BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT
BILL NO. 2014-40
(Repeals and replaces LVMC Chapter 6.04 relating to business license fees, including provisions for various fee increases and decreases, and provisions consolidating or eliminating a number of fee categories; and amends other LVMC Title 6 provisions to clarify the definition of "gross sales/gross revenue" for fee purposes and make other conforming amendments)

This business impact statement was prepared pursuant to NRS 237.090 to address the impact of a proposed ordinance, Bill No. 2014-40, that will repeal and replace LVMC Chapter 6.04 relating to business license fees, including provisions for various fee increases and decreases, and provisions consolidating or eliminating a number of fee categories; and amends other LVMC Title 6 provisions to clarify the definition of "gross sales/gross revenue" for fee purposes and make other conforming amendments.

1. The following constitutes a description of the manner in which comment was solicited from affected businesses, a summary of their responses and an explanation of the manner in which other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

Notice of the proposed measure was sent by postcard to approximately 12,087 gross fee licensees, 5,944 flat fee licensees, and 6 local chambers of commerce and by newspaper notice published on April 28th in the Review Journal with the draft bill language available on the City's website and at the Business Licensing Division offices. Responses included approximately 50 emails, 17 comments received via the City's website, and 2 letters received at the Business Licensing Division offices. In addition, notice of alcoholic beverage license fee increases were part of a separate solicitation relating to alcohol-related uses sent to approximately 2389 licensees. Copies of the written submissions particular to fees are attached to this business impact statement

2. The estimated economic effect of the proposed rule on businesses, including, without limitation, both adverse and beneficial effects, and both direct and indirect effects:

Adverse effects:

Increased burden of doing business for those license categories with a fee increase proposed

Beneficial effects:

Simplification and consolidation of categories and fee bases, in some cases. Improved service delivery with the planned improvements to the online services and maintaining or enhancing customer service

Direct effects:

See adverse and beneficial effects above

Indirect effects:

None identified

3. The following constitutes a description of the methods the local government considered to reduce the impact of the proposed rule on businesses and a statement regarding whether any, and if so which, of these methods were used:

City staff have considered the comments regarding fees and met with affected business owners to try and minimize impacts where possible. Adjustments to the original proposal have been made or will be proposed as a result of some of the feedback received

4. The estimate of the annual cost to the local government for enforcement of the proposed rule is:

Approximately $80,000

5. If the proposed rule provides for a new fee or increases an existing fee, the total annual amount expected to be collected is:

Approximately $1,392,000

6. If the proposed rule provides for a new fee or increases an existing fee, the money generated by the new fee or increase in existing fee will be used by the local government to:

Support technology costs of processing and monitoring business licensing and to either increase or maintain existing efficiencies related to administration and enforcement. The City has made a significant investment in licensing technology and will have to continue to do so, as well as investing in maintain existing technology. Additionally, the City has the need to maintain staffing levels to meet customer service demands and comply with licensing cycle timing and schedules.

7. If the proposed rule includes provisions that duplicate or are more stringent than federal, state or local standards regulating the same activity, the following explains why such duplicative or more stringent provisions are necessary:

N/A

8. The reasons for the conclusions regarding the impact of the proposed rule on businesses:

Although there will be an impact on many businesses, it is believed that adjustments to business license fees are warranted at this time. A significant period of time has passed since adjustments were made to most of the fixed fee categories. No adjustment has been made to the gross revenue schedule since 1960. Currently the minimum annual license fee of $50 no longer covers the cost to the City to maintain the each license. Presently it costs the City a minimum of $105 to maintain each license. Additionally, the service delivery (both online and by the City's customer service staff) that will be able to be maintained and enhanced should greatly improve the business licensing experience for the City's business community.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge or belief, the information contained in this business impact statement was prepared properly and is accurate.

for Betsy Fretwell

By: City Manager
Date: May 22, 2014

Georges Baba
Sam's Smoke Shop Plus
8512 W. Lake Mead Blvd.
Las Vegas, Nevada 89128

May 7, 2014

City of Las Vegas
Department of Planning
333 North Rancho, 3rd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

Re: AmendTitle6

To whom it may concern:

I went on your website and found that for my particular business the annual fee would go up an additional $50.00 per year and although that may not seem very much to you or the legislators, but considering how much fees overall have increased in recent years it is impossible for a small business person to stay in business. We already also have to pay a tax on our gross income in the City of Las Vegas, but in my industry my expenses are nearly what I take in, it would be fairer to tax on net income.

