Miceli Family Trust
Calogero and Ida E. Miceli, Trustees
7780 North Jones Blvd..
Las Vegas, NV 89131-2121

RECEIVED BY
2011 NOV 29 PM 4:03
CITY ENGINEERS OFFICE

November 22, 2011

Protest

City of Las Vegas
Public Works
Jorge Cervantes, PE, PTOE
333 North Rancho Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89106

2011 DEC -1 A 10:44
CITY CLERK

Re: Special Improvement District No. 1507
APN: 125-13-201-007

Dear Mr. Cervantes:

I am in receipt of your letter dated November 2, 2011 regarding the Notice of Public Hearing on Special Improvement District No. 1507 together with the City of Las Vegas assessment statement totaling $13,290.94. This letter is being written to state my protest of the assessment.

I recently called Councilman Ross' office and was informed this Special Improvement District was decided upon in March of 2008. The estimated assessment for my property at that time was $13,700.00. I do not recall receiving notices of any hearings at that time. Now, more than three years later, the final assessment for my property is supposedly $13,290.94.

In the past three years the overall economy has been in serious decline. Our financial circumstances are significantly more troubled than ever, and our income is much lower than it was in 2008. For the past two years we have paid and will continue to pay taxes on many acres of vacant land. Yet, we have no objective information that would lead a reasonable person to reach an optimistic appraisal of the near or medium term economic outlook.

We own a professional building (another tax entity) that has been reduced from seven tenants to five tenants. We have reduced the rents of these tenants to compete with other building owners. Our costs and maintenance have increased on the upkeep of this property.

Submitted after final agenda
Date 12/1/2011 Item 55

In addition to the objective factors which should weigh in favor of lenience, subjective factors should be given consideration as well. The dire financial outlook has drastically reduced our standard of living and quality of life, and the assessment for Special Improvement levied upon us is like rubbing salt in an open wound. Circumstances change from year to year. Though the assessment may not have been a burden in 2008, it is certainly a different picture in 2011, and a less than positive prognosis for 2012.

Please take these circumstances into consideration when making your final determination. Any consideration given to this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ida E. Miceli

Ida E. Miceli

November 30, 2011

Jorge Cervantes, PE, PTOE
Director of Public Works
City of Las Vegas
333 N. Rancho Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89103

Protest

2011 DEC - 1 A 11: 46

RE: Special Improvement District No. 1507- Jones Blvd (Elkhorn Rd to Horse Dr)
APN 125-11-704-009 (6106 Racel St)

Dear Mr. Cervantes,

I have received the City of Las Vegas (City) notice on the final assessment for the above Special Improvement District (SID) project relating the parcel I own at Jones and Racel. As I understand it, the west side of Jones Blvd from Meisenheimer Ave to Eisner Dr is part of a City designated 'Rural Preservation Area'. Rural means no full urban improvements such as curb/gutter, sidewalks and street lights.

Due traffic concerns brought on by full urban subdivision developments on Jones Blvd, the City forced the owner's costs of full urban improvements upon my 'rural' parcel and others. I protested at the time and learned the City has the legal right to assess and force property owners for improvements they did not request, even in a 'rural' area. The SID another method to force land owners to pay for public street improvements and is morally unjustified. This is yet another method to raise additional revenue for the City while collecting higher property taxes concurrently. Jones Blvd is public right-of-way and any improvement costs should be using existing tax sources and not rely on an SID on the backs of working people like myself.

It is a fact that Clark County does not force full urban improvement upon their rural property owners in unincorporated areas when the City performs an SID that includes both City and County parcels. This policy is evident on nearby sections of Durango Dr (Alexander Rd to Tropical Pkwy) and Buffalo Dr (Craig Rd to Lone Mountain Rd, In these examples the City performed an SID for identical street improvements where Clark County parcels were not forced to accept curb/gutter, sidewalks or street lights.

I am not an out-of-town 'property investor' looking to flip land. I bought this parcel in 1994 with the intent to build a house in the future. I absolutely do not have the assessed amount of $26,239.09 just sitting around the house in a shoe box. This land does not generate any revenue, unlike an existing business. The assessment as forced will be an *extreme hardship*, made even more so that the City has 'conveniently' timed the payment to be due the same month as the already high property taxes.

