

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1 **GPA-27135 – PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: THE TAPESTRY GROUP, INC. –**  
2 **OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS, ET AL – Request to Amend a portion of the Southwest**  
3 **Sector Plan of the General Plan FROM: ROW (RIGHT-OF-WAY) AND PF (PUBLIC**  
4 **FACILITIES) TO: M (MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) AND PF (PUBLIC**  
5 **FACILITIES) on 15.25 acres adjacent to the north side of Westcliff Drive, approximately**  
6 **595 feet east of Tenaya Way (APNs 138-27-801-004 and 138-27-802-006), Ward 1**  
7 **(Tarkanian).**

8 **ZON-27496 – PUBLIC HEARING – APPLICANT: THE TAPESTRY GROUP, INC. –**  
9 **OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS, ET AL – Request to a Rezoning FROM: U**  
10 **(UNDEVELOPED) [ROW (RIGHT-OF-WAY) GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION] AND**  
11 **C-V (CIVIC) on 15.25 acres adjacent to the north side of Westcliff Drive, approximately**  
12 **595 feet east of Tenaya Way (APNs 138-27-801-004 and 138-27-802-006), Ward 1**  
13 **(Tarkanian).**

14 **VAC-27747 – PUBLIC HEARING – APPLICANT: THE TAPESTRY GROUP, INC. –**  
15 **OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS, ET AL – Petition to vacate a 60-foot wide public right-**  
16 **of-way grant generally located east of Tenaya Way, approximately 950 feet north of**  
17 **Westcliff Drive, Ward 1 (Tarkanian).**

18 **SDR-27497 – PUBLIC HEARING – APPLICANT: THE TAPESTRY GROUP, INC. –**  
19 **OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS, ET AL – Request for a Site Development Plan Review**  
20 **FOR A PROPOSED 252-UNIT, TWO AND THREE STORY, MULTI-FAMILY**  
21 **DEVELOPMENT INTENDED FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING WITH A WAIVER OF**  
22 **THE RESIDENTIAL ADJACENCY STANDARD TO ALLOW A 50-FOOT SETBACK**  
23 **WHERE 70 FEET ARE REQUIRED on 15.25 acres adjacent to the north side of Westcliff**  
24 **Drive, approximately 595 feet east of Tenaya Way (APNs 138-27-801-004 and 138-27-802-**  
25 **006), U (Undeveloped) [ROW (Right-of-Way) General Plan Designation] and C-V (Civic)**  
26 **Zones [Proposed: R-PD19 (Residential Planned Development – 19 Units Per Acre) and C-V**  
27 **(Civic) Zones], Ward 1 (Tarkanian).**

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

28 **Appearance List:**

29 OSCAR GOODMAN, Mayor  
30 RICHARD BRYAN, Lionel Sawyer and Collins, 300 South Fourth Street  
31 STEVE WOLFSON, Councilman  
32 MARGO WHEELER, Director of Planning and Development  
33 ORLANDO SANCHEZ, Acting City Manager  
34 LUCY STEWART, 856 East Sahara Avenue  
35 LINDA MINK  
36 JIM LEWIS, Deputy City Attorney  
37 TOM MCGOWAN, Las Vegas resident  
38 JIM McFADDEN, 204 Fig Court  
39 JUANITA CLARK, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation  
40 GARY REESE, Councilman  
41 LOIS TARKANIAN, Councilwoman  
42 BEVERLY K. BRIDGES, City Clerk  
43 LARRY BROWN, Councilman  
44 UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER  
45 STEVE HOUCHENS, Deputy City Manager  
46 STEVEN D. ROSS, Councilman  
47 HELENA GARCIA, 6725 Brunswick Circle  
48 CHRIS KAEMPFER, Attorney on behalf of Westcore Properties  
49 BETTY EVENSON, 7100 Pirates Cove, Condo 1044  
50 RICKI Y. BARLOW, Councilman  
51 JORGE CERVANTES, Director of Public Works  
52 ED BYRGE, Right-of-Way Superintendent  
53 BART ANDERSON, Public Works  
54  
55 1 hour and 45 minutes  
56 Typed by: Angela Crolli  
57 Proofed by: Lean Coleman

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

58 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

59 Okay. I'm gonna call Items 87 through 90. Eighty-seven is SDR-27497 (sic). The applicant is  
60 the Tapestry Group, Inc. The owner, City of Las Vegas, et al. Request for a site Development  
61 Plan Review for a proposed 252-unit, two and three-story multi-family development intended for  
62 affordable housing with a waiver of the Residential Adjacency Standard, to allow a 50-foot  
63 setback where 70 feet are required on 15.25 acres adjacent to the north side of Westcliff Drive  
64 approximately five hundred and ninety-five feet east of Tenaya Way. The Planning Commission  
65 and staff recommend approval. This is in Ward 1.

66 Number 88 is ZON-27496; the same applicant, the same owner. Request for a rezoning from U,  
67 Undeveloped ROW, Right-of-Way General Plan Designation and C-V, Civic to R-PD24 (sic),  
68 Residential Planned Development, 24 units per acre, and C-V, Civic on 15.25 acres adjacent to  
69 the north side of Westcliff Drive, approximately five hundred and ninety-five feet east of Tenaya  
70 Way. The Planning Commission and staff recommend approval.

71 Number 89 is VAC-27747; same applicant, same owner. Petition to vacate a 60-foot wide public  
72 right-of-way grant generally located east of Tenaya Way, approximately nine hundred and 50  
73 feet north of Westcliff Drive. The Planning Commission and staff recommend approval.

74 Number 90 is SDR-27497. The applicant is the Tapestry Group, Inc. The owners, City of Las  
75 Vegas, et al. Request for a Site Development Plan Review for a proposed two hundred and fifty-  
76 two-unit, two and three-story multi-family development intended for affordable housing with a  
77 waiver of the Residential Adjacency Standard to allow a 50-foot setback where 70 feet are  
78 required, on 15.25 acres adjacent to the north side of Westcliff Drive, approximately five  
79 hundred and ninety-five feet east of Tenaya Way. The Planning Commission and staff  
80 recommend approval. All these items are in Ward 1. They're all public hearings, which I now  
81 declare open. And, Senator Bryan, are you representing the applicant?

82

83 **RICHARD BRYAN**

84 I am, Your Honor.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

85 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

86 Alright, be happy to hear from you.

87

88 **RICHARD BRYAN**

89 I appreciate that, Mayor and members of the Council. For the record, I'm Richard Bryan with  
90 the law firm of Lionel Sawyer and Collins, 300 South Fourth Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. 8-9-1-  
91 0-1, and I'm here on behalf of the applicant. Your Honor and members of the Council, I think it  
92 may be helpful to provide a little context, in terms of how we got here, on the issue before you  
93 today. As you recall Tapestry is a non-profit corporation formed under Arizona law  
94 approximately nine years ago, was qualified as a 501(C)(3) and throughout the country has  
95 acquired various projects for affordable or workforce housing. Is currently under construction  
96 for at least one other and moving through the process, and we'll talk a little bit more about that.  
97 Tapestry began its conversations with the City more than three years ago. I became involved in  
98 the early part of 2005. Obviously, the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act, which is  
99 a critical piece of what we're gonna be discussing today, is a piece of legislation that I have  
100 some familiarity with in my former life. It specifically provides for affordable housing to be  
101 made, land to be made available for that purpose. The City itself has taken a very strong stance,  
102 in terms of affordable housing. In your most recent statement of policy, the City has said, in  
103 effect, with respect to barriers of affordable housing, that the City's policy is to assist affordable  
104 housing developers with a development process and how to obtain project building permits in a  
105 timely manner. It also indicates it will explore possible incentives for developers of affordable  
106 housing, such as density bonuses. And, then, finally, it makes reference to the fact to work with  
107 the Bureau of Land Management to purchase federal lands to be set aside for affordable housing  
108 development, the point that I just referenced a moment ago.

109 Shortly after the conversations began with the City, Mr. Richard Gibb, who'd been retained by  
110 Tapestry, began to look at the BLM sites that might possibly be available. And there was,  
111 perhaps, a dozen or more that he looked at, and essentially, those got paired down to a couple  
112 because some of the BLM sites were identified for other pub, public purposes. The Water  
113 District needed a site, a library site is a possibility, some other public purpose. And so,  
114 essentially it came down to a couple of sites; one that was in Councilman Ross' district, and we

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

115 had some conversations with him early, and the one that's before us today. Now, I think it's  
116 important to emphasize that in working very carefully with the Neighborhood Services staff,  
117 they indicated that that would certainly be an acceptable site, and they encouraged us to pursue  
118 the application. And that's what, in effect, brings us here today. The –

119

120 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

121 Now, Senator, there was a – prior proceeding where the Council took action.

122

123 **RICHARD BRYAN**

124 That – is correct, Your Honor. I was gonna get to that, but you're absolutely right.

125

126 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

127 Fine, that's fine.

128

129 **RICHARD BRYAN**

130 And – I –

131

132 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

133 And I don't wanna (inaudible).

134

135 **RICHARD BRYAN**

136 No, and I don't wanna be, I know – your time is limited, so I will try to be as brief as I can. But  
137 sequentially, and then what occurred is that, we began a negotiation with the development  
138 agreement with the City, and Mr. Lewis, your Deputy City Attorney, was involved in that. That  
139 took a protracted period of time. It's not my purpose here to complain, but I think we worked  
140 months and months and months, and ultimately got the development agreement. And Your  
141 Honor and members of the Council, that is what on November of last year, which was before us,  
142 the development agreement, which then allowed us to go forward and then to be before you  
143 today on the matters that are on the agenda.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

144 Let – me just refresh your recollection. There’s controversy attached to this proposal, and part of  
145 the controversy as you’ll recall, is that some members of the Council, and I certainly respect  
146 their views, believe that there ought to have been an RFP, and they site the County by way of an  
147 example. Let me say, that first of all, Tapestry did not suggest the process by which to move  
148 forward. We were told that the City’s process, and I don’t think there’s any dispute on that, that  
149 it would be upon the developer to seek the necessary land entitlements to go forward. And that  
150 is the issue before you today on the four agenda items before you.

151 I think it’s important to emphasize the distinction between the RFP process that the County uses  
152 and what you have chosen, at least, as of the time that this application was processed. With  
153 respect to the RFP process that the County uses, the County gets all of the entitlements. In other  
154 words, in the County it would not be the developer appearing before the County Commission to  
155 seek necessary zoning or general plan amendments or all of the variances and that sort of thing  
156 that might be required for a project. That’s already approved. So, when it goes out to an RFP,  
157 all of the developers are aware that, look, that particular parcel has been approved and the RFP  
158 goes forward. That is in mark contrast to where we are today. This is –

159

160 **STEVE WOLFSON**

161 Mayor Goodman? I’m sorry, and I’m sorry to interrupt.

162

163 **RICHARD BRYAN**

164 Yes, yeah.

165

166 **STEVE WOLFSON**

167 Just for clarification, does that apply to BLM land itself?

168

169 **RICHARD BRYAN**

170 Yes, absolutely. In fact, the two projects that are involved in the City, involved BLM land, went  
171 through that process.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

172 **STEVE WOLFSON**

173 But I'm talking about the County, the –

174

175 **RICHARD BRYAN**

176 Yes, yes.

177

178 **STEVE WOLFSON**

179 – RFP process would also apply to BLM land as well?

180

181 **RICHARD BRYAN**

182 Right.

183

184 **STEVE WOLFSON**

185 And may I ask Margo, if you know, Margo. Why do we do it differently than the County?

186

187 **MARGO WHEELER**

188 Sir, that would not be a Planning matter. I think, maybe, Mr. Sanchez could speak to that.

189

190 **STEVE WOLFSON**

191 I mean, just out of curiosity because we're talking about some –

192

193 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

194 Mayor?

195

196 **STEVE WOLFSON**

197 – issues here. I'm just curious. Why – do we do it differently than the County?

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

198 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

199 Mayor, when this came up we did not have a policy in place, and what we did is, we receive, we  
200 received unsolicited requests for proposals. We came, Tape, Tapestry approached us with a deal  
201 that said they would not require any City financing at all.

