89015 (Henderson proper) were almost evenly represented at 35% and 42% respectively. The newly created 89012 (Green Valley Ranch) zip code had a 12% response rate.

The respondents' length of residence was primarily (46%) 0-5 years. Given the rapid growth of Henderson within the past five years, this was anticipated. The number of people with 6-10 years of residency was 26% and those with 11 or more years of residency also had a response rate of 26%.

The survey also asked people to rank the 12 areas of study in order of priority to them, from 1 being most important and 12 being least important. After tabulating the responses, the ranking is as follows, from highest priority to lowest:

1. Air Quality
2. Public Safety
3. Water Quality/Wastewater
4. Water Supply/Distribution
An unusually high number of residents, 621, provided their names and addresses and requested the survey results. The survey results were tabulated and provided to these residents, along with a personal letter from the Mayor (see Appendix B). Each entity on the SNSPA Public Outreach Subcommittee requested and received disks for their duplication and use of the presentation and handouts developed by the City.

The survey results, and public comments recorded during the community information fairs were provided to the SNSPA Public Outreach Subcommittee, to the Authority and to the State Legislature. Each State Legislator representing Henderson also received the results of the
city's public outreach efforts. The survey results were printed in the local papers, and were made available on the City's web site. The Public Information Office, after comparing the survey results with the City's Comprehensive Plan, determined that the Plan's vision statement remained valid, even though thousands of new residents had moved to the city after the Plan was completed.

The final SNSPA strategic plan, as it was adopted by the SNSPA on November 5, 1998, included key recommendations that were determined in large part by public input and participation. The Strategic Plan was formally accepted by the 1999 Nevada State Legislature.

This purpose of this paper was to determine whether the citizens of the City of Henderson supported the plan as it was presented to the 1999 Nevada State Legislature. Based on the findings of this study, it is evident that they do support the SNSPA plan, therefore this study is considered a success and has met its objectives.

Additional note: In September 1999, the City of Henderson, along with Clark County, the City of Las
Vegas, and the City of North Las Vegas, won national recognition by the City-County Communications & Marketing Association for their SNSPA public outreach efforts. That recognition factored into the determination of this study meeting its objectives.
Your opinion is important to the City of Henderson!

That's why we appreciate your filling out this survey to let us know your top priorities on the critical issues that directly impact you and your family.

On a scale of 1 to 3, with 1 being very important and 3 being not important, how would you rank the following issues as to how they will improve your quality of life and meet the demands of growth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality/Environment:</th>
<th>Transportation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Meet EPA/Clean Air Standards</td>
<td>• Expedite Road Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce urban haze</td>
<td>• Budget the Bus System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinate land use &amp; environmental planning</td>
<td>• Build a Monorail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Build More Schools More Quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide sufficient number of qualified teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide necessary higher education facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Supply/Distribution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase water supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meet water distribution needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide quality water treatment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks &amp; Recreation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Adopt a standard of 2.5 acres of parks for 1,000 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reserve open space in land use/parks and recreation master plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preserve cultural/historical heritage in Scenic Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economy/Economic Development:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Promote business-friendly tax/regulatory environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage economic diversification and investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a skilled, professional and technical workforce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use/Growth:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide adequate infrastructure to support future growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinate regional land use policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preserve and enhance the individual character of neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Control:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Build projects more quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve storm water runoff quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use flood control facilities for multiple purposes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage development of master planned communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase different types of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote neighborhood stability and revitalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Safety:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Build fire/police facilities as new development occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build fire/police facilities within a 5 mile response radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adopt standard of 2 police officers per 1,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Care:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improve access to affordable health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• State mandated performance standards for health insurance plans; long term care facilities; other institutional providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update computer to better administer Medicaid and health care quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How long have you resided in the City of Henderson (check one)?

- [ ] 0-5 years
- [ ] 6-10 years
- [ ] 11+ years

What is your zip code?

If you would like to receive a copy of the results of this survey, please write your name and address here:
The full SNSPA strategic plan is available for review at all Henderson public libraries, Henderson City Hall, and on the Henderson website at www.cityofhenderson.com. Please review the entire plan and provide your written feedback on the plan document to SNSPA, PO Box 11677, Las Vegas, NV, 89195-7511, or respond to this survey via email (SNSPA@city.henderson.nv.us) or online at www.cityofhenderson.com.

As our community grows, which of the following do you think is most important in preserving your quality of life? Please put them in the order of importance to you from 1 to 12, with 1 being the most important and 12 being the least important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Air Quality/Environment</th>
<th>2. Economic Development</th>
<th>3. Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Additional Comments:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please complete this survey, fold it in half, tape it closed and drop it in the mail no later than December 11, 1998. Postage is paid for your convenience.
APPENDIX B

March 21, 1999

My sincere thanks to each of you for participation in our informal survey regarding the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority's (SNSPA) Strategic Plan. The survey results have been included in the public response participation section of the Plan, which has been presented to the Nevada State Legislature. Your responses will be important in determining how the legislators view the plan and its various elements.

Each city and the county conducted its own public outreach program for SNSPA. I truly believe that our city received the greatest citizen response. Typically, the response rate for these kinds of surveys is about 1%. Our response rate was 6.3%, representing 2,132 people who took the time and trouble to reply to the survey questions and return them to us. After reviewing the completed surveys, it is obvious that each of you took the time to really think about the issues and your answers. This level of citizen commitment and involvement is one of the things that make Henderson a great community.