Therefore, I respectfully protest any SID assessment on the above property with the exception of the pavement share of $5,452.20 which I believe to be fair based on previous City SID's adjacent to unincorporated Clark County parcels. I look forward to your response on this matter.

Sincerely,

Darlene Rossell

Darlene Rossell

6325 Maggie Ave
Las Vegas, NV 89131

cc: Beverly K. Bridges, MMC, City Clerk, CLV
Carolyn G. Goodman, Mayor, CLV
Elizabeth N. Fretwell, City Manager, CLV
Steven D. Ross, Councliman Ward 6, CLV
Lorrie Linnert Dunford, PE, PW, CLV

November 25, 2011

City Council
333 N. Rancho Dr
Las Vegas, NV 89106

RE: APN: 125-14-504-001
Notice of Public hearing on Special Improvement District No. 1507

Protest

Dear City Council,

I am writing to file an official protest of the $35,940.42 special assessment you are planning to levy on APN: 125-14-504-001. The Pavement, Curb & Gutter, Sidewalk, Driveways, Streetlights and Sewer Laterals are not needed in this area. Furthermore they will not be used by the property owners but rather by people passing thru the area walking or riding bikes. We already pay our fair share of taxes. If the city needs these things done it should come out of the general fund. Otherwise they do not need done at all. To my knowledge no one has requested them.

Also please consider the cost as compared to the price of the property. This parcel is worth less then $70,000. In essence you are levying a 50% tax. That high a tax rate is unreasonable and unfair.

I thank you for your service. Please think of the voters you are suppose to represent and reconsider this extremely high and unfair tax.

Thank you,

David Auclair
Owner APN: 125-14-504-001

Mailing address: 6305 Palmona St., N. Las Vegas, 89031
Phone: (702) 462-5799

cc: Councilman Ross

12/01/2011 THU 16:57 [TX/RX NO 5665] 001

Protest of Assessment for Special Improvement District No. 1507

December 1, 2011 <Sent by Fax: 702-382-4803>

Office of the Clerk
City of Las Vegas
City Hall, First Floor
400 Stewart Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Protest

2011 DEC -1 P 5:03

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK

Dear Sirs/Madams:

I own and reside at 6101 Racel St., Las Vegas, NV 89131, parcel no. 125-11-803-008. The West side of my parcel abuts Jones Ave., and has been assessed a total of $33,470.18 in fees for improvements made in Special Improvement District (SID) no. 1507. I hereby contest the correctness of the assessment on my property, the amount levied, and the amount and procedure used to determine the alleged benefit as well as the alleged market value increase to my property.

I am on a private septic system, however I am being charged for sewer laterals. I did not request sewer laterals nor do I consider them a direct benefit. I purchased this property partially because I desired to be on a private septic system. I spoke with Engineering Associate Patrick Bowen today by phone, and he stated that he could not find any record that any previous owner requested sewer laterals.

The largest part of my assessment is $19,952.33 for streetlights. This represents a disproportionate share of the benefit conferred by these lights. Jones is used by residents of residential estate lots as well as subdivisions in the immediate vicinity, some of which abut Jones, but most of which do not. Those owners that do not abut Jones directly benefit from the use of Jones to travel to and from their homes every day, however, they are not being asked to share in that benefit. The purpose of street lights is to illuminate the street itself for traffic safety – it is not to light my personal parcel. Only the homeowners who abut Jones are being asked to undertake the cost of the lights that directly benefit many others. So, for example, my next door neighbor benefits from being able to now travel a well-lit major street to access his home, however because his property is maybe 100 yards or so from Jones, he does so for free. As another example, there is a subdivision that can only be accessed from my street Racel, then the next closet major street they use is Jones. Because no part of that subdivision abuts Jones, they are not being asked to share in the cost although they are receiving a direct benefit on a daily basis, and their property values have improved as well. Whereas the benefit of the curbs and gutters, driveways, sewer laterals and even sidewalks may be directly ascribed to the abutting property, it is grossly unfair and disproportionate to assign the cost of street lights only to those properties that directly abut the improved street while everyone else in the immediate surrounding neighborhoods are clearly receiving direct benefits. The procedure that the City has used to determine benefit is erroneous and grossly unfair.

Sincerely,

John A. Thompson

Dec 1 2011 05:46pm P001/001 Fax 3109363