I hope you will consider that the Nevada Employment Security is collecting a new "bond" now, the State of Nevada started collecting a $200.00 business license fee up 100% from inception. All new in the last few years. Gas prices have gone up at the very least $1.00 per gallon in the last few years mostly tax from the State of Nevada. Also in my industry there was a floor tax imposed on us as well.

Please reconsider this and give us small businesses a break.

Sincerely,

Georges Baba

RECEIVED
MAY 13 2014
City of Las Vegas
Bus. Licensing

Vegas Tows LLC
3300 SIRIUS AVE, UNIT 102-B
LAS VEGAS, NV 89102
(702) 589-6784
CPCN 7249

May 7, 2014

City of Las Vegas
Department of Planning
333 North Rancho Drive, 3rd Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89106

Regarding the increase to business license fees for license categories;

I have read the proposed update, AmendTitle6 that I downloaded from the city website.

I must admit I was shocked at the DOUBLING of most of the fees. The two categories that I fall under, an automobile towing service and an administrative and corporate office space, based on the fact that our office is located at other than our storage facility, will raise my present costs from $300.00 to $500.00 each year, on top of the State of Nevada doubling its fees in the recent past and an annual list if officers, etc., and the ever expanding regulatory requirements imposed by the Nevada Transportation Authority.

In an environment where more small businesses are failing each year, and the proposed margin tax, it is becoming harder and harder to survive in this lack of recovery. An increase of $200 may not seem like much to a government entity, but to a small business, any additional regulatory fees are a massive burden. I had visions of growing and employing an additional person by now, but with the ongoing economic downturn (and yes, it is still going on, look at the number of empty business spaces still within the city limits, not to mention NLV and Clark County) and increasing overheads of fuel, taxes, maintenance and rents, this will not happen this year, or next, if our business survives that long.

The large proposed increases will indeed both impose a direct and significant economic burden upon my business and restrict the operation and expansion of my business.

It is a proven fact that a reduction of fees and taxes result in more businesses and business activity, more taxes being collected and more people being employed. The old domino effect, only in a good way, more money kept in the businesses hands, more expansion and purchasing, more employment, more buying, more sales tax collected, more demand for things and services, more employment, etc., etc.,etc.

Please think hard of the overall impact that these increases will have on current and potential future businesses in this City. The small businesses will suffer.

Sincerely,

David & Brian Alphonso, Owners

RECEIVED
MAY 12 2014
City of Las Vegas
Dept. of Planning

TXT-53834 (Fee Consolidation) BIS Report for Online Responses

Initial Report

Last Modified: 04/24/2014

1. Please provide us with the following information:

Business Name	License Number
Salvadore Sinopoli	G62-02108
LA Insurance NV	I14-00326
Carrillos Travel	T07-00677
Gold Exchange the	S26-00020
Teacup Quilts	G50-02820
Robert Margison	I04-01526-J-038051
Karen Ryce Presents	150-00658
NICOLAS AND OSVALDO ANTIQUES	G5008622-6-014940
Aloha Mobile Detail	G62-02840
Farmers Insurance	114-00410-L-113818
Cheryl Miller Agency	I14-00101-F-127495
Julia C Bennett	I14-00177
Clean Up Time Inc	R60-04225
sherry verost agency inc	I14-000-61A-114485
Update to Business License Fees	TXT- Draft # 53834

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	15

2. Please provide your comments or arguments regarding the proposed changes to the city's business license fees for a number of license categories:

TXT-53834 (Fee Consolidation) BIS Report for Online Responses

Text Response
This is a tripling of the current license fee. I am a one-man investment advisor who nets around $50,000. The new license would be about 1.5% of my net income. With state, federal and city licenses, my licensing fees are approaching 5% of my net. There really ought to be some consideration to net profit as a percentage. Licensing authorities are starting to make it not worthwhile for the small business to stay in business.
6.04.070 Annual business license fee— $200.00 (firm), $200.00 each additional agent or representative Ladies & Gentlemen, I thank you for the opportunity to submit a comment. I agree that an agency should pay a business license fee of some sort. As a small agency $200 a year is not too much in my opinion. As I grow and try to hire new agents, I dont think i should pay the same amount for each new agent trying to start their career with me. It should be graduated fees some sort of way. I believe 30-40% of the initial fee for each agent up to lets say five. Then 50% from 5 to 10 for the larger agencies and so on. This is advanced so no one has made any money and the agent has to pay up, especially new agents who just paid for classes, testing and licensing. I have an assistant studying to take her test now and I will pay 1/2 of her costs to get licensed, then I will have to pay $200 more to have her here as well? I feel it is a bit much. Thank you Tony R L.A. Insurance NV30 3109 N Rainbow blvd Las Vegas, Nv 89108 702-395-1641
I'm don't agred with the increase the fees for my lincence my company provided services . I don't make enogh money to pay this amount. I think this is too much money to be able to pay it.
Is this really the time to increase business license fees? Business is terrible.
The city requires a license for all businesses even if those businesses do not sell product or produce income. In those instances, the fees will now be more than double the previous fee. I oppose the proposed increase in fees especially for those businesses generating incomes less than $5,000 semi-annually. Continual increases in fees just invite even honest people to not comply with the requirement to obtain a license. When a business is not generating income those fees are paid out of the pockets of the owner.
In regards to the proposed increase in Business License fees, I can not support a fee increase. As you are aware, along with many other businesses, our insurance agency, has experienced a steady decline in business over the past several years. We have had to cut our overhead in all possible manners to remain a viable enterprise. We are diligently working to recover from the greatest economic downturn in Las Vegas history. Additional government fees and taxes are not justified... We have tightened our belts as should our government. Thank you, Bob Margison
At the moment what I would have to pay for the new license is more than I make. I would like to make more and hopefully I will. But at the moment raising the fees would definitely be a hardship for me. Sincerely, Karen Ryce
THIS PROPOSED ORDENANCE WILL HAVE A TREMENDOUS NEGATIVE IMPACT ON ALREADY BAD BUSINESS SITUATION;SMALL STORES IN THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS HAVE BEEN CLOSING IN A ALARMING MANNER, THIS PROPOSED INCREASE WILL PUSH THE REST, OF THE SMALL BUSINESS TRYING TO HOLD ON TO FALL OF THE CLIFF. THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS SHOULD GIVE SMALL BUSINESS THE BENEFIT OF HELP AND NOT ASK MORE FEES,THAT SHOULD COME FROM BIG COMPANIES.GRATEFUL FOR YOUR UNDERSTANDING. NICOLAS & OSVALDO ANTIQUES . OSVALDO ZUNINO OWNER. "THE ANTIQUE SQUARE"

Since our business is one which is not stationary, we are concerned about the ramifications for mobile car wash and detailing services and how this change will impact our business. We are a small, family owned business with no employees. Our overhead is very low because our income is only enough to allow us to meet the needs of our daily life. We do not have an extravigant life style. Any additional yearly fees effect our bottom line. We oppose any increase in fees as we are competing with businesses who offer cut rate, stationary car washing services which are substandard to our way of conducting business. We offer a more personal experiences which allows our guests to work or play while their vehicles are being cared for with pride and Aloha.

"As worded" 6.04.070 would add $200 per ANY staff member in an insurance agent's office. Of course I object!

I am a small agency with my family working for me. The proposed license fee would raise my agenacy cost to $600 a year. To over come that expense would cost me one month of new business commission from sales. This squeezes the small insurance agencies especially the captive agents that only have one company to sell from.

•Impose a direct and significant economic burden upon a business; or How does the City think it is fair to impose a business license fee per person working in an insurance firm? It is bad enough that we have to have a business license for the state and the city that we work in. You will stop a lot of us from hiring workers. I can not afford to pay an extra 200 per year per person working in my office. I can barley afford to use a payroll service so that my staff can get health insurance. Your rates doubled since I have been doing this yet there is nothing that the City provides us. I hope others stand up because this is ridiculous. At least for me it will not matter. I am tired of this state and will be closing my doors. Just another good reason to leave.

Our small business struggles constantly with the rising costs of all goods and services that we cannot recoop and keep clients if we raise our prices too high. It appears we would increase our cost of business licensing 50% under this amendment. I figured the City of Las Vegas would be doing the right thing by going online but it appears the company taking care of the website is too expensive for what we can afford. I know this should mean fewer employees in offices working to do the work of the website but I'm dissappointed we as a company keep cutting costs and working on less money so we can give more for higher costs of running the license bureau. Many businesses will get better deals for an annual license but I didn't see my company getting any advantage just more cost. I feel all businesses should be charged equally. Thank you, Carol Platt, owner.

Regarding Insurance agency/representatives. I have had an insurance agency for 12 years, the license fee was orginally 100 annual that increased to 200/annual. Now an additional 200 per licensed rep is being proposed which is unfair to me, being a small business owner already dealing with increases in expenses and loss of revenue due to online companies. What is being proposed for the on-line insurers? Since that is where the business is going, its unfair to penalize the small insurance agent.