We have used these survey results here in the city, double-checking our Comprehensive Plan to determine if the vision for our community's future is still on track. The Citizens Advisory Committee developed the Comprehensive Plan, which is used to guide the City Council in its land use decisions, after numerous hours of public comments and review. The Comprehensive Plan contains the vision for Henderson's future. The SNSPA survey results show that our citizens still place a high priority on maintaining the integrity of neighborhoods, maintaining family oriented lifestyles and providing a high quality of life for residents.

As promised, we've attached the survey results for your review. We've compiled the information in chart form so that it will be easy to read. If you have any questions on the survey results, please call Vicki Taylor at 565-2848 or Brenda Fischer at 565-7790 and they will be happy to assist you.

In the open-ended comment form of the surveys, we received more than 100 responses. Some of the comments dealt with issues specific to a resident or a neighborhood. These comments have been forwarded to the appropriate city department for action and follow-up. Many of the comments concerned traffic and traffic control. A majority of comments concerned growth, specifically requiring developers, not taxpayers, to pay for infrastructure.
Regarding the need for traffic enforcement, I think you’ll be pleased to know that we also identified this as a problem. Our Police Department is now in the process of creating a separate traffic enforcement division within the Henderson Police Department. Traffic patrol officers will soon be on the streets, enforcing speed and traffic laws. Regarding road construction and traffic delays, the good news is that the County’s beautification project (along Lake Mead) will be completed by Stephanie by the end of the year. This should significantly improve traffic flow and reduce the congestion we’ve been forced to endure these last years. Because we received so many questions concerning future roadway construction, the city will be producing an information piece on roadway improvements to provide you with some answers. We’ll mail you a copy as soon as possible.

Apparently, we need to do a better job communicating with our residents about how the city deals with the costs of growth. Henderson residents today pay one of the lowest city property tax rates in the state and in all of Southern Nevada. These property taxes have stayed low despite our enormous growth because we do require developers to pay for infrastructure. To date, developers have donated $20.4 million in land for future school sites (the city now has 51 vacant sites in its inventory), $23 million in land and park space, $81 million in roadways, $223.4 million in utility lines and $12 million in land and equipment for fire stations within the city. We are the only city in Southern Nevada to ensure that development pays its way, so that the cost of new growth doesn’t fall on the backs of our existing residents.

I also would like to thank the many people who wrote to tell us how much they love living in Henderson. Without the support and commitment of our residents, Henderson could not be the success it is today.

Sincerely,

James B. Gibson
Mayor
Henderson SNSPA Survey Results

- 70,000 Distributed
- 2,142 Returned
- 3% Return Rate

Air Quality
Meet EPA/Clean Air Standards

- Very Important: 18%
- Somewhat Important: 4%
- Not Important: 70%
- No Answer: 8%

Air Quality
Reduce Urban Haze

- Very Important: 9%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 22%
- No Answer: 63%

Air Quality
Coordinate land use and environmental planning

- Very Important: 11%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 25%
- No Answer: 58%

Public Safety
Build fire/police facilities as new development occurs

- Very Important: 9%
- Somewhat Important: 4%
- Not Important: 24%
- No Answer: 63%

Public Safety
Build fire/paramedic facilities within a 1.5 mile response radius

- Very Important: 13%
- Somewhat Important: 5%
- Not Important: 49%
- No Answer: 33%
Public Safety
Adopt standard of 2 police officers per 1,000 population

- Very Important: 14%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 27%
- No Answer: 53%

Water Quality/Wastewater
Meet federal, state and local regulations

- Very Important: 9%
- Somewhat Important: 16%
- Not Important: 71%
- No Answer: 4%

Water Quality/Wastewater
Improve water quality management

- Very Important: 7%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 26%
- No Answer: 61%

Water Quality/Wastewater
Provide adequate wastewater facilities

- Very Important: 8%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 26%
- No Answer: 60%

Water Supply/Distribution
Increase water supplies

- Very Important: 19%
- Somewhat Important: 7%
- Not Important: 40%
- No Answer: 34%

Water Supply/Distribution
Meet water distribution needs

- Very Important: 37%
- Somewhat Important: 9%
- Not Important: 48%
- No Answer: 6%
Schools
Provide necessary higher
education facilities

- Very Important: 27%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 34%
- No Answer: 33%

Land Use/Growth
Provide adequate infrastructure to
support future growth

- Very Important: 10%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 31%
- No Answer: 53%

Land Use/Growth
Coordinate regional land use policies

- Very Important: 13%
- Somewhat Important: 7%
- Not Important: 42%
- No Answer: 38%

Land Use/Growth
Preserve/enhance the individual
color character of neighborhoods

- Very Important: 13%
- Somewhat Important: 5%
- Not Important: 29%
- No Answer: 53%

Economy/Economic Development
Promote business-friendly tax/
regulatory environment

- Very Important: 16%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 38%
- No Answer: 40%

Economy/Economic Development
Encourage economic
diversification/investment

- Very Important: 14%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 39%
- No Answer: 41%
Economy/Economic Development
Develop a skilled, professional and technical workforce