202

203 **RICHARD BRYAN**

204 That's right.

205

206 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

207 It looked like an attractive deal to us. We were, back then, really behind the curve trying to get  
208 affordable workforce housing and we said we – would recommend it; we went forward. But  
209 now we do have a policy for any further future BLM property that will go through the proposal  
210 process, based on your direction.

211

212 **RICHARD BRYAN**

213 And my purpose, Councilman Wolfson and other members of the staff, and – of the Council, is  
214 not to be critical. I'm just trying to draw that fundamental distinction, which is significant. So,  
215 in this particular case, and Mr. Wilczewski, who is the principal who have (sic) talked to  
216 members of the Council previously, fully understood that the risk was on him, and he spent,  
217 obviously, several hundred thousand dollars to get to this point. We recognize that's a risk that  
218 he –

219 At that time it was suggested that maybe there was something inherently unfair, that a lot of  
220 other developers might wanna come forward and provide affordable or workforce housing. To  
221 the best of our knowledge, as I have been led to believe, and staff can, nobody else has come  
222 forward. It's not exactly as if there's a line where people are cued up and say we wanna do  
223 workforce housing. So, I would like to disabuse the notion that somehow Tapestry got some  
224 kind of an unfair advantage. They were the only applicant that was moving forward with it, and  
225 to the best of my knowledge, I wanna be careful, I'm not aware of anybody else. As Councilman  
226 Wolfson –

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

227 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

228 I'm not sure that's relevant either.

229

230 **RICHARD BRYAN**

231 Well, I'm sure that it is either, but to the extent that there was somehow, others were  
232 disadvantaged because they didn't get a chance to participate. Everybody was free to pursue the  
233 policy that Mr. Sanchez has – suggested.

234 As we pointed out, we seek no incentives financially from the City. We're not asking for any  
235 federal. This is not the Section 8. It's not that kind of thing.

236 The next question that came up, that I think might be helpful for the Council to get an update on,  
237 it was represented at the time that projects in Florida were ongoing. One of the projects, which  
238 is identified as the Springfield, Florida project, that is currently in construction, and to the extent  
239 that it may be relevant here, here's the construction that's in place currently. I believe it's  
240 scheduled to be completed later on this year. If that becomes a question for the Council, we'll be  
241 happy to respond. Panama City, another project, the development agreement, they call it  
242 something a little different, but has been approved, and that is moving forward. It's not been  
243 finally approved, but from all of the indications, it's just one step from getting final approval.  
244 And there is a third project that was referenced that is a senior project that is in Lynn Haven,  
245 Florida; the zoning has been approved for that and the general plan amendment, and that needs  
246 to go through whatever their steps are as well. The reason why I brought that up, there was some  
247 question as to whether or not Tapestry was capable of constructing such a project, and I offer this  
248 information in that context.

249 So, I would respectfully submit, members of the Council, Mayor, that the issue before you today  
250 is, is this an appropriate land use? Is this an appropriate land use? Obviously, your staff in  
251 directing us to look at the project with the recommendation that's before you, has reached its  
252 conclusion in the affirmative. These matters were debated before the Planning Commission, and  
253 your Planning Commission has approved this as an appropriate land use.

254 Undoubtedly have seen a newspaper article this morning that I think bear some relevancy. The  
255 Review Journal story in terms of dealing with the City of Las Vegas, how you're constrained  
256 because of some of the geography that you have, and this could become increasingly important

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

257 to use infill. And, as you all know, a technical term, this is an infill piece. It's gonna be very  
258 important to do so. So, I mean, with the commitment that you have, getting workforce housing,  
259 if not here, where? I mean, I've been out to look at the property. I'm sure you have as well.  
260 The neighbors, certainly, gonna express their views, and we certainly respect their views.  
261 Is there a need? There was some question about that. Well, according to the Price Waterhouse  
262 Report, that in the next two years, as these construction projects in the Las Vegas Strip, about 40  
263 billion dollars worth, and you're all familiar with that, it's estimated there'll be a hundred and  
264 thirteen thousand new employees that will be required. And although we have seen land values  
265 depreciate rather dramatically over the past few months, certainly dramatically since then,  
266 interestingly enough the surveys indicate that rents have increased. And that may very well be  
267 as a tragic consequence of people who've lost their home to foreclosure and now the only option  
268 that they have before them is to rent. So, we would respectfully argue that, certainly, by the time  
269 this project moves forward, if you give us the permission to do so today, there's gonna be a real  
270 need that's enhanced by those hundred and thirteen thousand employees.  
271 Let me talk a little bit about, we had three neighborhood meetings. Our planning consultant,  
272 who will speak in just a moment, attended those meetings, but essentially, these are good people  
273 that came to the meeting and they said in effect, look, we were promised a park at this site.  
274 There's no way in the world that I'm gonna contradict what the neighbors were told years before  
275 we got involved. We don't have, I will tell you that we had no knowledge of that. That question  
276 came up at the Planning Commission meeting and one of the Planning Commissioners directed a  
277 question to the staff: Is there any record of this ever having been planned as a park? And the  
278 answer at the Planning Commission meeting was no. That's certainly does not mean that the  
279 neighbors were not promised by someone that that was true, but again, Your Honor, members of  
280 the Council, we have no knowledge of that. There was also a contention that the neighbors have  
281 been told that the overpass, there not be an overpass at Tenaya. Again, we are not in a position  
282 and don't contradict what the neighbors were told. We simply do not know.  
283 Now, we did try to listen to the neighbors, in terms of some of the things that we thought that we  
284 could do. Some of the units are three-story buildings and Lucy will tell you a little bit more  
285 about that in a moment, but, we moved those to the perimeter. That was kinda a suggestion that  
286 they made. The second thing, we actually contemplated that there would be access on Tenaya,

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

287 right here, resident access. The neighbors did not want traffic along Tenaya, respect that. So,  
288 we eliminated that access; so now that is only a crash gate for emergency vehicles. From the  
289 very outset, we were told by the City's Planning staff, as well as the traffic people, that Westcliff  
290 is a very congested street and that we should not plan on any ingress or egress on Westcliff. So,  
291 with great respect, that leads us to the access that's currently contemplated here and which, as I  
292 said, Lucy will speak in more detail. So, we eliminated the Tenaya. We were also asked to  
293 make the two-story units look a little bit like larger homes, and so you'll see the elevations of  
294 those in a moment. I think we tried to do so. In my judgment, it's a nice looking project. Each  
295 member of the Council will decide that for himself or herself.

296 And then finally, originally the project contemplated two hundred and seventy-four units, and in  
297 the process of working through everything, the application before you, there's two hundred and  
298 fifty-two. The neighbors did express some concern that, I was made aware of by members of the  
299 Council, as I visit with you. I do not recall that discussion having occurred at the three  
300 neighborhood meetings, but Your Honor, I was not there. Lucy was. I wanna be very careful.

301 I know Mr. Kaempfer expressed some concern on behalf of the bank, in terms of what the  
302 ingress and egress is, and he is an extraordinary land use lawyer. I consider him a personal  
303 friend and a man of impeccable integrity. We – tried to work with him, but we're between the  
304 proverbial rock and a hard spot. In order words, if the neighbors do not want Tenaya to be  
305 accessed, okay, and if it's agreed that Westcliff is too crowded and congested, with all due  
306 respect, I mean, this is really the only access that would be available. Now, Mr. Kaempfer has  
307 suggested, but wait, there was, there is set aside at one time potential some right-of-way here, as  
308 I'm drawing, but that would involve traffic flowing on –

309 So, I don't know how we resolve that. Obviously, we're happy to try to work with Mr.  
310 Kaempfer on that, but just –

311 So, I guess I would just conclude by saying, in three years, more than three years, we have done  
312 everything the City of Las Vegas has asked us to do. During the negotiation agreement, you  
313 ought to give the Deputy City Attorney a raise because we capitulated and conceded on every  
314 point, and we did that willingly.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

315 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

316 Doesn't matter, he's not getting a raise.

317

318 **RICHARD BRYAN**

319 Does not getting (sic) a raise. Alright. Well, maybe you can un, unlock the salary freeze that  
320 you had him in for the last to several years. But, in any event, we tried to do that. So, I guess  
321 what I'm saying is that this is a land use decision before you. We have our financing in place.  
322 Column is going to be the underwriter. That is a subsidiary, as you may recall, of Credit Swiss.  
323 Their representative is here today if you have any questions. Obviously, if you approve the land  
324 use, then it must go through the BLM process and get their final approval. We've had a  
325 representative that has been engaged by Tapestry, who is here today, that can discuss with you  
326 her conversations, Katie Hughes Appel, preliminarily. Preliminarily, it all looks good, no final  
327 approval, let me be very clear and precise in the language.

328 Your Honor and member of the Council, I apologize for taking as much time, but I thought we  
329 needed some context here. You know what we've tried to do and we're here, obviously, to  
330 respond any questions. Let me defer to our – consultant/planner, if I might, to explain in more  
331 detail the project, and then, I know the neighbors will wanna speak and others. Your Honor, if  
332 we might have a chance to make a brief –

333

334 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

335 Absolutely.

336

337 **RICHARD BRYAN**

338 – response to that.

339

340 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

341 No problem.

342

343 **RICHARD BRYAN**

344 And I thank you very much for hearing me out.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

345 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

346 Thank you very much.

347

348 **LUCY STEWART**

349 Good afternoon, Your Honor and members of the Council, Lucy Stewart, 856 East Sahara. And  
350 as I think Senator Bryan did mention, we've had three neighborhood meetings. In addition,  
351 we've had some sub meetings with some sub groups, so, we've had a number of meetings. Since  
352 our meeting last summer, which is about a year ago, the Tapestry Group has hired a different  
353 architect, a local – firm, who's worked to change the plans. And as Senator Bryan did discuss,  
354 the, all the three stories are now oriented away from the existing homes and along the Summerlin  
355 Parkway are adjacent to the high-rise bank. In addition –

356

357 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

358 No, that is not coming across on the overhead. Could you do that again, please?

359

360 **LUCY STEWART**

361 Oh, sure. These are all the three stories.

362

363 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

364 I'm on the wrong button. Let me see. One more time.

365

366 **LUCY STEWART**

367 These are all the three stories, which is, this is Summerlin Parkway along the north and this is the  
368 bank building to the east.

369

370 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

371 Okay, thank you.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

372 **LUCY STEWART**

373 Along the existing homes, it's been designed as two-story and they look like big houses, and if I  
374 can show you. These are the three stories, they're the three stories, and these are the – two-story  
375 ones, and this is one of the designs that, to make it look like it's just a large house. In addition,  
376 the clubhouse, as you can see, carries the same type architecture and – building materials. So, I  
377 think that the building materials that were shown last summer and then the subsequent meetings  
378 we had with the neighborhood, I think, it's definitely improved and it's a Class-A project. In  
379 addition, adjacent – to the existing homes will be intense landscaping. Also, in the clubhouse  
380 there's gonna be activities; they're planning to have like a business center. So, if you live in  
381 these – units, you have the opportunity to go in and fax or get on the internet if you don't have  
382 that at your own house.

383 In addition, the project is completely gated. It's got 24-hour security and on-site management.  
384 It's been divided into like ninety-one bedrooms, a hundred and forty-four two-bedrooms and  
385 with only eighteen three-bedrooms. I'm trying to think of what else. Again, also along the –  
386 road that's between this property and the bank to the east, will be even more intense landscaping,  
387 and the gated entrance will be more intense landscaping. So, I'm not sure if I, if there's any  
388 more information I can give you about it.

389

390 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

391 Alright. Thank you very much. Before we hear from the folks who are present, any questions of  
392 the Senator or Ms. Stewart?

393

394 **STEVE WOLFSON**

395 Yes, Your Honor.

396

397 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

398 All right, Councilman Wolfson.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

399 **STEVE WOLFSON**

400 Lucy, either you or the Senator, let's talk about the types of persons who would be living in these  
401 residences. I mean, you referred to them as homes and houses. They're not. They're  
402 apartments, are they not?

403

404 **LUCY STEWART**

405 Right. I'm sorry, when I talked about the big house design, is the one that –

406

407 **STEVE WOLFSON**

408 Right.

409

410 **LUCY STEWART**

411 – they're building the other units to look like a big house.

