



EMPLOYMENT PLAN POLICY

NEW RECOMMENDATIONS

April 6, 2011





Today's Presentation:

- **State Law Requirements**
- **Current Policy – RDA & City**
- **Current Policy Results – What Works, What Doesn't**
- **Current Practices in Other Cities**
- **New Policy Recommendation – RDA & City**
- **Actions Requested**





State Law Requirements (NRS 279.482):

- **An Employment Plan is required for each private redevelopment project and must include:**
 - **A description of employment opportunities in the area; and**
 - **Effect of the project on those opportunities; and**





State Law Requirements (continued):

- **Description of how an employer relocating a business into the RDA area plans to employ persons living within the area of operation who:**
 - **Are economically disadvantaged**
 - **Have a physical disability**
 - **Are members of racial minorities**
 - **Are veterans; or**
 - **Are women**





Current Las Vegas RDA Policy:

- Adopted in June 2001
- Policy Goal to hire 51% residents of the RDA
- Requires developer to have a project-specific plan on hiring persons identified within the statute for:
 - *Construction of Project*
 - *Permanent Employment (excludes “speculative tenants”)*
 - *Includes “Best Efforts” hiring goal*





Current Policy – Results:

- **Project-specific Employment Plan included within contract for each developer**
- **Hiring of Minority Contractors and Women Contractors has varied from as low as 3% to as high as 15%**
- **Does not have a standardized reporting template for developers**
- **No clear definition of “Local Hire” preference - 51% goal in current policy is out of reach**





Current Practices in Other Cities:

- **Resident and Minority participation goals for a range of U.S. cities reveal:**
 - **Increased trend towards Race and Gender-Neutral Policies, Small Business Enterprise**
 - **Emerging emphasis for Local Hires**
- **Matrix was developed to analyze participation targets with economic and minority population data**





Participation Targets in Other Cities:

Atlanta, GA – Minority

Philadelphia, PA – Minority & Women

Boston, MA – Resident & Minority

Phoenix, AZ – Project-by-Project

Cleveland, OH – Resident

Portland, OR – Race/Gender Neutral

Denver, CO – Minority

Salt Lake City, UT – No Target

Detroit, MI – Resident

San Antonio, TX – Minority & Women

Los Angeles, CA – Resident

San Diego, CA – Race/Gender Neutral

Memphis, TN – Minority & Women

San Francisco, CA – Minority & Women

New Orleans, LA – Race/Gender Neutral

Tucson, AZ – Race/Gender Neutral





Legal Basis for Diversity Goals:

- **Firm Diversity Goals require Disparity Study as the legal basis**
- **Disparity Study with potential variety of RDA & City projects may cost between \$700,000 - \$1,000,000**
- **New policy proposes “Aspirational” Goals**
- **Revisit Performance in one year to determine if disparity policy needed**
- **Recent disparity studies in the State/MSA have found 5 – 7% disparity**





New Policy Recommendation – RDA:

- **Required - 15% of all New Jobs created as direct result of project must be filled by bona-fide residents of the RDA**
- **Resident Preference Incentive - 10% of the negotiated incentive may be awarded as bonus if resident requirement is achieved**
- **For projects with non-cash incentives, deposit shall be provided by developer**





New Policy Recommendation – City:

- **For City Economic Development Projects:**
 - **30% of all new jobs created as a direct result of the project must be filled by bona-fide residents of the City**
 - **Resident Preference Incentive - 10% of the negotiated incentive may be awarded as a bonus if resident requirement is achieved**
 - **For projects with non-cash incentives, a deposit shall be provided by developer**



New Policy Recommendation – RDA & City:

- **Reporting - For accountability and consistency, standard reporting templates shall be used to demonstrate specific outreach and development efforts**
- **Appeal Process - If after diligently implementing employment plan, developer fails to achieve participation requirements and goals, an appeal may be submitted**



New Policy Recommendation – RDA & City:

- **Aspirational Goal - 15% of all new jobs created as a result of the project shall be filled by hiring persons identified within NRS 279**
- **All private development projects valued over \$100,000 must submit an employment plan**
- **Public agency using funds for design or construction of a project built as a public work pursuant to NRS 338 is exempt from the policy**





Action Requested Today:

- **Approve Resolution for implementation of employment plan policies designed to ensure residents of the RDA & City have a reasonable and significant opportunity to participate in redevelopment and economic development projects**





CHARLESTON NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION

"Doing things today that will improve tomorrow"

Phone/Fax: 702-877-2438

TO: City of Las Vegas REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
FROM: CNP
DATE: April 6, 2011
TIME: 8:30 AM
RE: RA-4-2011

We welcome EACH of you and congratulate our own Las Vegas Councilwoman TARKANIAN and Councilman BARLOW on their Primary Election success. You have all earned the confidence of your constituents!

This RESOLUTION RA-4-2011 in possibly attempting to ensure local employment, prevents employers from selecting the artisans and craftsmen which they know are the most skilled and efficiently productive and even by dollar criteria dictates what 'government has determined' is best for and what residents need.

As stated on lines 21 and 22 on page 2 of this Resolution, "the Governing Board of the Agency"... "finds it to be in the best interest of the Agency and the residents"... Indeed, this is all that "government" can do—make the decisions they think "to be in the best interest of the Agency and the residents of the Redevelopment Area,"

City staff must be increased, 20 pages of regulations and their enforcements are all forced upon residents and paid for by Las Vegas in wards other than where these "best interest" projects are forced to be developed.

To repeat, government can enforce this resolutions' expenditures in activities which our representatives have "found to be in the best interest of the Agency and the residents of the Redevelopment Area" but we remind residents of the absence of resident demand from resident usage.

Charleston Neighborhood requests a NO vote on this item due to the 'cotton candy' unsustained dependability.

June Ingram, President and Board of
CHARLESTON NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION

June Ingram

Submitted at Redevelopment Agency

Date 4/6/2011 Item 4

By: Juanita Clark

BOARD & ADVISORY MEMBERS

Dennis Ardine-Vicki Arnold-Dick Bratton-Ena Clark-Juanita Clark-Miriam Ean- Danielle Hanslip-Rose Honrath-June Ingram-Rick Johnson-
Jolanta Krol-Rod & Betty Larsen- Geno & Pearl Lonardo-Flo Montalvo-Dorothy Orr-Jim Seward-Pamela Stancil-Tim Volz-Marcus Gobel-
Ginger Norton-Denise Reitz-Layne Rushforth-Jeanine Sweany-Julia Whaun-Jean Withers-Others