Flood Control
Build projects more quickly

Flood Control
Improve storm water runoff quality

Flood Control
Use flood control facilities for multiple purposes

Transportation
Expedite road construction

Transportation
Expand the bus system
Transportation
Build a monorail

- Very Important: 49%
- Somewhat Important: 5%
- Not Important: 22%
- No Answer: 24%

Parks & Recreation
Adopt a standard of 2.5 park acres per 1,000 residents

- Very Important: 24%
- Somewhat Important: 5%
- Not Important: 34%
- No Answer: 34%

Parks & Recreation
Reserve open space in land use/parks and recreation master plans

- Very Important: 12%
- Somewhat Important: 4%
- Not Important: 36%
- No Answer: 48%

Parks & Recreation
Preserve cultural/historical heritage in Southern Nevada

- Very Important: 23%
- Somewhat Important: 4%
- Not Important: 38%
- No Answer: 35%

Housing
Encourage development of master planned communities

- Very Important: 27%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 33%
- No Answer: 35%

Housing
Increase different types/prices of available housing

- Very Important: 25%
- Somewhat Important: 6%
- Not Important: 38%
- No Answer: 31%
Water Quality/Wastewater

On a scale of 1 to 12, rank in order of importance
1 is most important, 12 is least important

Water Supply/Distribution

On a scale of 1 to 12, rank in order of importance
1 is most important, 12 is least important

Health Care

On a scale of 1 to 12, rank in order of importance
1 is most important, 12 is least important

Schools

On a scale of 1 to 12, rank in order of importance
1 is most important, 12 is least important

Land Use/Growth

On a scale of 1 to 12, rank in order of importance
1 is most important, 12 is least important

Economy/Economic Development

On a scale of 1 to 12, rank in order of importance
1 is most important, 12 is least important
On a scale of 1 to 12, rank in order of importance:
1 is most important, 12 is least important.
AN ACT relating to regional planning; establishing the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority; setting forth the purpose and duties of the Authority; creating a technical committee to advise the Authority; providing for the funding of the Authority; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

[Approved July 17, 1997] made applicable for the provisions of this act because of the economic diversity of the local governments of this state, the unusual patterns of growth in certain of those local governments, the need to identify and evaluate the needs of certain counties that have arisen as a result of growth experienced by those counties and the special conditions experienced in certain counties related to the need to provide basic services; now, therefore,

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. 1. The Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority, consisting of 21 members, is hereby created in Clark County. The Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority consists of:
(a) The respective mayors of the City of Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, the City of North Las Vegas, Boulder City and the City of Mesquite.
(b) The Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County.
(c) The Vice Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County.
(d) One member appointed by the Southern Nevada Home Builders Association as its representative.
(e) One member appointed by the Nevada Resort Association as its representative.
(f) One member appointed by the Nevada State AFL-CIO as its representative.
(g) One member appointed by the Nevada Taxpayers Association as its representative.
(h) One member appointed by the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce as its representative.
(i) One member appointed by the Nevada Development Authority as its representative.
(j) One member elected by the plurality vote of the members specified in paragraphs (a) to (i), inclusive, and (l) to represent environmental concerns.
(k) One member elected by the plurality vote of the members specified in paragraphs (a) to (i), inclusive, and (l) to represent the concerns of racial and ethnic minorities.
(l) One member appointed by each of the members specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) to represent the concerns of the residents of each city specified in paragraph (a) or Clark County, respectively. Such members must not be affiliated with any organization or special interest represented by the members specified in paragraphs (a) to (k), inclusive.

2. A member who no longer meets the qualifications by which he secured his membership on the Authority automatically ceases to be a member of the Authority. A vacancy must be filled in the same manner as the original member was selected.

3. A member of the Authority who is:
(a) An ex-officio member pursuant to paragraph (a), (b) or (c) of subsection 1 shall serve without compensation.
(b) Appointed or elected pursuant to paragraphs (d) to (l), inclusive, of subsection 1 must be compensated by the Authority at the rate of $40 per meeting or $200 per month, whichever is less.

Sec. 2. 1. The Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority shall:
(a) Identify and evaluate the needs of Clark County relating to its growth.
(b) Prioritize the objectives and strategies relating to the growth of Clark County.
(c) Recommend to the 70th session of the Nevada Legislature strategies for meeting the growth needs and objectives of Clark County.

2. The Authority shall review the master plans and the plans for capital improvement of the planning agencies of Clark County. The Authority shall review the plans and the policies contained therein to determine if they are sufficient to meet the needs and address the expected amount of growth of Clark County over the next 20 years.
A report regarding the determination of the Authority, including an analysis of whether there exist any duplications or inconsistencies in the plans, or whether any issues have been omitted, must be submitted to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the Legislative Commission on or before June 1, 1998. As used in this subsection, "planning agency" includes:
(a) The planning agencies for Clark County and the cities located within the county; and
(b) Any agency responsible for planning for the provision of services related to infrastructure, including, without limitation, the Regional Transportation Commission of Clark County, the Clark County Regional Flood Control Board, the Metropolitan Police Department, the Clark County School District and the Southern Nevada Water Authority.