412

413 **STEVE WOLFSON**

414 Talk to me about generally speaking the rentals and what types of persons, as far as economics,  
415 will be living in these units?

416

417 **RICHARD BRYAN**

418 Councilman Wolfson, we'll be happy, we've got somebody here that probably knows a bit more  
419 about that than Lucy, if that's acceptable.

420

421 **STEVE WOLFSON**

422 I don't care who.

423

424 **RICHARD BRYAN**

425 Yes. All right. This is Linda Mink, who has been working with us with Column and I think she  
426 can – describe. My understanding, as she's getting up here, we're talking about eighty percent  
427 of, you know, the average income, which is \$51,000 a year. So, people that make \$51,000 a year

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

428 would be at the eighty percent. And so, these units will be available to people who make  
429 \$80,000 a year, or, I mean, \$51,000 a year or less. Is that correct, Linda?

430

431 **LINDA MINK**

432 Yes (inaudible).

433

434 **STEVE WOLFSON**

435 Is it eighty percent –

436

437 **RICHARD BRYAN**

438 Identify yourself for the record, here.

439

440 **LINDA MINK**

441 Yes.

442

443 **RICHARD BRYAN**

444 And just take that one over there. This is Linda Mink, if, I hope that answers your question, but

445 Linda's here and has –

446

447 **LINDA MINK**

448 Thank you Mayor Goodman and Council. And Councilman Wolfson, in response to your  
449 question, the property is designed for the residents in the area earning eighty to fifty percent of  
450 the area median income. That equates to roughly a resident earning in \$50,000 a year from, say,  
451 thirty-two, thirty-three thousand a year to fifty, \$55,000 a year, somewhere in that range.

452 Just, you know, and I'm so glad that you asked that question. Over the last several days, we  
453 have been working to get a formal market study. We've had two appraisers in the market  
454 preparing appraisals and the formal market study to give us, the lender, a very clear and accurate  
455 picture of what is actually going on in this market. One of the things that I did over the  
456 weekend, was, I wanted to, you know, we focused very intently at the beginning of this process  
457 three years ago, on your schoolteachers, your educators here in Clark County and the City of Las

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

458 Vegas. Over the weekend, I went back and I went to the Clark County School Board's Human  
459 Resources Department website, and I pulled your salary ranges from entry-level schoolteachers  
460 with Bachelors of Arts, Bachelors of Science degrees, all the way up to those who had Masters,  
461 plus thirty-two points. I looked strictly at base salary, not the PERS Program that you have  
462 added in to it, but strictly base salary.

463 The rents proposed on this project meet the income levels of ninety-four percent of your  
464 educators here in your area, from the minimum all the way up to the top. And that covers entry-  
465 level schoolteachers to those with Master's degrees, plus thirty-two additional credits. We're on  
466 target; we feel very much that we have adhered to the quote unquote workforce housing segment  
467 of your population, those who are in need of real housing. So, I hope that responds.

468

469 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

470 Well, if I may say this, maybe you're looking at the wrong source, to be quite frank with you.  
471 We've had an experience in the City here, which I think is fairly telling, and that is, we – felt  
472 obligated to do our part in order to attract educators into our community. And the City  
473 established a program where we set aside, I believe, half a million dollars, where we were going  
474 to give incentives to teachers who were teaching primarily in at-risk schools. In the beginning  
475 we limited to science and technical type courses, and we had very few takers. And then we  
476 amended our philosophy, sort-to-speak, to include a broader range of teachers and then we  
477 amended it further to include renters and not first time homeowners and have very little takers,  
478 which is an incredible thing. We can't understand it. It's a phenomenon that it is inexplicable to  
479 me.

480

481 **LINDA MINK**

482 Yes, Sir.

483

484 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

485 But the teachers, for some reasons, don't take advantage of what's out there for 'em. Don't ask  
486 me why, I don't know.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

487 **RICHARD BRYAN**

488 And Your Honor, I'm – aware of the efforts that the City made. I wouldn't wanna give the  
489 impression that this is designed just for teachers, but I, that's offered as an illustration –

490

491 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

492 No, and I appreciate –

493

494 **RICHARD BRYAN**

495 – of a kinda of –

496

497 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

498 – I appreciate that.

499

500 **RICHARD BRYAN**

501 And the individuals have to be screened by background. I don't know how much more  
502 Councilman Wolfson may wanna hear on that, but there's a screening process they go through, a  
503 law enforcement check, and that sort of thing. But I, again, if there's more questions, then I'll be  
504 happy to have Mr. Wilczewski explain that.

505

506 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

507 And I will say this, Councilman, in response to your questions, as a result of your introduction to  
508 me, there were some folks who are gonna be speaking today who are present in the audience  
509 who visited with me, actually, before I even met with Senator Bryan and before I met with Mr.  
510 Kaempfer. And they, the first question I asked them, if they'll recall, is this an area of  
511 nimbyism? Is this, are you quarrelling with this concept because you think there's going to be a  
512 certain element in the community that you believe it's undesirable, because that would be  
513 unacceptable to me, to be quite frank with you, as a standard, and they answered very candidly  
514 looking at me right in the eye and said, has nothing to do with it. And I believe them. I really  
515 do. I don't think that it's an issue as to the type of clientele that would be using these facilities  
516 that is of disturbance to the objectors, so-to-speak. I really believe them.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

517 All right. So, there's no further questions, what we'll do, is we'll, by show of hands, how many  
518 are for the project? All right. How many are against the project? All right. How many desire to  
519 speak? Okay, with about four people, that's fine. Then what we'll do is, we'll, we'll not use any  
520 timer to begin with and we'll see how we go from there. All right, the public hearing is open, be  
521 happy to hear from anybody.

522

523 **JIM LEWIS**

524 Mr. Mayor, this is Jim Lewis –

525

526 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

527 Yes.

528

529 **JIM LEWIS**

530 – City Attorney. Could you indicate for the record about, approximately how many people  
531 raised their hands?

532

533 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

534 Well, you can count them; just about everybody in the first several rows there are against the  
535 project.

536

537 **JIM LEWIS**

538 Okay.

539

540 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

541 That would be one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen,  
542 fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen, say generally, twenty people.

543

544 **JIM LEWIS**

545 Thank you, Sir.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

546 **TOM McGOWAN**

547 Twenty-one.

548

549 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

550 You were included in the twenty.

551

552 **TOM McGOWAN**

553 That's right. Thank you. I'll try to be brief. Tom McGowan, Las Vegas resident and candidate  
554 for election to the Clark County Commission District D. I would respectfully submit in preface,  
555 there's no such thing as infill development. There is big fraud developments. There is polka-dot  
556 development, all other forms of disjointed development, for different reasons usually because of  
557 the non-availability of other properties and parcels that will be suitable.

558 The actual term is community development. Community development, redevelopment and the  
559 key word in that phrase is community, not development. And so the important factor here is the  
560 surrounding community and the genuine best interest of the public community all over the City,  
561 because that's what will be attracted to this property if it is attractive. First of all, there's no  
562 guarantee that any teachers will be here to take these units and any renters either because nobody  
563 has said yet what the square footage of the units are and what the lease terms are. If you know  
564 what they are, please divulge that to the public; might be of interest to them. And so, what are  
565 the amenities, if any? What's the traffic impact around the surrounding vicinity? Where's the  
566 traffic impact study? Is there one? You need not respond on the public record.

567

568 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

569 Well, there is. There's a preliminary, there's not a –

570

571 **TOM McGOWAN**

572 There is.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

573 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

574 Well, there's not an official traffic study because we don't do it that way. We have a one page  
575 report, which indicates in, at least, that department's opinion, there will be no impact, as far as  
576 traffic is concerned. But –

577

578 **TOM McGOWAN**

579 Understand, understand.

580

581 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

582 – should we go forward with this, we would direct that a traffic study be prepared and then we  
583 would remediate, if necessary or mitigate, if necessary, at some later time.

584

585 **TOM McGOWAN**

586 That's commendable that you intend to do that on the record. Thank you. If the project does not  
587 serve the genuine best interest of the surrounding vicinity of the entire general public, remember,  
588 it's called community development and not just development, if it does not serve those purposes,  
589 deny the item. Thank you very much.

590

591 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

592 Thank you. Mr. McFadden.

593

594 **JIM McFADDEN**

595 Thank you. I'd like to thank the Council for the time they have committed to (inaudible).

596

597 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

598 Please identify yourself for the record.

599

600 **JIM McFADDEN**

601 Jim McFadden, 204 Fig Court, Las Vegas. Thank you again for the time that you committed to  
602 our – cause here and for meeting with us individually. I presented everyone with a packet of

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

603 information regarding our concerns on this project. Hopefully, you've had the opportunity to  
604 review all that. We do have an amendment to that, which I would like to present now.

605

606 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

607 All right.

608

609 **JIM McFADDEN**

610 I have a copy here for the Clerk and one for each of the Councilpersons (inaudible).

611

612 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

613 As I understand it, you submitted the packet to the Clerk already.

614

615 **JIM McFADDEN**

616 Yes, Sir.

617

618 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

619 Very good.

620

621 **JIM McFADDEN**

622 They're all the same. I put tabs on 'em with everyone's names, but it doesn't matter. It's – all  
623 the same information, which I – will address this, pretty much, at the end of my presentation.

624 The package that you had before addressed all of our concerns, the quality of life issues that we  
625 think this development will impose on our neighborhood. Traffic and congestion is a big

626 concern. The population density was – our primary concern, the size and scope of this project  
627 and how it will affect our neighborhood. Mr. Mayor addressed the nimby issue, and, that was

628 not one of our concerns. Our neighborhood, and within three quarters a mile to a mile from this  
629 proposed project, there are over three thousand condos, apartments and townhomes that all have

630 rental rates comparable to what's being proposed with this development. So it's – not a question  
631 of the people it will draw. It's a question of how many people it will draw and – the traffic and

632 pollution concerns that are gonna be attached to that.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

633 We proposed some – possibly acceptable solutions that – we would find could be a compromise  
634 and – make this a viable project. One of those solutions obviously, our concerns are the height  
635 and the density. If we could reduce the height from two-story and three-story to one-story and  
636 two-story, that would be an acceptable solution to us. If this development were to be proposed  
637 as a senior development instead of multi-family housing, we feel that that would reduce the  
638 traffic concerns, especially during the peak traffic hours.

639 And lastly but – not necessarily in keeping with the housing issues, every time we’ve had a  
640 meeting, every time we’ve spoken to residents in the neighborhood and – Senator Bryan brought  
641 up the question as well, there’s always been this – background nagging question about why was  
642 it not developed into a park and where did we get that concept? That information that I just  
643 handed to you is primarily where that – came from. In August of 2003, there was a notification  
644 sent out to all the homeowners identifying this BLM land as being specified for park  
645 development.

646

647 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

648 May I ask this, ‘cause I haven’t seen this document ‘til –

649

650 **JIM McFADDEN**

651 And I apologize if we did not (inaudible) –

652

653 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

654 No, no, I’m not faulting you –

655

656 **JIM McFADDEN**

657 – have this information available for you.

658

659 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

660 But what – kind of letter does go out under the City seal with my name on the top of it without  
661 being signed? What kind of letter is this?

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

662 **JIM McFADDEN**

663 I – believe –

664

665 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

666 Have you seen this?

667

668 **JIM McFADDEN**

669 Mr. Mayor, I believe this may pertain to the postcard notifications that go out within the 1000-  
670 foot notification range. This – map that’s on the back of that is – what I recall seeing on that  
671 postcard notification several years ago.

672

673 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

674 (Inaudible).

675

676 **JUANITA CLARK**

677 May – we see what he’s laying down there?

678

679 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

680 Well –

681

682 **JIM McFADDEN**

683 I, what I’m putting there did not come up on the monitor.

684

685 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

686 All right – before I start getting excited, ‘cause I have the capacity –

687

688 **JIM McFADDEN**

689 This information if I may clarify, Mr. Mayor, I – was given some information regarding this.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

690 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

691 (Inaudible).

