

Scenarios Discussion

Business as Usual:

- Agreement that it's important to evaluate the BAU, but consensus that it's probably not meeting our needs
 - One conflicting opinion that our BAU can meet our needs but that we don't have the right tools or incentives to support what we need
- Question to better understand what's holding back development in the BAU
- BAU won't address affordability
- West Henderson may be de-emphasized in BAU and baseline scenarios, but is a significant priority for COH

Alternative scenarios (meeting discussion):

- Agreements that alternatives should explore benefits of increasing density
- Water infrastructure is important to evaluate (this may make more sense as an evaluation criteria)
- Need to work with LVGEA to align on industries being evaluated
- Infrastructure improvements should support all users and ages (ie vulnerable users)
- City centers scenario will still need smaller surrounding cores to support them
- Many scenarios won't happen without transit support (i.e. TOD) – there will be a need for massive transit investment (RTC may not support this at this time, was not present at meeting to respond)
- Affordability and safety are important outcomes (overlap with comments on evaluation criteria)
- Need to support existing infrastructure (aligns with survey feedback)
- Blank slate opportunity in #4 & #5 can present significant opportunities
- BAU and scenario #4 may be too similar
- #3 is most likely closest to the pattern we're already seeing - we do already see some higher density in new our new developments (especially true in C.C.)
- Infill housing should not occur around the airport (current or future)
- Scenarios are focused on future growth but not clear how they can benefit existing residents
- #3 will likely benefit existing residents the most
- Affordable housing is hard to pencil
- #1 and #4/5 may be too similar

Evaluation Criteria Discussion

- See menti-meter results
- Most metrics were relatively close in overall score, with most scores ranking as important above 4.2
- Indicators scoring 4.0 or more: water usage (4.8), heat impacts (4.5), infrastructure costs (4.5), housing affordability (4.5), quality of life (4.5), housing and transportation costs (4.5), housing types and locations (4.4), mode share (4.3), fiscal resources (4.3), access to open space/outdoors (4.2), walk access to amenities (4.2), congestion and commute times (4.1), greenhouse gas emissions (4.1),
- Indicator scoring less than 4.0: VMT(3.9), job types and locations (3.9), transit access to amenities (3.9), barriers to development (3.8), acres consumed and conserved (3.7), number of new students (3.2), car access to amenities (2.4)
- Other criteria to consider:
 - Health outcomes
 - Aging in place
 - Food deserts
 - Access to healthcare
 - Housing types and choices (i.e. missing middle housing)
 - Safety on roadways
 - Diversity of housing/housing mix
 - Job quality
 - Water availability for development of private property
 - Heat impacts can be broken into categories:
 - public health impacts (outcomes, healthcare costs, strain on hospitals/emergency rooms)
 - economic impacts (degrading infrastructure, utility costs)

Post-it Comments

Scenario 1: Business as Usual

- Support
 - Acknowledges ongoing efforts and transportation initiatives
 - Provides predictability for the development community
 - Growth based on market driver metrics
 - Challenge current policies & permitting (?)
 - Need a baseline
 - Needed to compare change – why change

- Concerns
 - Lacks light rail
 - “Tail wags the dog”
 - Supports existing transit
 - Growth forces further changes to transit plan
 - Doesn’t take new innovation into account
 - Identifies problems with BAU and need for change
 - Limited infill
 - BAU is how the LV became the worst city for urban heat island effect and consistent “F” air quality ratings
 - Not sure BAU is sustainable
 - Current development patterns don’t seem sustainable
 - Long-term need for more diversity of housing options to address the housing issue
 - Facing challenges with status quo – need more tools

Scenario 2: City Centers

- Support
 - Allows people to live close to work
 - Infill will reduce sprawl
 - Opportunities to modernize current outdated infrastructure
 - Reflects CLV Master Plan direction
 - Targeted high-density areas with mixed-use and improved housing can impact many quickly (transit, jobs, etc.)
 - Makes existing transit investment more sustainable\Cost benefit for existing infrastructure investment
 - Addresses density, heat, and economic development but need more details
 - Agreeable future
- Concerns
 - Lacks light rail
 - Will there be the “T” for TOD
 - Lack of light rail or similar transportation mode to support this growth model
 - St. Rose and Las Vegas Blvd are important corridors and important considerations for this scenario

Scenario 3: Walkable Cities

- Support

- Supports economic diversification, TOD, infill, and retrofitting car oriented development, which can improve air quality and slow warming temps
- TOD is a top priority for CLV
- Positive for safer neighborhoods
- Less environmental impact
- Includes key health indicators and health across life span
- Aligns with vision of Henderson Strong
- Best addresses aging populations
- Maximizes existing investment in infrastructure
- Survey results support this
- Concerns
 - Lacks light rail

Scenario 4: Frontier City

- Support
 - Most likely to happen but won't be low-density (today's development is not low-density)
 - Is an opportunity to grow differently in the future if new land becomes available
- Concerns
 - Will worsen urban heat island and extreme heat
 - Does not support variety of housing needs
 - Puts further strain on transit
 - Will create exclusion zones
 - CLV is out of land so scenario doesn't apply
 - Lacks light rail
 - Lack of land and there is resistance to releasing new land
 - Not sustainable
 - Sprawl?
 - Traffic impacts to work areas
 - Not a concept to strive for due to limited resources

Scenario 5: Satellite City

- Support
 - Only is #2&3 are also happening
 - Raw land is an opportunity for a clean slate – can manage development expectations and create zoning
 - Opportunity to deed restrict for owner occupied home ownership

- Preferable to option 4 – could support live-work options & high-quality job opportunities
- Smart to include this option
- Concerns
 - Lacks light rail
 - Concerns about infrastructure (power, water, etc.)
 - No greenfield left
 - New land without strict modeling could put stress on existing commutes and water being restricted