3. The Authority shall develop and submit to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau for transmittal to the 70th session of the Nevada Legislature for its review on or before April 1, 1999:
(a) A needs assessment that identifies the issues relating to the growth of Clark County over the next 20 years. The needs assessment must be completed by the Authority on or before October 1, 1998.
(b) A strategic plan that sets forth the objectives, goals and strategies of the Authority with regard to those issues. The strategic plan must address the effects of such growth with respect to:
(1) Economic development, including, without limitation, the creation of new jobs.
(2) Educational institutions, including, without limitation, public schools.
(3) The environment, including, without limitation, air quality.
(4) Housing.
(5) Local land use and growth boundaries.
(6) Parks and recreation.
(7) Public safety.
(8) Transportation.
(9) Water, sewage and sanitation.
(10) Other issues as are determined by the Authority to be pertinent.
(c) An evaluation of the current allocation of resources in the development of regional infrastructure that is not
supported by the payment of user fees, including, without limitation, regional flood control, transportation and parks. The information relating to the allocation of such resources must be provided to the Authority by a subcommittee of the Technical Committee created pursuant to section 4 of this act. The subcommittee must consist of the directors of finance of Clark County and the cities listed in paragraph (a) of subsection 1 of section 4 of this act.

(d) Recommendations for legislation.

4. The Authority may make reasonable requests for information to any local government.

Sec. 3. 1. There is hereby created the position of Facilitator of the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority. The Facilitator:

(a) Must be nominated by the plurality vote of the members appointed to the Authority pursuant to paragraphs (d) to (l), inclusive, of subsection 1 of section 1 of this act from a list of persons who have applied for the position and who:

(1) Have the necessary training, experience, capability and interest in planning to perform the duties of the Facilitator;

(2) Have demonstrated the ability to administer a major program relating to planning; and

(3) Are not affiliated with any entity listed in subsection 1 of section 1 of this act; and

(4) May be a consultant or a consulting firm.

(b) Must be appointed by the plurality vote of the members of the Authority set forth in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of subsection 1 of section 1 of this act.

2. The Facilitator shall appoint a Project Coordinator who:

(a) Shall devote his entire time and attention to the business of his office and shall not pursue any other business or occupation or hold any other office of profit.

(b) Shall not hold any other position relating to planning with a regional or local entity in the county, or be on a leave of absence from any other regional or local entity in the county while holding the position of Project Coordinator.

(c) Is responsible for the administration of the Authority.

(d) Shall prepare an annual budget for the Authority.
May:
(1) Appoint professional, technical or clerical staff to positions that are approved by the Authority.
(2) Execute contracts for services and interlocal agreements that are approved by the Authority.
(3) Direct the activities of all persons employed by the Authority.

Sec. 4. 1. The Technical Committee of the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority, consisting of 13 members, is hereby created. The Technical Committee consists of:
(a) The respective city managers of the City of Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, the City of North Las Vegas, Boulder City and the City of Mesquite or their designees.
(b) The County Manager of Clark County or his designee.
(c) The General Manager of the Southern Nevada Water Authority or his designee.
(d) The General Manager of the Clark County Regional Flood Control Board or his designee.
(e) The Director of the Regional Transportation Commission of Clark County or his designee.
(f) The County Health Officer of the Clark County Health District or his designee.
(g) The Superintendent of the Clark County School District or his designee.
(h) The General Manager of the Virgin Valley Water District or his designee.
(i) The Chief Executive Officer of Nevada Power Company or his designee.

2. The Technical Committee shall advise the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Commission regarding the growth of Clark County.

3. A member who no longer meets the qualifications by which he secured his membership on the Technical Committee automatically ceases to be a member of the Technical Committee. A vacancy must be filled in the same manner as the original member was selected.

4. A member of the Technical Committee shall serve without compensation.

Sec. 5. 1. To pay for the costs associated with carrying out the provisions of this act:
(a) The governing body of:
(1) Clark County shall allocate not less than $150,000;
(2) The City of Las Vegas shall allocate not less than $75,000;
(3) The City of Henderson shall allocate not less than $60,000;
(4) The City of North Las Vegas shall allocate not less than $45,000;
(5) Boulder City shall allocate not more than $20,000; and
(6) The City of Mesquite shall allocate not more than $15,000,
from its general fund to the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority.
(b) The Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority may solicit and accept contributions from the organizations specified in paragraphs (d) to (i), inclusive, of subsection 1 of section 1 of this act and any other organization that wishes to contribute to the Authority.
2. The Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority may expend any money received pursuant to this section in carrying out the provisions of this act.
3. Any money received by the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority pursuant to this section must not be committed for expenditure after June 30, 1999.
4. The Facilitator of the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority shall cause any remaining balance of the money allocated or contributed to the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority pursuant to this section that has not been committed for expenditure as of June 30, 1999, to be transferred to the various entities which made the allocations or contributions in the proportion that the entity's allocation or contribution bears to the total amount of all allocations and contributions received by the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority pursuant to this section.
Sec. 6. The Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority and the Technical Committee of the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority shall each hold its first meeting on or before September 15, 1997.
Sec. 7. The provisions of subsection 1 of NRS 354.599 do not apply to any additional expenses of a local government that are related to the provisions of this act.
Sec. 8. This act becomes effective upon passage and approval and expires by limitation on July 1, 1999.
APPENDIX D

1. Senate Bill No. 436—Senator Porter

CHAPTER

AN ACT relating to regional planning; revising the composition of the debt management commission in certain counties; providing for the creation of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition; establishing a governing board; prescribing the powers and duties of the board; establishing a technical committee; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, REPRESENTED IN SENATE AND ASSEMBLY, DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. NRS 350.002 is hereby amended to read as follows:

1. NRS 350.002 1. There is hereby created in each county whose population is 400,000 or more, a debt management commission, to be composed of:
   1. (a) Three representatives of the board of county commissioners from its membership;
   1. (b) One representative of each governing body of the five largest incorporated cities in the county from its membership;
   1. (c) One representative of the board of trustees of the county school district from its membership; and
   1. (d) Two representatives of the public at large.