692

693 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

694 I don't know.

695

696 **JIM McFADDEN**

697 I went to BLM just this morning –

698

699 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

700 And got this from BLM?

701

702 **JIM McFADDEN**

703 – and got this from – a file in BLM. These letters and these maps are all in – the file in BLM –

704

705 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

706 Richard –

707

708 **JIM McFADDEN**

709 – and again, I apologize –

710

711 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

712 Senator, have you seen what we're talking about?

713

714 **RICHARD BRYAN**

715 I have no idea, Your Honor.

716

717 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

718 All right, do you have an extra copy?

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

719 **JIM McFADDEN**

720 I – you want an extra copy? Again, I apologize for the late notice. It was just this morning that  
721 – I got this information and put together, otherwise, I would have included it in the information  
722 that you had before for your early review.

723

724 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

725 Let everybody who, wants to see this take a look at it. I'm been told through whispers that this is  
726 standard operating procedure. I – don't believe that's true.

727

728 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

729 Mr. Mayor, it's my understanding that this is the way we used to have notices sent out to people  
730 so they would be aware of something happening, and they have a short little letter on front and  
731 then they have the map on the back.

732

733 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

734 Do you get that in an envelope, Councilwoman?

735

736 **MARGO WHEELER**

737 I apologize Sir; this is not from –

738

739 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

740 Not now.

741

742 **MARGO WHEELER**

743 – either the Public Works or the Planning Department, so –

744

745 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

746 It's not familiar to you.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

747 **MARGO WHEELER**

748 No, Sir.

749

750 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

751 Well –

752

753 **JIM McFADDEN**

754 I don't – think –

755

756 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

757 And the Clerk is taking no responsibility for it.

758

759 **BEVERLY K. BRIDGES**

760 Ours are addressed directly to the (inaudible).

761

762 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

763 Anybody wanna stand up and take responsibility?

764

765 **JIM LEWIS**

766 Well, I don't much like taking responsibility, but I'm looking, I'm reading the letter, it says feel

767 free to contact Robin with the Bureau of Land Management.

768

769 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

770 So, you're telling me the Bureau of Land Management is sending out stuff –

771

772 **JIM LEWIS**

773 No.

774

775 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

776 – (inaudible)?

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

777 **JIM LEWIS**

778 No, no. The name Robin, we have a person –

779

780 **MARGO WHEELER**

781 Excuse me, if –

782

783 **JIM LEWIS**

784 – in the Real Property Division.

785

786 **MARGO WHEELER**

787 – the – stationary shows the Department of Field Operations, it's what the stationary shows.

788

789 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

790 How can you tell that?

791

792 **JIM LEWIS**

793 If –

794

795 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

796 For the second one.

797

798 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

799 No, see, they're different dates too.

800

801 **JIM McFADDEN**

802 There are – two other letters included; behind each letter is a map or two pertaining to that letter.

803

804 **JIM LEWIS**

805 Robin Yoakum.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

806 **JIM McFADDEN**

807 These additional letters dated August 2005 and April 2006 specifically state information.  
808 August 2005 says, the area we are submitting has not been developed yet, but will be within the  
809 next few months. And – the maps behind it show the maps of a plan for a park on this parcel.  
810 The letter dated April 2006, highlighted you’ll see, however, attached is an amendment plan of  
811 development for the portion line south of Summerlin Parkway and east of Tenaya Way. This  
812 amendment plan development is being submitted to include the revised plan for the Bonanza  
813 Trail. And that has this map of the proposed park. So, I, it was not our imagination that we were  
814 told that this would be a park, at some time.

815

816 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

817 (Inaudible).

818

819 **JIM McFADDEN**

820 And again, I apologize, we –

821

822 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

823 (Inaudible).

824

825 **JIM McFADDEN**

826 – did not sandbag this information. It’s something that just happened –

827

828 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

829 You’ve got nothing to apologize for.

830

831 **JIM McFADDEN**

832 – this morning.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

833 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

834 I am bewildered, which is usually my state of mind, but now I am expressing it publicly. I am –  
835 publicly, I am bewildered. I don't know how this stuff happens. Okay. Thank you.

836

837 **JIM McFADDEN**

838 And with that, all we would do is request on behalf of the 300 petitioners and the people who are  
839 in the room that – this request be declined.

840

841 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

842 (Inaudible).

843

844 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

845 No, that's not what I'm talking about.

846

847 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

848 This is the mystery letter.

849

850 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

851 I'm not worried about the, the only thing that I am worried about, to be quite frank with you, is  
852 the cover page, which is this document of August 27, 2003.

853

854 **MARGO WHEELER**

855 (Inaudible), Sir.

856

857 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

858 How can you tell?

859

860 **MARGO WHEELER**

861 Yes, Sir, because –

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

862 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

863 How can you tell?

864

865 **MARGO WHEELER**

866 The staff person mentioned is the same as the one (inaudible).

867

868 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

869 No, it isn't.

870

871 **MARGO WHEELER**

872 Yes, Sir.

873

874 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

875 No it isn't. One's with the Bureau of Land Management.

876

877 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER**

878 No, they're not.

879

880 **MARGO WHEELER**

881 Sir, that's (inaudible).

882

883 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

884 There's a Robin who is a Real Estate and Asset Management who works for the City.

885

886 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

887 Yeah.

888

889 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

890 And there's a reference to a Robin with Bureau of Land Management.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

891 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

892 There is a Robin (inaudible).

893

894 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

895 But they're not the same person.

896

897 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER**

898 Your Honor –

899

900 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

901 (Inaudible).

902

903 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER**

904 – Your Honor, I believe, it –

905

906 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

907 That's what I'm saying. As far as I'm concerned, in the 2005, really is irrelevant. The thing that  
908 bothers me is the August 27, 2003 letter, with my name as the Mayor on it going out without  
909 attribution to anybody. And I find that offensive and I want to find out who sent it.

910

911 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

912 There is – a reference on the back page.

913

914 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

915 To what?

916

917 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

918 (Inaudible) scribbled on there.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

919 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

920 It's scribbled in, but that, it's not part of the official document. I would like to, Mr. Houchens,  
921 do you know where it came from.

922

923 **STEVE HOUCHENS**

924 Well, just to comment on the Robin. I believe Robin Yoakum is the same Robin in both  
925 instances.

926

927 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

928 No, I would tend to disagree with you, Sir.

929

930 **JIM LEWIS**

931 Your Honor.

932

933 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

934 The Robin that's referenced in the August 27, 2003 is a Robin with the Bureau of Land  
935 Management. The Robin Yoakum is with the City of Las Vegas, our Real Estate Division.  
936 They're two different Robins.

937

938 **COUNCILMAN ROSS**

939 Your Honor, there is, however, if I may –

940

941 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

942 Yep.

943

944 **COUNCILMAN ROSS**

945 – a case number at the bottom of the document that may be referenced to get more information  
946 for us.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

947 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

948 Right. It's case, it says –

949

950 **JIM McFADDEN**

951 That's –

952

953 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

954 – case number N-6-3-3-3-6. What's that?

955

956 **JIM McFADDEN**

957 Yes, Sir. That's – the case, but that's the file number at BLM where I obtained all of this  
958 information.

959

960 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

961 Oh, it's a BLM, I wanna know what does the BLM using my stationary? I never liked them  
962 anyhow.

963

964 **JIM McFADDEN**

965 Mr. Mayor, if I may, I'm – take a seat and not tie up any more of your time; I understand that  
966 Senator Bryan requested a rebuttal period. I would like to make myself available to answer any  
967 questions –

968

969 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

970 Of course.

971

972 **JIM McFADDEN**

973 – if there are any after his rebuttal.

974

975 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

976 All right. Do you wanna be heard, Ma'am?

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

977 **HELENA GARCIA**

978 Yes. Helena –

979

980 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

981 You're not with the BLM, are you?

982

983 **HELENA GARCIA**

984 You know me, Mayor. You know I'm not with them. Helena Garcia, 6725 Brunswick Circle. I  
985 have a home at the northeast corner of Rainbow and Alta and I'm here for two reasons. One is  
986 that I pass this street, on Rainbow, everyday, and it is so condensed right now without any kind  
987 of development. My niece goes to the childcare that's on Westcliff. And as a realtor, I sold a  
988 home in the townhouses. Now, I sold a home to Rafael Gonzalez, the editor of El Mundo, and  
989 his home is in back of where the desert area is. Now, this letter, he also bought (sic) me this  
990 letter and I told him they're going to have a park there. So, I knew before that they were going  
991 to have a park there also. So, when Mr. Gonzalez contacted me again to tell me that they're  
992 going to put a development there, I was in shock, as all of you are right now.

993 Now, as a realtor and a neighbor in the neighborhood, this is not, this two, three-story is not a  
994 good use for this development. One, the congestion to the schools, to the neighborhood is not  
995 going to be feasible for any of us because the traffic is going to be horrendous. And the school  
996 that is there is a nine-month school, so with all these children there, that would probably have to  
997 make it a year-round school. So, you're not disrupting only these townhomes, you're going to  
998 be disrupting all this neighborhood that pertains to this school.

999 The other thing is, if it's not coming off of Westcliff, which would be really bad scenario  
1000 because of all this congestion coming out of this small street, and it's not coming off of West, I  
1001 mean Westcliff, then Rainbow is the only one. Well, Rainbow where you, where it would come  
1002 off of is where everybody comes off coming from the freeway. So, this, if anything, as former  
1003 President of DCDC, the Downtown Center Development Committee, I more than anyone know  
1004 about revitalization, and to do something good for the neighborhood. If anything, if this was  
1005 going to be a project, it should be for senior citizens who are not accounted for in our  
1006 community. And if they had a one-story development, I'm sure the neighbors, because they

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1007 wouldn't have somebody looking into their backyards, because you're taking away their privacy  
1008 by having these two and three-story. Kids are going to be right next to a freeway where they can  
1009 jump off of a balcony, if that three-story is going to be right there off of Summerlin Parkway.  
1010 So, if anything, if this was a senior citizen neighborhood, there wouldn't be as much traffic.  
1011 There's a grocery store right across the street that the senior citizens, there's a bank right there. I  
1012 mean, that would be more feasible than a two or three-story development. Thank you.

1013

1014 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1015 Thank you. Next. Yes, Councilman Brown.

1016

1017 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

1018 Your Honor, just on the, pardon me just for a moment. Let me address the package, because I  
1019 worked – backwards on the package to the front page. And the only unanswered question, I  
1020 think, it's the author or the person that approved this top letter going out dated August 27<sup>th</sup>,  
1021 2003. But in – 2003, this was the form that was used in certain situations. So, that's familiar.  
1022 The contact number, Robin at the Bureau of Land Management, at that number listed in the  
1023 letter, is in fact the City of Las Vegas Office at the BLM local field office. So, that is, in all  
1024 probability, the same Robin. Rebecca – is the City employee that works over there now.

1025 And then following through the package, that the only change that was made from the original  
1026 application was the incorporation of the Bonanza Trail, later on in the package, the only revision  
1027 to the original request to BLM was the inclusion of the Bonanza Trail going through the park  
1028 sites. So, this package is in fact, driven by the City of Las Vegas and the only thing I wasn't able  
1029 to ascertain is who either authored the cover letter or authorized the cover letter.

1030

1031 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1032 Thank you, Councilman. Yes, Ma'am.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1033 **JUANITA CLARK**

1034 Yes. I'm Juanita Clark from Charleston Neighborhood Pres, Preservation, and a belated Happy  
1035 Father's Day to you fathers. And we appreciate Councilman Brown being able to clear up  
1036 things. We need – do need, appreciate our expert up here or other experts.

1037 We faxed over, and maybe it was a little bit late, but we did refer to the traffic flow study from  
1038 the 2020 Plan that the City has done and has put out indicating that the Westcliff/Rainbow area  
1039 is a high priority for problems in the near future and – of course currently. And we can state that  
1040 what is planned there now, on that property, is very adequate, is a community development, is  
1041 exactly what could flow through the, through, as far as traffic is concerned, with, and could be –  
1042 handled by that neighborhood. And that is the Twin Lakes Baptist Church and that is the bank  
1043 and that is the park, And in – looking over – the park, I noticed that it has seven picnic ramadas  
1044 and two play areas, one restroom site, one dog park, two areas of turf plan, and – so, along with  
1045 the residents that are there now, with – the Pirates Cove, with the High Gates, with the Coves  
1046 and with the Tenaya overpass going in. And also, the fact that these things were all done way  
1047 ahead of time, prior to what has now come in, and at this time now we're bringing in a group of  
1048 beautiful homes. I don't think there's anybody that's going to contest about the – appearance of  
1049 these – drawings that we've seen here today. It's just like, they just don't fit. It's not a fit for the  
1050 community for livability.

