



**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE**  
**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: OCTOBER 3, 2007**

**DEPARTMENT: ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES**  
**DIRECTOR: CHRISTOPHER KNIGHT**

Consent  Discussion

**SUBJECT:**

Discussion and possible action on a report from staff concerning the alternatives presented in the scoping meetings for the on-going Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, conducted by the Las Vegas Field Office of the Bureau of Land Management, for the Proposed Conservation Area in the North Las Vegas portion of the City - Ward 6 (Ross)

**Fiscal Impact**

No Impact  Augmentation Required  
 Budget Funds Available

**Amount:**  
**Funding Source:**  
**Dept./Division:**

**PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:**

In December of 2004 the Bureau of Land Management issued a Record of Decision for an Environmental Impact Statement prepared for lands added to the disposal area of the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act Disposal Boundary through the Clark County Lands Act of 2000. The EIS recommended a 5,000 acre conservation transfer area (CTA) in the upper Las Vegas wash within the boundaries of the Cities of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas. Additional CTA boundary alternatives were identified during subsequent meetings between BLM and various stakeholders to discuss implementation and mitigation strategies. To assess these alternatives the BLM is conducting a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) to the original EIS. Staff will present the preliminary alternatives identified for the SEIS. The alternatives range from approximately 3,000 to 13,000 acres and have significant relevance to the future growth of the City.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Receive the report and direct staff accordingly.

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. SEIS Alternatives as presented at the initial scoping meetings
2. Submitted after meeting - Hardcopy of PowerPoint presentation by Chris Knight

Motion made by STEVEN D. ROSS to Approve to accept the report, with direction to CITY MANAGER SELBY and MR. KNIGHT to prepare an aggressive resolution, consisting of the factual history on this matter, as well as a request to the City's lobbying team to also take an aggressive stance on the City's position before the congressional delegation

Passed For: 6; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 1

## CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: OCTOBER 3, 2007

LOIS TARKANIAN, LARRY BROWN, OSCAR B. GOODMAN, GARY REESE, STEVE WOLFSON, STEVEN D. ROSS; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-RICKI Y. BARLOW)

### Minutes:

CHRIS KNIGHT, Director of Administrative Services, gave a brief PowerPoint presentation and gave a chronology on the Upper Las Vegas Wash Conservation Transfer Area. He noted that, from the discussions held, there were six alternatives identified for different boundaries, and, of those, staff has expressed support of Alternative Boundary One.

At the direction of COUNCILMAN ROSS, MR. KNIGHT identified some of the landmarks in the area, as depicted in the Alternative Boundary One PowerPoint slide. MR. KNIGHT continued with his presentation and outlined the various Alternatives and their acreage, expounding on Alternative Boundary One. It includes acreage from the cities of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas. The acreage within the City of Las Vegas consists of approximately 1,500 acres, and the proposal does not include the 1,100 acres encompassing Floyd Lamb Park at Tule Springs, or the 350 acres immediately east of Floyd Lamb Park that were designated for an equestrian center. He noted that the boundaries for Alternative Boundary One through Six would preclude extension of utilities beyond the Paiute site. Alternative Boundary One is the most restrictive and could result in a loss of the \$63 million that the City has expended since 2004 toward planning for growth and development.

It is imperative that the City remain a cooperative agency, in order to have an impact on the outcome of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. He reiterated that staff strongly supports Alternative One, which provides the greatest amount of development, with a balance between preservation and development. The City had already taken steps to preserve land well in advance of area development. The City Manager has sent correspondence to Clark County to try to get its stance on the issue. Staff would recommend briefing the congressional delegation on the City's position. In a worst-case scenario, with Alternative Five selected, there may be recourse for legal action, should the land be removed from potential growth. The City's Finance Director has been consulted, and he projected that the loss of revenue under Alternative Five would be approximately \$61 million annually. Staff agrees with MS. MULROY that the crucial question is how a city grows. Hence, Planning and Development is working to negotiate with the Rocky Mountain Institute to study the growth and development in the areas discussed, so that growth continues in a sustainable fashion, in order to protect the natural sources that support quality of life.

COUNCILMAN ROSS opined that the projected revenue loss would create a hardship in providing necessary public safety and quality of life, as well as the services that the residents expect. He directed staff to prepare a resolution supporting Alternative Boundary One, to make conversations with the County a priority, and to have the City's lobbyists communicate to the congressional delegation the City's position in this matter and its importance. Lastly, he pointed out that discussions have taken place with the Paiutes, and they are going to need the City's services. Therefore, flexibility is essential in order to help the Paiutes realize their goals and vice versa.

## CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: OCTOBER 3, 2007

COUNCILMAN BROWN concurred with the comments of COUNCILMAN ROSS. He then asked if there was an environmental study done when the entire area was released for a wilderness study. MR. KNIGHT answered that the area was part of the Quail Springs Wilderness Study, which was conducted by the federal government to see if it should be designated as a wilderness area. The study concluded that it would not be appropriate for a wilderness area, and it was discussed prior to the Clark County Public Land Act. DEPUTY CITY MANAGER FRETWELL suggested finding and thoroughly reviewing the environmental reports that were part of the debate.

COUNCILMAN BROWN stressed that the land has not been managed for decades, and it is being used for illegal dumping, shooting, off-roading, etc. However, the City identified years ago that this area is special and that something special should be done with the Wash, should the opportunity for growth develop. But several of the recent alternatives are ridiculous and impractical. Referring to the southwesterly quarter of the Clark County Shooting Range, he noted that it was completely left out of the CTA (Conservation Transfer Area) study area, because it is designated as the Clark County Shooting Range, although there could be paleontological finds, there is no longer an environmental problem, because the area is designated as a shooting range. The true intent is to protect sensitive areas, it should be realistic, and those areas should be identified. Regarding the Paiute Reservation, it is important, but it is already a part of Southern Nevada. Asking for a mild buffer around the Reservation does not make sense, when the City is already extending to the south of it. Certainly, continued dialogue with the Paiutes is critical; however, he hopes that the study by the University of Utah will bring some factual information on which to base growth or no more growth. Nevertheless, he supported the resolution suggested by COUNCILMAN ROSS, requesting that it take an aggressive position on behalf of the City.

COUNCILMAN WOLFSON supported the motion for a resolution and the comments of COUNCILMAN BROWN, noting that the resolution is critical. The City has relied on the Lands Act of five years ago, and has expended resources because of it. But it seems that fairness is not being taken into account. He agrees that factual information should be pushed to be contained in the resolution. He thanked SENATOR RICHARD BRYAN for briefing the Council.

MAYOR GOODMAN requested the motion incorporate the comments of COUNCILMEN BROWN and WOLFSON.