2. There is hereby created in each county whose population is less than 400,000, a debt management commission, to be composed of one representative of the county, one representative of the school district and the following additional representatives:

   1. (a) In each such county which contains more than one incorporated city:
1. (1) One representative of the city in which the county seat is located;
1. (2) One representative of the other incorporated cities jointly; and
1. (3) One representative of the public at large.
1. (b) In each such county which contains one incorporated city:
1. (1) One representative of the incorporated city; and
1. (2) Two representatives of the public at large.
1. (c) In each such county which contains no incorporated city, one
1. representative of the public at large.
1. (d) In each such county which contains one or more general
1. improvement districts, one representative of the district or districts jointly
1. and one additional representative of the public at large.
1. (e) In Carson City, there is hereby created a debt management
1. commission, to be composed of one representative of the board of
1. supervisors, one representative of the school district and three
1. representatives of the public at large. The representative of the board of
1. supervisors and the representative of the school district shall select the
1. representatives of the public at large, and for that purpose only, constitute a
1. quorum of the debt management commission. Members of the commission
2. serve for a term of 2 years beginning on January 1, or until their successors
1. are chosen.
1. (f) Each
1. 4. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 1, each representative
1. of a single local government must be chosen by its governing body. Each
1. representative of two or more local governments must be chosen by their
1. governing bodies jointly, each governing body having one vote. Each
1. representative of the general improvement districts must be chosen by their governing bodies jointly, each governing body having one vote. Each representative of the public at large must be chosen by the other members of the commission from residents of the county, or Carson City, as the case may be, who have a knowledge of its financial structure. A tie vote must be resolved by lot.

5. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, members of the commission or their successors must be chosen in January of each odd-numbered year and hold office for a term of 2 years beginning January 1. The representatives of incorporated cities must be chosen after elections are held in the cities, but before the annual meeting of the commission in July.

5. The term of a representative who serves pursuant to paragraph (a), (b) or (c) of subsection 1 is coterminous with the term of his elected office, unless the public entity that appointed him revokes his appointment.

6. Any vacancy must be filled in the same manner as the original choice was made for the remainder of the unexpired term.

Sec. 2. NRS 350.003 is hereby amended to read as follows:

The commission shall meet during the month of February of each year, to organize by selecting a chairman and vice chairman. In a county whose population is 400,000 or more, the chairman must be one of the representatives of the board of county commissioners. The county clerk is ex officio the secretary of the commission.
1. 2. In addition to the organizational meeting, each commission shall meet annually in July of each year and at the call of the chairman whenever business is presented, as provided in NRS 350.004 and 350.005. 3. In conjunction with the meetings required by subsections 1 and 2, the commission in a county whose population:
   1. (a) Is 100,000 or more but less than 400,000, shall meet each quarter.
   1. (b) Is 400,000 or more, shall meet each month. The meetings required by this subsection must be scheduled at each annual meeting in July.
4. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3 of NRS 350.002, a majority of the members constitutes a quorum for all purposes.

Sec. 3. As used in sections 4 to 16, inclusive, of this act, unless the context otherwise requires, the words and terms defined in sections 4, 5 and 6 of this act have the meanings ascribed to them in those sections.

Sec. 4. "Board" means the governing body of the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition.
Sec. 5. "Coalition" means the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition created pursuant to section 7 of this act.
Sec. 6. "Committee" means the technical committee to the coalition created pursuant to section 14 of this act.
Sec. 7. The Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition is hereby created, consisting of Clark County, the City of Las Vegas, the City of North Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, Boulder City and the Clark County School District.
Sec. 8. 1. The coalition must be governed by a board consisting of 10 members.
2. The members of the board must be appointed as follows:
(a) Two members appointed by the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County from its membership, one of whom is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002;
(b) Two members appointed by the City Council of the City of Las Vegas from its membership, one of whom is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002;
(c) Two members appointed by the City Council of the City of North Las Vegas from its membership, one of whom is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002;
(d) Two members appointed by the City Council of the City of Henderson from its membership, one of whom is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002;
(e) One member appointed by the City Council of Boulder City from its membership who is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002; and
(f) One member appointed by the Board of Trustees of the Clark County School District from its membership who is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002.