1051 We brought up the fact here that this is for – our safety and, I'm not talking, so I hope it's not  
1052 getting counted. Okay. So – the Twin Lakes Baptist Church, the Coves, High Gates housing  
1053 community, Private Cove and the Tenaya overpass, have all precluded by physical establishment  
1054 and public documentation of the agenda items that we're – discussing here today. And any  
1055 added housing eliminates, will eliminate the neighborhood park at Westcliff, which is what the  
1056 Tapestry Group is proposing, is incompatible with the quality of life, the safety and welfare for  
1057 the current residents of this portion of the City of Las Vegas.

1058 Also, just a little reminder about these beautiful townhomes, apartments going in, they are, the  
1059 shortest one is two-story and those homes that are, that they would be abutting there are one-  
1060 story. So, we're going from one to – another story up, every – time. So, we do respectfully ask  
1061 you all to vote no about – this. It's a wonderful project. It's just, this little piece of land sticking

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1062 out there it's just not the place to put it. And so we respectfully ask you to vote no on those four  
1063 agenda items. Thank you.

1064

1065 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1066 All right. Thank you.

1067

1068 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1069 Mayor Goodman, may I please.

1070

1071 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1072 Certainly.

1073

1074 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1075 And I'm going to ask for your indulgence just for a moment. I'd like to take a little bit of a hand  
1076 survey, please, of the people that are in the audience that are against this project, how many of  
1077 you live, by a show of hands, within a half mile of this project? Okay.

1078 My second question is, how many of you folks have lived in your residences now for more than  
1079 fifteen years? Almost, all of you.

1080 My next question, Margo, and you know where I am going right now. I'm a big believer in  
1081 people having a right to a reasonable expectation, and by a show of hands we had twelve or  
1082 fifteen people that have lived within a half mile of this project for more than fifteen years. If any  
1083 of these folks fifteen years ago or so had done some due diligence and checked with the City  
1084 records or any kind of records that people can check into before moving into a location, they  
1085 wanted to see, what's going to go in this piece of land? I'm thinking of buying or moving into  
1086 an area and there is this vacant parcel, what's going to be there? What information would they  
1087 have given, been given?

1088

1089 **MARGO WHEELER**

1090 Mr. Mayor and Councilman, the property was annexed, the significant portion of the property, as  
1091 you know, the Summerlin freeway has changed quite a bit of that, but the property in general

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1092 was annexed in 1983 and when it was brought into the City it was zoned, what was then the  
1093 zoning designation of NU, which is Non-Urban. And the exact text – on that is that that district  
1094 is a more or less temporary classification to be given to property until such time the property is  
1095 ready for development for an urban use. This classification is primarily intended to be used as a  
1096 holding zone. The uses allowed within that zone include single-family, public quasi or public,  
1097 cemeteries, churches, hospitals and convalescent homes.

1098

1099 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1100 Now, that's twenty-five years ago, right?

1101

1102 **MARGO WHEELER**

1103 Yes. At the time of the Summerlin Parkway, the majority of the property was designated as  
1104 right-of-way. It has remained right-of-way, except for a small portion in the – western portion of  
1105 the “L”, if you will, which is currently designated PF, which is Public Facility. The majority of  
1106 the site is designated as right-of-way and the zoning on the majority of the site is what it is now,  
1107 which is U, the Undeveloped, and CV, which is Civic. Those are the general plan and zoning  
1108 categories that have been in place from 1983 until now.

1109

1110 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1111 So, if somebody went down to City Hall or wherever they would be directed to go, and said, I  
1112 wanna know what's gonna go on this piece of land and fifteen years ago that's what they would  
1113 have been told?

1114

1115 **MARGO WHEELER**

1116 Yes, Sir.

1117

1118 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1119 Now, the letter that was given to us, August of '03 unsigned but on City letterhead, this was  
1120 obtained from the BLM office? Is that right?

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1121 **JIM McFADDEN**

1122 Yes, Sir.

1123

1124 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1125 And it's a public document and you just went down there, Mr. McFadden, and – obtained it,  
1126 right?

1127

1128 **JIM McFADDEN**

1129 Yes, Sir.

1130

1131 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1132 But we still don't know, and this isn't a question, this is just an observation, who the actual  
1133 author of this is. I mean, we think we might know, and we don't know where she got her  
1134 information from, which talks about building a public park. Is that a fair observation? Mr.  
1135 Sanchez?

1136

1137 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1138 Yes, Sir.

1139

1140 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1141 Okay.

1142

1143 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1144 And I think right now we do not know where this came from and I just e-mailed to find out if I  
1145 can get some more information, but I have not received anything back yet.

1146

1147 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1148 Okay. Thanks.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1149 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1150 Okay. All right. Anybody else like to talk to us?

1151

1152 **JIM McFADDEN**

1153 Mr. Wolfson, if I may.

1154

1155 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1156 Wait, wait, let – Mr. Kaempfer go and then –

1157

1158 **JIM McFADDEN**

1159 I'm sorry.

1160

1161 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1162 – I'll be happy to hear from you again.

1163

1164 **CHRIS KAEMPFER**

1165 Your Honor, unless he –

1166

1167 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1168 No.

1169

1170 **CHRIS KAEMPFER**

1171 All right.

1172

1173 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1174 Have to have some order here.

1175

1176 **CHRIS KAMPFER**

1177 Good afternoon, Your Honor, members of the Council, I'm Chris Kaempfer here on behalf of

1178 Westcore Properties. We're the owner of the property in which the Bank of America and the

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1179 adjoining property to the north sits. First of all, every time I hear Senator Bryan speak, I wonder  
1180 why we were deprived of the opportunity to vote for him for President. There's not a more  
1181 quality man that I (inaudible). It's always my pleasure to work with him and I wanna make sure  
1182 everyone understands there was a little bit of mix up that we had. We had asked originally, a  
1183 couple of weeks ago, if we could continue this item so that we could sit down and talk with them  
1184 about our concerns that I'm about ready to express. I was told that because of the length of time  
1185 that it already passed, that this had to be heard on the 18<sup>th</sup>. I understand now that the direction  
1186 was, well, they wanted it to be heard on the 18<sup>th</sup>, but it wasn't mandatory. So, I guess, I just  
1187 wanna make it clear, there wasn't any desire on our part not to work with him and certainly there  
1188 was no desire on their part not to work with us. It's just that we understood that it had to go  
1189 forward today for – their reasons.

1190 So, anyway, with that clarification in mind, first and foremost it's important for everyone to  
1191 understand that I am not standing here in objection whatsoever to affordable housing. I  
1192 presented affordable housing projects and proud to do so in the City, in the County and so that is  
1193 not an issue. And I know that you know me and know that I would not represent someone who  
1194 thought it was an issue, and it's not an issue for Westcore at all as well.

1195 Westcore's concerns are basically that when they did purchase the property, and they just  
1196 concluded that purchase in March of this year, they did not learn about this application until May  
1197 after they'd already purchased the property. When they inquired they were told that the property  
1198 is master planned for Public Facilities (sic) and zoned Civic, which may very well be where  
1199 some people get the idea about the park because Public Facility and Civic is what you have as  
1200 the general plan designation and the zoning designation for a park. But all we knew, we did not  
1201 do any further investigation in that, of that, and you can argue all day as to whether we should  
1202 have. But the bottom line is that's the concern is that when we purchased the property, it's  
1203 general plan Public Facility, it's zoned Civic and then after we purchased it we find that this  
1204 application is here to change, essentially, Civic to R-PD19, which is different than we thought.  
1205 But that's not our main issue, and I need to make that clear.

1206 Under the proposed plan, if we could go to the overheard, please. We'll start with this map. I  
1207 assume we're not there yet because I can't, okay. This is the Bank of America building right  
1208 here. This is our property that extends back to here. The property that's presently before you,

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1209 except for the Las Vegas Valley Water District property located here, the property that we're  
1210 talking about, essentially runs in this area right here. The concern that we have is that under the  
1211 plan that's proposed, and let me put up right now, the vacation. You can see that there is a street  
1212 that is planned for right here that goes into Tenaya and then goes all the way here to this road  
1213 that is adjacent to our property and then goes all the way down the side of our property here and  
1214 the church property to Westcliff. This road is being vacated in its entirety, this portion here and  
1215 this portion of the road here is being vacated 30 feet and then 25 feet is being given back to the  
1216 City so that you'll end up, essentially, with a 50-foot road here that then ends in a cul-de-sac.  
1217 And that's you can see on the site plan that I have here. If we can zoom in that just a little bit,  
1218 please. Okay.

1219 You see this cul-de-sac bulb right here. So, the – plan is that this is the road, this is the cul-de-  
1220 sac bulb. Now let me put that on this plan, if I might. This is the road, here is the cul-de-sac  
1221 bulb and then this is the road again coming down. Our concern is that you have all of this traffic  
1222 now and again remember you've changed the Master Plan now to go to R-PD19, so you have  
1223 two hundred and fifty-two units, take all of this traffic from here, exit here. The church traffic,  
1224 here is church property and all of this is church property. All of this church property here exits  
1225 through that little cul-de-sac bulb. So, now you have the church property that exits here, all of  
1226 this property exits here, we exit here, from the most part, because this is the only place you can  
1227 make a left turn; you have to make a right turn out of here. And so, our concern is that you're  
1228 taking all of this and you're putting into that one roadway. Now, we have the right to, and our  
1229 concern is that, should we decide to expand, as we're allowed to under the existing general plan  
1230 and existing zoning, that we may be then confronted with the situation that a roadway that was  
1231 designed to serve the uses that are planned on that site, no longer may be able to serve what we  
1232 wanna do on our site, and so we may have to dedicate additional land here or put a street light  
1233 here, something. In order words, there may be other things imposed on us if these vacations are  
1234 allowed to go today. And that is – our concern, is that the – vacation of those streets, we think,  
1235 impact us.

1236 And finally when you look at this plan, and remember this right here is where the street is  
1237 supposed to be, and see all those homes that are located along, that is where the street is  
1238 supposed to be. The street is also supposed to be here, essentially where homes have been put as

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1239 well. And our concern, we think, without objecting to the project, is that the streets, we think,  
1240 are being vacated here, not because they are not needed as streets, so much, but they're needed  
1241 more to accomplish the density desired for this project. And it's kinda always been your practice  
1242 to do it the other way. You ask, are the streets needed at all, and if the answer is no, they're not  
1243 needed at all, then you vacate them and if they're vacated then you can build on 'em, as opposed  
1244 to reversing that and saying, well, we're vacating them because we need those, that property to  
1245 build on. So, we're concerned about, again, not the use one iota. It's the fact that all of that  
1246 traffic dumps on that street and now and eventually, it's going to create a problem for those  
1247 properties that are planned exactly as the general plan has it now.  
1248 So, those are our comments. Again, I wish to thank the Senator and Lucy for being classy, as  
1249 they always are and we respectfully request your denial of the vacation and the site development  
1250 review because we think that needs to be retooled. Thank you.

1251

1252 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1253 Thank you. Now, do you wanna respond to something –

1254

1255 **JIM McFADDEN**

1256 Just briefly.

1257

1258 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1259 – before – you have the opportunity to respond to Senator Bryan?

1260

1261 **JIM McFADDEN**

1262 I – just want to add to the, Mr. Wolfson's question.

1263

1264 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1265 Go ahead.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1266 **JIM McFADDEN**

1267 He's talking about this letter, that he was not familiar with it. This reminds me of something I as  
1268 a homeowner received years ago, it's a vague memory, but I – have clear memories of this map.  
1269 In the file at BLM there is (sic) reams of pages of homes that were notified of – this and I assume  
1270 this letter went out to all those homes. So, there's just lists of names and addresses that,  
1271 obviously, I did not make copies of, but there was a lot of notification that went out with this.

1272

1273 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1274 Okay, thank you.

1275

1276 **MARGO WHEELER**

1277 If I may, Mayor, just, Margo –

1278

1279 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1280 Yes.

