

**Study Purpose & Need**

NAIOP-Southern Nevada ("NAIOP") commissioned RCG Economics ("RCG") to prepare an analysis whose main purpose was to investigate the issue of land scarcity in Clark County (or the "Las Vegas MSA"; "Southern Nevada"). The focus of RCG's scope of work was to evaluate whether future short- and long-term developable land constraints that could negatively impact the region's economic resilience. The Study Period used goes from 2018 through 2035.

*Note: RCG did consider the negative impacts on the Clark County economy associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. The Study was essentially completed prior near closing of the Clark County economy in mid-March 2020.*

**Recommendations & Major Findings**

- Nevada's Congressional delegation should immediately and aggressively pursue changes to federal law included in the Southern Nevada Economic Development and Conservation Act to expand Southern Nevada's disposal boundary.
- Southern Nevada will face a land shortage, stunting economic development around 2030 if nothing is done to expand regional access to lands; sooner if the BLM fails to release lands as needed.
- There are roughly 19,100 gross acres of developable employment land in 198 parcels of 20+ acres remaining in Clark County.
- Approximately 9,700 of those acres are most optimal for development. Includes federally-owned parcels that have not yet been released under SNPLMA.
- The region is projected to require about 14,100 acres of developable employment land to meet the needs of the expected economic and job growth by 2035.
- Based on the estimated 9,700 acres note above, there would be a deficit of 4,400 acres.
- Failing to ensure an adequate supply of employment land could lead to a reduction in an yrly. gross regional product growth from 2.8 percent per year to 1.5 – 2.0 percent per year.

**Three Forecast Scenarios Developed (2018 – 2035)**

- Base-Case (No land constraints)
- 3% cost disadvantage (due to land constraints)
- 5% cost disadvantage (due to land constraints)

**Economic Output Impact**

**Base-case:** Average yrly. growth rate: 2.8%

**3% cost disadvantage:** Avg. yrly. growth rate: 1.9%  
 Growth reduction over Study Period: \$43.6 billion or by 13.7%

**5% cost disadvantage:** Avg. yrly. growth: 1.3%  
 Growth reduction over Study Period: \$69.5 billion or by 21.8%

**Job Impact**

**Base-case:** Avg. yrly. growth rate: 1.9%.

**3% cost disadvantage:** Avg. yrly. growth rate: 1.2%  
 Growth reduction over Study Period: 204,800 jobs or by 11.3%

**5% cost disadvantage:** Avg. yrly. job growth rate: 0.7%  
 Growth reduction over Study Period: 329,100 jobs or by 18.1%

**Earnings (Wages and Business Income) Impact**

**Base-case:** Avg. yrly. growth rate: 2.8%

**3% cost disadvantage:** Avg. yrly. growth: 2%  
 Growth reduction over Study Period: \$12.2 billion or by 11.1

**5% cost disadvantage:** Avg. yrly. labor income growth: 1.6%  
 Growth reduction over Study Period: \$19.5 billion or by 17.9%

**Gross Regional Product Impact**

**Base-case:** Avg. yrly. growth rate: 2.8%

**3% cost disadvantage:** Avg. yrly. growth: 2%.  
 Growth reduction over Study Period = \$22.5 billion or by 11.8%

**5% scenario disadvantage:** Avg, yrly. growth: 1.5%  
 Growth reduction over Study Period = \$36.1 billion or by 18.9%

###