3. The term of each member of the board is coterminous with his term of elected office unless the public entity that appointed him revokes his
appointment to the board.
4. If a member fails to attend three consecutive meetings
or fails to
attend five meetings during a calendar year, his
appointment is
automatically revoked.
5. If a member is unable to serve for the duration of his
term or has his
membership revoked, his position becomes vacant. A
vacancy on the board
must be filled by the authority which was entitled to
appoint the member
whose position is vacant. A vacancy must be filled within
45 days after the
departure of the member. The term of a member appointed
by the board to
fill a vacancy is the remainder of the term of the member
whose position is
vacant.
Sec. 9. 1. The board shall meet each month at a time and
place
designated by the chairman of the board. The board may
hold special
meetings as often as the needs of the board require, upon
notice to each
member of the board.
2. The board must provide notice of a meeting in the
manner
prescribed by NRS 241.020.
3. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 4:
(a) A majority of the members of the board constitutes a
quorum; and
(b) All actions must be adopted by at least a majority of
the members
present and constituting the quorum at such a meeting.
4. The affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the
members of the
board is necessary to pass an action relating to:
(a) A budgetary matter or a matter which involves an
expenditure of
public money; or
(b) A contract or other instrument that creates a binding
legal obligation
on a public entity.
Sec. 10. 1. The board shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from its membership at the first meeting of each calendar year.
2. The term of the initial chairman and vice chairman expires on the date on which the first meeting is held in the year 2000.

Sec. 11. The board shall:
1. Adopt rules or bylaws that govern its management and affairs.
2. Prepare and adopt an annual budget.

Sec. 12. The board may employ such professional, technical and support staff as it deems necessary and shall prescribe specific duties for such staff.

Sec. 13. The board shall:
1. Consult with and request recommendations from a regional organization, governmental agency or other public entity that may be affected by a decision of the board; and
2. Take all other actions necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 14. 1. The technical committee to the coalition consisting of the County Manager of Clark County, the Superintendent of the Clark County School District, and the city managers of the City of Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, the City of North Las Vegas and Boulder City, or an appointee of such an entity who is an employee of the entity, is hereby created to provide assistance to the coalition.
2. In performing its duties, the committee may request the participation of representatives of regional agencies, including, without limitation, the Regional Transportation Commission, the Clark County School District, the Regional Flood Control District, the Clark County District Board of
Health, the Southern Nevada Water Authority and public utilities.
3. The committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from its membership.
4. The committee shall meet as often as is necessary to provide assistance to the board. The chairman shall determine the time and place of the meetings of the committee and the method of providing notice of meetings.
5. The committee shall perform such duties as the board may require.

Sec. 15. The board may:
1. Develop policies for Clark County which may include, without limitation, policies for:
   (a) The promotion of orderly development, coordinated land use planning and the efficient provision of services to urban areas, including, without limitation, roads, water and sewer service, police and fire protection, mass transportation, libraries and parks;
   (b) Protection of the environment;
   (c) Recreational programs, including, without limitation, programs for regional trails and open space;
   (d) Economic development and employment; and
   (e) Affordable housing.
2. Carry out and manage the strategic plan and recommendations for financing infrastructure adopted by the Southern Nevada Strategic Planning Authority, or its successor.
3. Compile and coordinate a regional and local data base for Clark County, including, without limitation, a comprehensive regional master plan with land use designations and a geographic information system.
4. Establish standard projections for population.
5. Recommend methods for increasing the efficiency of and reducing
the cost of furnishing governmental services.
6. Make recommendations for the disposal of federal land.
7. Establish methods for resolving disputes relating to
annexation,
future land use, zoning and development that arise
between jurisdictions,
including, without limitation, identification of the
spheres of influence of
the jurisdictions. As used in this subsection, "sphere of
influence" means an
area into which a jurisdiction plans to expand.
8. Establish a program of incentives to encourage
regional strategic
planning for economic development, including, without
limitation, joint
activities relating to the creation of jobs, agreements
for revenue sharing,
education, transportation, law enforcement, water and
sewer services, and
parks and recreation.
9. Develop a regional park plan in coordination with the
Clark County
Regional Flood Control District, organized pursuant to
NRS 543.240.
10. Consider any issues of regional significance as
determined
appropriate by the board.
11. Review:
(a) Master plans adopted by the governing body of the
county and each
city in the county;
(b) The annual plan for capital improvements prepared by
the governing
body of each local government in the county pursuant to
NRS 278.0226;
and
(c) Plans for capital improvements, facilities plans or
other similar plans
adopted by:
(1) The Regional Transportation Commission of Clark
County;
(2) The Southern Nevada Water Authority, created on July
25, 1991,
by a cooperative agreement entered into on that date pursuant to the provisions of NRS 277.080 to 277.180, inclusive; (3) The Board of Trustees of the Clark County School District; (4) The Clark County District Board of Health; and (5) The Board of Directors of the Clark County Regional Flood Control District, organized pursuant to NRS 543.240.

Sec. 16. 1. The board shall establish:
(a) A subcommittee to address issues relating to the disposal of federal land and report its activities to the board. The subcommittee must consist of:
(1) The members of the board who are members of the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County;
(2) The Mayors of the City of Henderson, the City of Las Vegas and the City of North Las Vegas; and
(3) A representative of the Federal Bureau of Land Management and a member selected by the United States Air Force, who are nonvoting members.
(b) A subcommittee to carry out the duties of the Clark County Clearinghouse Council, created on July 6, 1993, by a cooperative agreement entered into on that date pursuant to the provisions of NRS 277.080 to 277.180, inclusive, and to report its activities to the board. The subcommittee must be composed of six members as follows:
(1) One member appointed by the Board of County Commissioners of Clark County from its membership;
(2) One member appointed by the City Council of the City of Las Vegas from its membership;
(3) One member appointed by the City Council of the City of North Las Vegas from its membership;
(4) One member appointed by the City Council of the City of Henderson from its membership;
(5) One member appointed by the City Council of Boulder City from its membership; and
(6) One member appointed by the City Council of the City of Mesquite from its membership.
2. The board may form other subcommittees as it deems appropriate.
3. The board may appoint additional members of the subcommittees formed pursuant to subsection 1 as the board deems appropriate.
Sec. 17. 1. This section and sections 3 through 16 of this act become effective on July 1, 1999.
2. Sections 1 and 2 of this act become effective on January 1, 2000.