1281

1282 **MARGO WHEELER**

1283 – over here. Just one thing real quickly that I can add, if I may. I've reviewed the Master Plan  
1284 for the City, the Parks Elements specifically, for the period that was adopted in 2000 and was in  
1285 effect during the period of the dates of these letters, and the Master Plan does not call for a park  
1286 in this area and that is not part of our Master Plan, and I double checked with the maps. So, I  
1287 just wanted to clarify that.

1288

1289 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1290 Okay, that may well be, but this letter says –

1291

1292 **MARGO WHEELER**

1293 I understand Sir, but I just wanted to clarify, I wanted to double check and be to able to tell you –

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1294 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1295 Fine.

1296

1297 **MARGO WHEELER**

1298 – that that is the case with regards to the Master Plan.

1299

1300 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1301 I appreciate that. Fine. Do you wanna be hear (sic) Ma'am?

1302

1303 **BETTY EVENSON**

1304 Betty Evenson at 7100 Pirates Cove in Condo 1044 in LasVegas, Nevada. Mr., Councilman

1305 Wolfson asked a very intriguing question, why we did not have the same as the County. And I

1306 was kind of alarmed when I heard that there was no policy in place at all, because I served on a

1307 Planning Commission for quite some time, and, in Ohio. And so to hear somebody say it looked

1308 good for the City, really bothered me. You do not have a policy, it looked good for the City, but

1309 the City Council and the City representatives look after the people. And so I just wanna put this

1310 out that probably we wouldn't be here today had the City done what they were supposed to do

1311 and put a policy in place before this got started.

1312

1313 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1314 Anybody else wanna be heard? No, one shot, sorry. Okay, anybody else? All right, then I'll

1315 close the public hearing.

1316

1317 **COUNCILMAN BARLOW**

1318 Mayor?

1319

1320 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1321 Yes.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1322 **COUNCILMAN BARLOW**

1323 I just want just put on the record just my comments, if you will. I, I've met with the residents  
1324 and I met with the applicants, in regards to this item, and looking through the information that I  
1325 received, well, let me just back up. Speaking with the residents, they were informed, they  
1326 informed me that they were informed that this was going always to be a park location. And so I  
1327 asked the question to the residents, is there something in writing that you all have to document  
1328 that this was going to be a proposed park because from my conversations with staff there was no  
1329 documentation in place. It was through a conversation that took place and nothing specifically in  
1330 writing. And now to see that there is some documentation as early as, from my, from what I  
1331 read, 2003, and the site plan which depicts a park at this location from 2005, August of 2005, an  
1332 additional drawing which states April of 2006, which depicts a park.

1333 Basically, goes to say that the residents were correct, in regards to the information that they  
1334 were informed of. And for the gentleman to go and retrieve this information from the BLM,  
1335 justifies that it's been out in the public. And in addition, additional information that has come  
1336 since, from the Bureau of Land Management as well, states that the location, which lie between  
1337 Rainbow and Fort Apache, along the Summerlin Parkway, also depicts that this location was  
1338 going to be a park. So, I can understand the residents' frustration in that respect, as far as what  
1339 they've been told all this time. And so, I just wanna just put that on record just to let the  
1340 residents know, thank you for that information and also doing your due diligence in bringing that  
1341 information forward because, as you see, it wasn't anything that we had here tangibly. And so,  
1342 for that, I just wanna say thank you.

1343

1344 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1345 Oaky, thank you. All right, Senator?

1346

1347 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1348 Very brief, Your Honor, you've been very patient listening to us. To state the obvious, knew  
1349 nothing about, let me, for just a little frustration, I mean, I think we tried to do the right thing.  
1350 I'm not been critical of the neighbors at all. They received this letter, I understand that, but my  
1351 understanding is that the City it had expressed a reservation on this property for workforce

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1352 housing. We had talked with the staff and say, look, what is available. Could you be supportive  
1353 if this were – look this – is the piece. This is the first I've ever heard the (inaudible) at least  
1354 suggested park. And again, I'm not trying to pick a quarrel with the neighbors. We don't know  
1355 what that lease says. We don't know whether it refer to the property that's to the north, what is  
1356 now the expressway or not. Now, I don't know that. I'm not suggesting that, I'm not suggesting  
1357 it, but haven't seen it, so it's almost impossible to respond.

1358 Let me assure you, Your Honor, that Mr. McFadden is a very articulate man. Basic, and I  
1359 believe that Stewart will confirm this, all we heard at the town hall meeting was crime and sign  
1360 that it (inaudible) low income housing. So, we, this – density issue is something that we,  
1361 frankly, heard from you, Your Honor, when you expressed to me and – Mr. Hayes that you had  
1362 some conversations with neighbors. I'm not, I don't know that that would change the equation,  
1363 but I just, so that you don't think that we're not trying to work with people. We – were trying to  
1364 do that as best we can.

1365 Finally, with respect to the able advocate, Mr. Kaempfer. Remember I spoke we were between a  
1366 rock and a hard spot, a catch 22, this right-of-way here that is being vacated –

1367

1368 **JUANITA CLARK**

1369 I can't see.

1370

1371 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1372 Well, let's see, can we get that?

1373

1374 **JUANITA CLARK**

1375 No, we can't see.

1376

1377 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1378 Is it on the overhead, out there?

1379

1380 **LUCY STEWART**

1381 No, it's not.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1382 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1383 No.

1384

1385 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1386 Can you get it on the overhead out there, please? It's on ours.

1387

1388 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1389 (Inaudible). Part of the application, before you, Ms. Stewart will correct me if I'm mistaken, is  
1390 that, as Mr. Kaempfer pointed out, we are vacating this. Now, when meeting with the staff, with  
1391 traffic and everybody, I said, look, this is never gonna be used as a road. We talked with the  
1392 traffic and the Planning people, this is essentially what they suggested to us for ingress and  
1393 egress. If I can just go back for one point, originally, in our plan, we contemplated ingress and  
1394 egress at Tenaya for residents only. The neighbors indicated to us that they did not want that;  
1395 respect that, so we eliminated that. So, if we accept what the neighbors want to do, to try to be  
1396 good and responsible corporate citizens, then what we've done is to deny the point that Mr.  
1397 Kaempfer so articulately mentioned. He likes the ability to have the traffic flow through this.  
1398 With all due respect, you may not love us but we can't do it both ways. Which way is it?

1399 And finally, let me make the point, if I may. My understanding is the City of Las Vegas has a  
1400 reservation on this for affordable housing. Why would we not be told about this years ago,  
1401 several hundred thousand dollars back when we've taken a lot of your time previously, and I  
1402 know a lot of frustration that you probably had with us and – all of the people have come to visit  
1403 you. But I'm – very frustrated. Where did we go wrong in this process? In my view, we did  
1404 everything we were supposed to do and respect the neighbors' right to disagree. That's –  
1405 absolutely their right. But what – use could we have at this property? In order words, if we  
1406 listen to what Mr. Kaempfer said, you'll – open this out and then you will have these good  
1407 people come at the next project, senior or otherwise, and say, but look we don't want – traffic on  
1408 that. So, I would simply suggest and urge that you follow the recommendation of your staff and  
1409 – City Planning Commission. And I apologize for the confusion. This all hits us for the first  
1410 time. We – knew nothing about any of this and –

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1411 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1412 (Inaudible).

1413

1414 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

1415 I just like to ask Senator Bryan.

1416

1417 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1418 Yeah –

1419

1420 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

1421 Who told you, Senator Bryan, that this property was set aside for attainable or affordable  
1422 housing?

1423

1424 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1425 Let me just, Mr. Gibb? This is Mr. Richard Gibb.

1426

1427 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1428 Mayor – , I can address that.

1429

1430 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1431 Yeah.

1432

1433 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1434 Maybe I can address that, Orlando. When I was Director of Neighborhood Services, we worked  
1435 with Real Estate Division and we identified, I believe, four or five parcels within the City that  
1436 were affordable, that we were, we thought would be appropriate for affordable housing, since  
1437 this act, since the enactment of the affordable housing that went through the federal government.  
1438 My understanding back then, and I'm trying to get some further information, when the City  
1439 reserves property it's just putting an earmark on it. We put it for public purpose, and then later

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1440 on we come back to – BLM and we change it to what we, the intended use would be like for  
1441 affordable housing, whatever the case may be.

1442 My understanding is that we did submit a letter that this would be for affordable housing. I don't  
1443 know, I did not know, I'm trying to get hold of Robin to see if she has a copy of that letter.

1444

1445 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

1446 Is – that before this application or after?

1447

1448 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1449 It would be – probably during when we started working with them, when we identified it,  
1450 because originally when you put the place holder for public purpose, it holds it there. We did not  
1451 know affordable housing was going to become available until it passed Congress and it said, this,  
1452 you can use this act now for affordable housing. At that point, we identified it and we went out  
1453 there and we went through the process to change it to say for affordable housing, if that clarifies  
1454 it.

1455

1456 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1457 Thank you. Councilman Ross?

1458

1459 **COUNCILMAN ROSS**

1460 I just wanna back Mr. Sanchez up on that. I recall when we had this conversation long before  
1461 they were in the picture in regards to locations for affordable housing issues. It's always been on  
1462 the forefront of the City's mind. And, of course, as any responsible government, we move in  
1463 that direction, to – look out for those who need it. But, I don't know if that helps or not, but that  
1464 is true.

1465

1466 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1467 Okay.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1468 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

1469 Okay, well, I'm – just confused. Okay, he said – it was being reserved for affordable housing,  
1470 but yet we have letters here saying it was, a park was supposed to go there. Somebody – didn't  
1471 do their homework somewhere or something.

1472

1473 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1474 Well, Mayor –

1475

1476 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1477 We were told in 1998, Councilman Reese, is when the letter went. I don't have it, but, the letter  
1478 before me, so I wanna be very careful that I don't damage my credibility. But we certainly  
1479 operated on the premise, and I think Mr. Sanchez is, has – correctly stated that this was being  
1480 reserved for the City for affordable housing and that's why we –

1481

1482 **COUNCILMAN ROSS**

1483 Your –

1484

1485 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1486 – proceeded.

1487

1488 **COUNCILMAN ROSS**

1489 – Your Honor, if I may, and not to interrupt you.

1490

1491 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1492 Yeah.

1493

1494 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1495 We keep on talking, yes, Counc –

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1496 **COUNCILMAN ROSS**

1497 Not to interrupt you.

1498

1499 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1500 No, no. I'm sorry, Councilman.

1501

1502 **COUNCILMAN ROSS**

1503 The – conversations I had with Orlando's team, Orlando, with regards to affordable housing, of  
1504 course my position with the Las Vegas Housing Authority, a big priority of mine, it wasn't so  
1505 much that these locations were set aside for affordable housing, these were BLM reserves, the  
1506 City had reserves on that could be used for a number of things, whether it was affordable  
1507 housing or parks and recreation or public facilities, for that matter. So, I just – wanna clarify  
1508 that. In our earlier discussion, long before your client came around, we weren't just talking  
1509 about sites that were just set aside for affordable housing. These were all BLM pieces the City  
1510 had in – reserve for some use, whether it's that use or another use, that had to be determined. I  
1511 hope that helped, Mayor.

1512

1513 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1514 I appreciate that. Let me tell you something, folks. It's a lot of scurrying going on here and  
1515 that's not the way I wanna do business. I really wanna find out what happened –

1516

1517 **MARGO WHEELER**

1518 If –

1519

1520 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1521 – who was responsible. No, no.

1522

1523 **MARGO WHEELER**

1524 Okay.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1525 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1526 No, maybe I've allowed, not blaming anybody right now. But this is, at least from my  
1527 perspective, unsatisfactory and – I wanna get to the bottom of it, to be quite frank with you. I  
1528 wanna find out what the story is. You have certain rights, reliances and the neighbors have  
1529 reliances and it looks like the City is involved with being right in the middle of all of it. I wanna  
1530 find out what the bottom line is before I act on this. I gonna move to –

1531

1532 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1533 Mr. Mayor?

1534

1535 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1536 Yes.

1537

1538 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1539 Before you make that motion –

1540

1541 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1542 Yep.