Amendment No. 521

Senate Amendment to Senate Bill
No. 436 (BDR S-1588)

Proposed by: Committee on Government Affairs

Amendment Box:

Resolves Conflicts with: N/A

Amends: Summary: Title: Preamble: Joint Sponsorship:

ASSEMBLY ACTION Initial and Date | SENATE ACTION Initial and Date

Adopted Lost | Adopted Lost
Concurred In Not | Concurred In Not
Receded Not | Receded Not

Amend sec. 6, page 1, line 14, by deleting "13" and inserting "9".
Amend sec. 6, page 2, line 4, after "membership;" by inserting "and".
Amend sec. 6, page 2, by deleting lines 6 through 18 and inserting:
"membership.
3. The term of each member of the board is coterminous with his term of elected office unless the public entity
Amend sec. 7, page 2, by deleting lines 36 and 37 and inserting:
"4. The affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the members of the board is necessary to pass an action."
Amend sec. 7, page 2, line 40, after "money;" by inserting "or."
Amend sec. 7, page 2, by deleting lines 42 and 43 and inserting:
"on a public entity.".
Amend sec. 7, page 3, by deleting lines 1 through 5.
Amend sec. 8, page 3, by deleting lines 7 and 8 and inserting:
"its membership at the first meeting of each."
Amend the title of the bill, first line, by deleting: "in skeleton form".

Amendment No. 898

Assembly Amendment to Senate
Bill No. 436 First Reprint (BDR S-1588)

Proposed by: Committee on Government Affairs

Amendment Box:
Resolves Conflicts with: N/A

Amends: Summary: Title: Preamble: Joint Sponsorship:
ASSEMBLY ACTION Initial and Date | SENATE ACTION Initial and Date
Adopted Lost | Adopted Lost
Concurred In Not | Concurred In Not
Receded Not | Receded Not

Amend the bill as a whole by renumbering sections 1 through 15 as sections 3 through 17 and adding new sections designated sections 1 and 2, following the enacting clause, to read as follows:
"Section 1. NRS 350.002 is hereby amended to read as follows:
350.002 1. There is hereby created in each county whose population is 400,000 or more, a debt management commission, to be composed of:
(a) Three representatives of the board of county commissioners from its membership;
(b) One representative of each governing body of the five largest incorporated cities in the county from its membership;
(c) One representative of the board of trustees of the county school district from its membership; and
(d) Two representatives of the public at large.
2. There is hereby created in each county whose population is less than 400,000, a debt management commission, to be composed of one representative of the county, one representative of the school district and the following additional representatives:
(a) In each such county which contains more than one incorporated city:
(1) One representative of the city in which the county seat is located;
(2) One representative of the other incorporated cities jointly; and
(3) One representative of the public at large.
(b) In each such county which contains one incorporated city:
(1) One representative of the incorporated city; and
(2) Two representatives of the public at large.
(c) In each such county which contains no incorporated city, one representative of the public at large.
(d) In each such county which contains one or more general improvement districts, one representative of the district or districts jointly and one additional representative of the public at large.
3. In Carson City, there is hereby created a debt management commission, to be composed of one representative of the board of supervisors, one representative of the school district and three representatives of the public at large. The representative of the board of supervisors and the representative of the school district shall select the representatives of the public at large, and for that purpose only, constitute a quorum of the debt management commission. Members of the commission serve for a term of 2 years beginning on January 1, or until their successors are chosen.
4. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 1, each representative of a single local government must be chosen by its governing body. Each representative of two or more local governments must be chosen by their
governing bodies jointly, each governing body having one vote. Each representative of the general improvement districts must be chosen by their governing bodies jointly, each governing body having one vote. Each representative of the public at large must be chosen by the other members of the commission from residents of the county, or Carson City, as the case may be, who have a knowledge of its financial structure. A tie vote must be resolved by lot.

5. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, members of the commission or their successors must be chosen in January of each odd-numbered year and hold office for a term of 2 years beginning January 1. The representatives of incorporated cities must be chosen after elections are held in the cities, but before the annual meeting of the commission in July.

6. Any vacancy must be filled in the same manner as the original choice was made for the remainder of the unexpired term.

Sec. 2. NRS 350.003 is hereby amended to read as follows:

350.003 1. The commission shall meet during the month of February of each year, to organize by selecting a chairman and vice chairman. In a county whose population is 400,000 or more, the chairman must be one of the representatives of the board of county commissioners. The county clerk is ex officio the secretary of the commission.

2. In addition to the organizational meeting, each commission shall meet annually in July of each year and at the call of the chairman whenever business is presented, as provided in NRS 350.004 and 350.005.

3. In conjunction with the meetings required by subsections 1 and 2, the commission in a county whose population:

(a) Is 100,000 or more but less than 400,000, shall meet each calendar quarter.

(b) Is 400,000 or more, shall meet each month.