1543

1544 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1545 – please. I think that I have information relating to this just according to land use, not according  
1546 to all this other business that I think it shows something that would affect our voting today. And  
1547 I respectfully ask you as the –

1548

1549 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1550 Fine.

1551

1552 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1553 – the Councilwoman, please, don't obey this again.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1554 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1555 Well, I – appreciate what you’re saying, Councilwoman, but I see some major problems with it  
1556 and I’m gonna vote accordingly because of the problems not because of my position on the  
1557 matter. But go ahead.

1558

1559 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1560 Well, I wanted to let them finish and then –

1561

1562 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1563 No, no.

1564

1565 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1566 – I’ll go ahead. I’m assuming that’s what I can do.

1567

1568 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1569 No, you’ve been very patient with us, Your Honor. I think you understand our position and I  
1570 thank you for your courtesy and the attention each of you have given us.

1571

1572 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1573 Okay. All right, anybody else wanna be heard here? All right, thank you very much.  
1574 Councilwoman?

1575

1576 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1577 Your – Honor, the one thing that (inaudible) we’d be agreeable to work on a stop light, excuse  
1578 me, at that Tenaya intersection, with respect to the or rather the – Westcliff intersection.

1579

1580 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1581 Would you be agreeable to make it into senior housing?

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1582 **RICHARD BRYAN**

1583 Well, I'm not, I can't make that representation.

1584

1585 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1586 Okay, that's fair –

1587

1588 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1589 There's some concerns we've looked into, the traffic light situation and there're some concerns  
1590 because NDOT's involved and they have certain placements you can have for lights; I just make  
1591 that comment.

1592 You know, we're all good people here; the residents are good people, Senator Bryan's a good  
1593 person, Chris Kaempfer's a good person, certainly my colleagues up here, I believe are good  
1594 people. But sometimes actions are begun with all the right intentions, which I think everybody  
1595 had, but subsequent information comes forth which clearly indicates a different direction is  
1596 needed. And I believe such is the case regarding these items.

1597 I – when I first looked at this, I – was intrigued about the vacants (sic). Why – do they want to  
1598 vacate this parcel? Well, I understood why it would allow more houses and everything. And  
1599 then I asked myself, but why was it a right-of-way? Why did the City Council and staff go for a  
1600 right-of-way? There must be some reason. So, anyway, it took a lot of time, but we did come to  
1601 the reasoning, and now if I could only find my papers here to cover that. First of all, we had  
1602 information that this right-of-way was granted in October 12 of '04, and that came from our  
1603 records within the City. Secondly, I began to ask the people that were involved at that time. Can  
1604 you remember why we did this right-of-way? What was the reasoning? And if I can first ask,  
1605 Jorge Cervantes, who is our current Directler (sic) of Public Works, if he would come up here,  
1606 please, and just give his recollection of what happened at that time.

1607

1608 **JORGE CERVANTES**

1609 Jorge Cervantes, Director of Public Works. Councilwoman, the way that this right-of-way came  
1610 to be was that late 2003, early 2004, we were developing plans for the Tenaya bridge overpass.  
1611 As part of our planning efforts, we had several neighborhood meetings out there. Back then

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1612 Councilman (sic) Boggs McDonald organized these meetings. Some of these meetings were  
1613 with the neighbors south of Summerlin Parkway, and at some of those meetings the residents of  
1614 the Coves development raised some concerns that with this new overpass it's going to be  
1615 difficult for them to exit their development.

1616 And part of their request was that, in order to facilitate their ability to come out, if we, since  
1617 there was, the City had a lease on this property back here, if a right-of-way grant road could be  
1618 built through there so they could make a right turn, coming out of the development instead of a  
1619 left turn. They were concerned with the bridge and additional traffic would be difficult for a left  
1620 turn to occur and they thought easier for them to do a right turn, use this street and then get out to  
1621 Westcliff. And so that's how the right-of-way came into being. At that time we submitted  
1622 paperwork to the BLM to convert a portion of the lease into a right-of-way grant.

1623

1624 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1625 Thank you very much. And is Ed Byrge here?

1626

1627 **JORGE CERVANTES**

1628 He is.

1629

1630 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1631 I can't see in the dark; a little bit of dimness there. I'm just trying to confirm what happened  
1632 within our own City organization and that's why this right-of-way was granted. And so that's  
1633 my question, if you, would you remember, it says, because as I was told you were more involved  
1634 in it.

1635

1636 **ED BYRGE**

1637 Yes, Ma'am. Essentially –

1638

1639 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1640 You have to identify yourself.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1641 **ED BYRGE**

1642 Yes, Ed Byrge, Right-of-Way Super, Superintendent with the City of Las Vegas. And at that  
1643 time we were requested and directed, essentially by the condo complex to the south of the leased  
1644 property, the BLM property, to go with a 60-foot right-of-way grant, and – we went ahead and  
1645 applied for that and it was granted, and as you say, given in October of 2004.

1646

1647 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1648 And so the right-of-way grant was given because it would be sort of a safety release if the traffic  
1649 became heavy with the addition of the Tenaya bridge?

1650

1651 **ED BYRGE**

1652 Yes, Ma'am.

1653

1654 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1655 Thank you. Thank you very much.

1656

1657 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1658 Councilwoman?

1659

1660 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1661 Yes?

1662

1663 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1664 With the Mayor's permission.

1665

1666 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1667 Yes.

1668

1669 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1670 I just want to make sure I understand the points you're making, if you don't mind.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1671 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1672 I'm making the point that we should not approve the vacation of this land because commitments  
1673 were made to the citizens who live there and because it isn't a safe situation if we do vacate it.

1674

1675 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1676 And my question is this. The two gentlemen that just came up and spoke, there were  
1677 neighborhood meetings concerning this, and the decisions that were made were as a result of the  
1678 participation of the neighbors at the time, and some of those neighbors are in the audience. Is  
1679 that right?

1680

1681 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1682 I have no idea if some of the neighbors that were there then are in the audience now. However, I  
1683 do know that this was started within the City to meet that need.

1684

1685 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1686 I mean –

1687

1688 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1689 It was not just at neighborhood meetings, it was also within the City, and if you give me some  
1690 time, I'll give you some information –

1691

1692 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1693 My question is that –

1694

1695 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1696 – pertaining to each memos.

1697

1698 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1699 – there were neighbors involved in this process, is my question.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1700 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1701 There were neighbors who were questioning adding the Tenaya bridge, yes.

1702

1703 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1704 Okay, I think that.

1705

1706 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1707 And if I could ask Bart Anderson, what you feel, if you, is that your recollection of what  
1708 occurred and what do you feel are the consequence to the residents of the Coves if we do away  
1709 with this vacation?

1710

1711 **BART ANDERSON**

1712 Well, that, as, this is Bart Anderson, Public Works. The record as illustrated by Director  
1713 Cervantes does match my recollection. There were a number of meetings back then that citizens  
1714 were concerned about the effect of the Tenaya bridge, increasing traffic, such making it very  
1715 difficult for them to get out of their subdivision. And one of the possible solutions to that was  
1716 this right-of-way, as – a relief mechanism for when the bridge comes into place. The bridge is  
1717 intended to be under construction October, November of this year, and will take 12 to 18 months  
1718 to complete, at which point the traffic on Tenaya will, undoubtedly increase.

1719 The ability to make left turns out of the existing subdivision will most likely be affected, at least,  
1720 during the peak hours of the morning and the evening. Making left into or out of this  
1721 subdivision will be much more challenging. The point of the right-of-way grant was to provide a  
1722 solution in the event that it became overwhelming. And although we have projections for the  
1723 amount of traffic that will be on Tenaya, we won't know for certain until the bridge is actually  
1724 open. So, it's difficult to predict with any confidence whether there is definite damage, that's  
1725 probably not the right word, definite impact to the ability to make a left turn out of this site prior  
1726 to that bridge opening. But I can definitely say that there will be an impact to the ability of  
1727 people to turn left.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1728 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1729 Is it safe to say that you had a concern with the access for the Coves if the, when the overpass  
1730 comes into being?

1731

1732 **BART ANDERSON**

1733 I think that's fair to say.

1734

1735 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1736 Because, yes, because right here we have an April 14<sup>th</sup>, 2004 report from the City of Las Vegas,  
1737 which notes that Bart has concerns with the access onto the new Tenaya Way for the Coves  
1738 when the overpass comes in and be requiring this site to put a BLM application for a right-of-  
1739 way over the abutting BLM parcel. And that's how this whole thing began. Right?

1740

1741 **BART ANDERSON**

1742 That's how the right-of-way grant process began. I would say the whole thing began with the  
1743 neighborhood meetings and the identification of the problem. But the creation of the right-of-  
1744 way grant, yes, that – memo would be how that started.

1745

1746 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1747 And then I just like to read another memo from Cheryl (sic) Eldeman to yourself, Bart, and it  
1748 says, there is a driveway just to the north of Pirates Cove Road that services the Las Vegas  
1749 Valley Water District and south of Summerlin Parkway. Due to access concerns for future  
1750 development, as well as access, traffic patterns for the existing subdivision, which would have  
1751 been the Coves, we are going to provide for an eventual future roadway north of that  
1752 subdivision. And that's what we're talking about, as far as the right-of-way. Therefore, we need  
1753 to design curb returns for potential future –street, Bart do you want that to be a 51-foot street or a  
1754 60-foot street. And then you reply, well normally 51, but since we're getting a fifth, a 60-foot  
1755 wide street in the north/south alignment, commonly called Rock Springs, which is the street  
1756 going by the bank and the church, correct? You state, east, to which this street will tie in, I

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1757 recommend a 60-foot right-of-way for this connection, and if design pressures need a narrow  
1758 width at the bridge, we'll accept it, but you prefer the 60-foot.

1759 I'm bringing all this into the record because I think it's important to note that it doesn't matter  
1760 how it came up, if the – citizens were concerned and they brought this concern, they didn't want  
1761 the Tenaya bridge, perhaps the Councilperson who was there at the time didn't want the Tenaya  
1762 bridge, but the thing is, it was passed and the, when the overpass was put into motion, there was  
1763 a concern about the traffic and the safety involved, and that is why the overpass came into  
1764 existence. And in fact, I didn't see anybody from the church here today. They had called and  
1765 complained vehemently to us, but it does even have a letter on April 9<sup>th</sup>, 2004 written to the  
1766 church, wants the appropriate right-of-way for a knuckle meeting current City standards. So, I  
1767 just wanted to bring that up.

1768 And I also wanted to say that, as far as our disposition and development agreement, beginning on  
1769 line nine of that, it says, quote, the City shall cooperate with developer and assist developer with  
1770 vacations or relinquishments of the interest held by the City, provided vacations and or  
1771 relinquishments are found to be possible or desirable by the City upon further investigation by  
1772 the developer and the City. I had no idea when I started wondering why would you have a right-  
1773 of-way going exactly the way it was going, where it was going to, why was it put into place, and  
1774 then I gathered this information.

1775 I think it's obvious that this vacation is not desirable and, as I understand it, maybe Jim Lewis  
1776 could state for me, what is it, a vacation can only be done if you have what cause?

1777

1778 **JIM LEWIS**

1779 Mr. Mayor if I may?

1780

1781 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1782 Please.

1783

1784 **JIM LEWIS**

1785 Well, what you're asking, Councilwoman, I think, is what the standard, the legal standard is for  
1786 this Council to approve a vacation. The legal standard would be a finding that, you would, the

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1787 Council would make a finding there was no material injury to the public. And so, upon that  
1788 finding, then the vacation could be granted.

1789

1790 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1791 Okay. I myself feel it would cause material damage to those City residents, and I think that our  
1792 staff was looking out for that when it decided to go for this right-of-way. And so, I feel very  
1793 strongly that the City of Las Vegas took the time and energy to request this right-of-way from  
1794 BLM. It was acquired for the purpose of providing to the Coves neighborhood a relief  
1795 mechanism in anticipation of the increased traffic. The Tenaya bridge overpass will undoubtedly  
1796 bring, if anybody's driven along there during peak hours, you know how crowded it is. And I  
1797 believe that releasing that safety valve prematurely, prior to construction on the bridge, which as  
1798 I understand is supposed to be coming either in October, November, it will begin construction,  
1799 will cause material harm to the neighbors, and particularly to the residents of the Coves. And  
1800 that right-of-way was granted in October, 12<sup>th</sup> of '04. And Mr. Mayor, I would like to move for  
1801 denial of the vacation.