The meetings required by this subsection must be scheduled at each annual meeting in July.
4. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3 of NRS 350.002, a majority of the members constitutes a quorum for all purposes.

Amend section 1, page 1, line 1, by deleting: "2 to 14," and inserting: "4 to 16.",

Amend section 1, page 1, lines 2 and 3, by deleting: "2, 3 and 4" and inserting: "4, 5 and 6",

Amend sec. 3, page 1, line 7, by deleting "5" and inserting "7",

Amend sec. 4, page 1, line 9, by deleting "12" and inserting "14",

Amend sec. 5, page 1, by deleting line 12 and inserting: "North Las Vegas, the City of Henderson, Boulder City and the Clark County School District.",

Amend sec. 6, page 1, line 13, by deleting "9" and inserting "10",

Amend sec. 6, page 2, line 4, by deleting "and",

Amend sec. 6, page 2, by deleting line 6 and inserting: "membership; and

(f) One member appointed by the Board of Trustees of the Clark County School District from its membership.",

Amend sec. 6, page 2, line 10, after "4." by inserting: "If a member fails to attend three consecutive meetings or fails to attend five meetings during a calendar year, his appointment is automatically revoked.

5.

Amend sec. 7, page 2, line 17, by deleting: "at least once each calendar quarter" and inserting "each month",

Amend sec. 11, page 3, by deleting lines 2 and 3,

Amend sec. 11, page 3, line 4, by deleting "2." and inserting "1.".

Amend sec. 11, page 3, line 7, by deleting "1." and inserting "2.",

Amend sec. 12, page 3, line 10, after "Clark County" by inserting: ", the Superintendent of the Clark County School District,",

Amend sec. 12, page 3, by deleting line 12 and inserting: "City, or the appointee of such an entity who is an employee of the entity, is hereby created to provide",

Amend sec. 15, page 5, by deleting line 24 and inserting:
"Sec. 17. 1. This section and sections 3 through 16 of this act become effective on July 1, 1999.
2. Sections 1 and 2 of this act become effective on January 1, 2000."

Amend the title of the bill, first line, after "planning;" by inserting: "revising the composition of the debt management commission in certain counties;".

Amend the summary of the bill to read as follows: "SUMMARY—Makes various changes relating to regional planning. (BDR 30-1588)".

Amendment No. 1118

Assembly Amendment to Senate Bill No. 436 Second Reprint (BDR 30-1588)

Proposed by: Assemblyman Bache

Amendment Box: Makes technical changes only.

Resolves Conflicts with: N/A

Amends: Summary: Title: Preamble: Joint Sponsorship:

ASSEMBLY ACTION Initial and Date | SENATE ACTION Initial and Date

Adopted Lost | Adopted Lost
Concurred In Not | Concurred In Not
Receded Not | Receded Not

Amend sec. 8, page 3, line 36, by deleting the semicolon and inserting: ", one of whom is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002;".

Amend sec. 8, page 3, line 38, by deleting the semicolon and inserting: ", one of whom is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002;".

Amend sec. 8, page 3, line 40, by deleting the semicolon and inserting: ", one of whom is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002;".

Amend sec. 8, page 3, line 42, by deleting the semicolon and inserting:
", one of whom is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002;".
Amend sec. 8, page 4, line 2, by deleting the semicolon and inserting:
"who is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002;".
Amend sec. 8, page 4, line 4, by deleting the period and inserting:
"who is a member of the debt management commission established pursuant to subsection 1 of NRS 350.002.".
November 5, 1998

TO: Dale Aches, Clark County Manager
Virginia Valentine, City Manager, Las Vegas
Pat Imparato, City Manager, North Las Vegas
John Sefried, City Manager, Boulder City

As a previous SSNA Public Outreach Committee meeting, the members agreed that each entity would have to be responsible for its own public outreach efforts. It was also determined that each entity would hold a public hearing on the SSNA Strategic Plan to obtain public comments.

I thought you might be interested in the City of Henderson's Public Outreach Plan. There are some areas in which other members of the Authority might like to participate. For example, on November 15th and 16th, we have scheduled the Galleria Mall on Sunset for SSNA displays, handouts, information and public comment.

I have also attached the schedule of our public outreach program, and a copy of an informal survey which we'll be sending out to our residents. The survey is designed to serve a variety of purposes: inform citizens about the SSNA Strategic Plan and invite formal comment, determine which issues are of greatest importance, and increase public awareness of the issues addressed through SSNA. We will use this information for our own internal purposes, but will be happy to share whatever data we obtain if you would like.

We're also preparing a 15-20 minute overview presentation on the Strategic Plan, which we can provide to you on disk.

Hopefully, our efforts will enhance the overall public outreach efforts of the SSNA. If you can be of further assistance, please call.

Sincerely,

Philip D. Spright
City Manager

APPENDIX E
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open House</td>
<td>November 8, 9 a.m. to 9 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Meeting</td>
<td>November 14, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Fair</td>
<td>November 14, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Meeting</td>
<td>November 16, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>November 17, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Government</td>
<td>November 18, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Fair at the Galleria Mall</td>
<td>November 14, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Meeting/Citizen Participation</td>
<td>November 16, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>November 17, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Government</td>
<td>November 18, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Fair</td>
<td>November 14, 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Meeting</td>
<td>November 16, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>November 17, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Government</td>
<td>November 18, 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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