1802

1803 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1804 All right, before we consider that, I wanna make part of the record, so we have this level of  
1805 playing field, as we can have at this point in time, a submission that was given to me, about five  
1806 minutes ago by Mr. Sanchez. It's a, two letters, one dated December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2005 and the other  
1807 January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2006, which talks in term of a reservation for affordable housing upon this  
1808 property. So, basically, what we have in the record now is a series of letters that say a park and  
1809 another say affordable housing. So, let's make this part of the record, so whatever is gonna  
1810 come, it's gonna come. Okay. There's a motion and that's on the, on –

1811

1812 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1813 Vacation.

1814

1815 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1816 On Number 89. All right, let's vote on that.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1817 **COUNCILMAN BARLOW**

1818 Well, Mayor, before –

1819

1820 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1821 Yes.

1822

1823 **COUNCILMAN BARLOW**

1824 – before we take the vote, if you don't mind, please, because I wanna make sure that I'm clear,  
1825 as far as the direction in which we going here, because what – I don't want to do is subject the  
1826 City, more than what we already are, in a position to, now we have, and I'm finding this  
1827 information out right now, on the dais, which I'm personally uncomfortable with, as far as, and  
1828 with all due respect to the Councilwoman, whom I have a respect, moving forward with this item  
1829 because of, I'm receiving all of this very credible information right now. And so, I know the  
1830 motion is on the floor for denial, but if – I may, Councilwoman, request for some level of  
1831 abeyance, just to give us, at least, give me more time and possibly the Council more time, just to  
1832 sift through it all, because I believe I'm – making a – knee jerk reaction of a vote. And I don't  
1833 wanna do that because this is very valuable to the residents, and very valuable to the applicant,  
1834 and I wanna make sure that, at least, my vote is a fair and just vote. So, that would be my  
1835 request.

1836

1837 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1838 All right. Councilwoman?

1839

1840 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1841 I have a very, a big concern because I want you to know, and you know, Dick, how much I  
1842 respect you and how much, and how thrilled I was with the Bryan Elementary School when I  
1843 was trustee there. But you asked, you wanted to know what went wrong, and I want to tell you, I  
1844 think it started when I told you that Ward 1, this place was not a good location for this site  
1845 applicant, and you decided to move ahead anyway. And I think that was where it began because  
1846 I think those of us who represent our wards know our wards very, very well.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1847 And I will say another thing, we're talking about the need for affordable housing there when you  
1848 have hundreds of apartments and homes available for rent or purchase that if you rented them  
1849 they would be far less or the same as what you would be charging for your affordable housing.  
1850 What makes you feel that you, and then you talk about, well we have all of the casinos that have  
1851 come in and the casinos have, are going to be bringing more people? Yes, they are, but you  
1852 know what? They're not near us.

1853

1854 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER**

1855 Beverly?

1856

1857 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1858 They're not near our live/work philosophy. They're not near this land that you're talking about.  
1859 What we do need is senior housing. We need senior housing desperately there.

1860

1861 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER**

1862 How do I undo my vote?

1863

1864 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1865 We call up the real estate agents and we found about the hundreds of apartments that are vacant  
1866 within a mile of the land that we're talking about, that, at less cost or similar cost to what  
1867 Tapestry is saying. We then called and checked into the senior housing and we found out that  
1868 everyone had a significant waiting list. Skyview, which just came in, not too long ago and came  
1869 on, I believe in BLM land also, they have a significant waiting list. And I – just think, excuse  
1870 me, did someone say something? I don't know if, okay.

1871 Anyway, I do believe that I would like to go forward with this, but if it's the consensus of the  
1872 group to abey. Certainly, Councilman Wolfson, at one time knew about this. I don't know if  
1873 you knew about all this background, but you knew about it.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1874 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

1875 Well, I'm not sure what you're talking about knowing about it. I've been asking for two weeks  
1876 for documentation concerning park. Didn't get anything until a half an hour ago, and it was by  
1877 one of our nice neighbors that brought this forward. And I'm not faulting you, Sir. The process  
1878 stinks, really does. But here we are today and Councilwoman, I don't know if you know, but  
1879 some of my comments before were trying to flush some of this out. But I'm of the opinion that  
1880 we need to get some clarification, for everybody's sake. Where did some of these documents  
1881 come from? What was the impetus behind some of these documents? So, I'm in favor of an  
1882 abeyance at this point.

1883

1884 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1885 Councilwoman, you have a motion.

1886

1887 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

1888 Your Honor?

1889

1890 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1891 Yes. Councilman Brown.

1892

1893 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

1894 I just wanna fill in for the public record at least for today. I went and got some notes from – the  
1895 park component. I can't comment on the documents the Mayor submitted, as far as the public  
1896 land reservation, but what initiated, and – I'm gonna reference the package that was submitted  
1897 by Mr. McFadden.

1898 Two thousand and three we had, we, the City, had identified the 100-acre, plus or minus up  
1899 along Summerlin Parkway, between Buffalo, Durango, Washington on the north, what is now  
1900 currently Kellogg-Zahr. We had identified that as a major regional park. As part of that RPNP,  
1901 which is the cover letter, and this, I can – attest to this form being used, so there's nothing out of  
1902 the ordinary about the form. It not only encompassed the Kellogg-Zahr property, but as the map  
1903 indicates, went further east, all the way down to the Rainbow Curve area to include what is now

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1904 the Bill Braire Park, north of the Summerlin Parkway, a current Regional Flood Control Facility  
1905 and reference to roadway expansion, which I'm assuming is part of the 95, Rainbow Curve  
1906 expansion project. So, that portion is fine.

1907 The next reference in the park package was August 29<sup>th</sup>, 2005, where the City amended the 2003  
1908 application to include the attached Bonanza Trail Phase One project. And that was, likewise,  
1909 done in conjunction with a lot of the work on the 95; that is in order. Then a year later, April  
1910 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006, that RPNP lease was once again requested to be amended for a revised plan regarding  
1911 the Bonanza Trail. And if my memory serves me correctly, that was because of, I think, the  
1912 church application and or the flood detention basin. So, we had to amend what we had  
1913 submitted, as far as the trail component.

1914 So, that park package that was submitted, I think, is in order. And I – mention because there was  
1915 some concern with Robin and Robin Yoakum, the two names. I – just wanna put on the record  
1916 that Robin is a tremendous asset for the City and has done great work, and by no means should  
1917 any of the comments today reflect that she, somehow, did something out of the normal City  
1918 operating procedures.

1919

1920 **COUNCILMAN REESE**

1921 Thank you.

1922

1923 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

1924 Feel very comfortable that Robin did her job and this documentation, independent of other, I'm  
1925 sure supplemental pieces, in my opinion, from my perspective, was done properly.

1926

1927 **COUNCLMAN BARLOW**

1928 Mayor? Mayor, if I may.

1929

1930 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1931 Yes, Councilman.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1932 **COUNCILMAN BARLOW**

1933 Okay. And – I really appreciate the historic analysis that Councilman Brown has brought  
1934 forward in respect to bringing all of this information together. April of eight, April 18, 2006, the  
1935 letter which he has been referring to, in regards to Bonanza Trail, it didn't mention anything  
1936 outside of the trail. However, what I've just received from the Department of Neighborhood  
1937 Services, is a letter dated January 24, 2006, which the City of Las Vegas asks for reservation for  
1938 affordable housing. So, these two letters with both Robin, both Robins' name on both letters,  
1939 one in January of 2006 and one in April 2006, pretty much, Councilman Brown, if you would  
1940 just clarify that it separately talked about two different line items; however, at the same location.  
1941 And that's where the complexity for me comes in, as it relates to what we're being asked to vote  
1942 on today.

1943

1944 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1945 All right. May I ask whether or not we've voted on this reservation, as a Council or was this  
1946 done administratively?

1947

1948 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1949 Mayor, it was done administratively.

1950

1951 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1952 So, we – really didn't have any specific knowledge until today when we saw the document  
1953 which you handed.

1954

1955 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1956 You were briefed on it.

1957

1958 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1959 We were briefed on the fact that it was reserved for affordable housing –

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF  
*June 18, 2008*  
COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90

1960 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1961 Correct.

1962

1963 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1964 – but we never saw any documentation as to how that came about.

1965

1966 **ORLANDO SANCHEZ**

1967 That is correct.

1968

1969 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1970 All right – there's been a motion. There's a request by Councilman Barlow for the  
1971 Councilwoman to reconsider the motion. It's up to the Councilwoman.

1972

1973 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1974 I feel that we should stay together, as a Board, and **I would move to abey. However, if it does**  
1975 **come back, I want to state that with all the research we've done, with the information I**  
1976 **have presented today, which I feel shows the vacation is not appropriate, that I will still feel**  
1977 **the same way at the next meeting.**

1978

1979 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1980 And I'm going to state that it was your second issue that disturbs me more than that of the  
1981 vacation, that is the need for affordable housing in view of our housing market today. That's  
1982 something that's very troublesome to me. We have all these homes and apartments that are  
1983 available. They're not being leased at this point in time, and when we come back two weeks  
1984 from now, I want to have that addressed because I don't think there is a need for this project. All  
1985 right, there is a motion.

1986

1987 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

1988 And Mr. Mayor, I just would like to add that I – think we've talked a lot about communication  
1989 between, amongst staff, staff and Council and these are the types of things we're talking about.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

1990 Because it has been difficult, although we've had some who have been really helpful. It's also  
1991 been difficult, in many instances, to obtain the information. I had to go to BLM myself to get  
1992 some information related to the park situation.

1993

1994 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

1995 Well, it's pretty disturbing to me, Councilwoman, when we had a briefing yesterday and the  
1996 Councilman is asking for information about this and we have to get it from one of our  
1997 constituents. That's disappointing.

1998

1999 **COUNCILMAN WOLFSON**

2000 Mayor Goodman, if you don't mind. And Councilwoman, you and I have been talking about  
2001 communication since, well, dating back a few years. And I think this is just an example of  
2002 there's some breaks in those chains of communication. Thank you.

2003

2004 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

2005 All right, there's a motion to abey for two weeks. Let's vote on that, please. Post.

2006

2007 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER**

2008 On all items?

2009

2010 **JIM LEWIS**

2011 Mayor?

2012

2013 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

2014 On all – items, yes.

2015

2016 **JIM LEWIS**

2017 Thank you, Mayor.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

2018 **BEVERLY K. BRIDGES**

2019 All four items.

2020

2021 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

2022 All four items. Yes, Councilman? Councilman Barlow did you –

2023

2024 **COUNCILMAN BARLOW**

2025 No, that wasn't me, Mayor.

2026

2027 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

2028 Oh, then, I'm sorry. Let's vote. Post. Motion carries. **(Motion carried unanimously)**

2029 Councilman Brown would like to –

2030

2031 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

2032 Your Honor –

2033

2034 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

2035 – make a comment.

2036

2037 **COUNCILMAN BROWN**

2038 – I have two things, so we, at least, I think, there's a sense on the Council's part. One, I'd like,

2039 Orlando is you could talk to the man, to the senior management, as far as, I'd like a briefing on

2040 our overall process, as far as affordable housing, the unsolicited proposal approach versus,

2041 perhaps the RFP that the County uses. And let's take a look and revisit that whole policy.

2042 And secondly, and perhaps not in defense of staff, as much as little bit of fact here, the timing of

2043 all this. The City has gone to great lengths over the last two years with Performance Plus to

2044 break down some of the silos and get a lot more cross communication and shared information

2045 through technology and all the works. But if – you remember the timing of all this, we had

2046 transition in Real Estate. We had transition in Planning and Development. We had some

2047 departments take on different functions. So, I don't, I think there are just a lot of pieces out there

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*June 18, 2008*  
**COMBINED VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEMS 87-90**

2048 and some of the players that were involved in 2003 are not here anymore, both from a staff level  
2049 and from a Council level; so, that on the record, Your Honor.

2050

2051 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

2052 All right, very good.

2053

2054 **(END OF DISCUSSION)**

2055 /ac;lc