I would like to comment on an upcoming bill, slated to go before the council in June. As I am sure that you've begun receiving comments from other concerned city residents, I will be brief. I realize that compromise is necessary in society, what myself and others find problematic is a 30% proposed business fee increase on artists, and the many artists who will be impacted are renting studios, or trying to run businesses in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for bars and taverns, BUT NOT FOR ARTISTS OR GALLERIES. We have already seen big increases of the bar/tavern industry downtown, with more on the way, as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I urge the council to consider the impact of cutting local and grass-roots artists out of the "Arts District". I talk to visitors from all over the world at our offices in Emergency Arts. What is drawing them from places like the Strip, towards Downtown, involves the arts community; our unique perspective and ability to creatively collaborate between communities, as well as with each other. Most artists already live very close to the edge, and must supplement their income for their art to thrive. The Downtown and Arts Districts should be supporting artists, large and small, because true innovation grows from collaborations of all sizes. The arts support other business growth, please feel free to follow the link and compare the latest information on arts impact, state to state, from Americans for the Arts: http://www.artsindexusa.org/local-arts-index Thank you, Patty Dominguez
I would like to address the proposed business license fee increase of 30% for the Visual Arts category. This bill discourages the growth of an arts district by artists. The city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. This is a struggling demographic in Las Vegas and it needs to be given support and incentives to grow, which in turn will create a well rounded community. Your support is greatly appreciated. I oppose the proposed fee increase for the Visual Arts business license.
To Whom It May Concern: I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive. It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas. Most Sincerely, Darren Johnson Title: Artist

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	17

3. If you have data that you wish to submit regarding the proposed changes to the city's business license fees for a number of license categories please upload that here:

File Upload	File Type	File Size

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	0

Robert Summerfield

From: athiguchi@aol.com
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 2:56 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: TXT 53834: REQUEST FOR A CHANGE IN THE PROPOSED ORDINANCES

Dear Sir/ Madam,
My name is Aliza Elazar- Higuchi and I am writing this e mail on behalf of Three Twenty Two LLC, owner of 320-322- Fremont Street, Las Vegas, NV.

This is a request in regards to your proposed TXT-53834
TEXT AMENDMENT - APPLICANT/OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Discussion and possible action to amend LVMC Title 6 related to business taxes, licenses and regulations to provide for changes to various fees, to offset costs of technology to process business licenses, provide online services for business customers and maintain service levels and to provide for other related matters.

6.50.360: Whenever a permit is required to be obtained for individual alcohol sales or a restaurant is required to be maintained pursuant to an alcoholic beverage license, each licensee shall include the revenue of all alcohol sales in the calculation or payment of all fees required subject to 6.04.005.

Please delete the following words:
for individual alcohol sales
from your proposed ordinances: our license allows us to sell individual alcohol, but we are not required to report those sales separately, and this request is not typical for any other retail operation in Las Vegas.
Thanks,

Aliza Elazar-Higuchi
The Higuchi Group
5151 Procyon St Ste 108
Las Vegas, NV 89118
Tel 702-736-9430
Fax 702-736-9473

Robert Summerfield

From: Kelly Smith <info@CommandPilotServices.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 12:28 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Public Comment from a Business Owner

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment.

Here is my bottom line counter-proposal — Scrap the entire annual/semi-annual structure and use a NET consumption tax based structure no matter what business you are engaged in. Charge per site or per location or per "entity".

I will spend less if these changes are put fully into effect.

Overall, I always find it intriguing that we must shoulder the cost of making the system more efficient. The postcard clearly indicates that you are after efficiency, but that being more efficient will cost me in the short and long term. I find this counter-intuitive and unacceptable from local government organizations that are set up to take more of my earned money in the name of efficiency and "other related matters". How about a processing fee if I choose to do my semi-annual business with you online instead of pushing up my fees. I'll drop by your office and pay instead of having more of my income taken.

Comment #1:
Overall, the semi-annual fee structure is certainly undesirable. The first issue I have with this structure is that it already taxes me on my gross revenue—Why gross? I have a significant outlay every year just to keep my services available to the public and I have to include that sunken cost as part of the tax I pay to simply license myself.

Next, those brackets are going up and taking away more of my money to be used at my discretion for my business development. This continues one burden (gross receipts instead of net), and increases another (bracket increases) on me.

Comment #2:
As the sole proprietor of my professional business I infer that my business license cost will go from $150 to $500 annually. What on earth requires such a jump in fees before I even open my door for business? Given the unionization of Las Vegas I further infer that this is a direct, intentional and measured attack on non-union activity to subvert sole-proprietors that do not belong to a union. This further angers me because although I would not typically belong to a union, there is not a union for my type of activity as a contractor.

From what I can tell from your document and my uneducated knowledge of "The Code" I see this as another way the city is increasing it's immediate tax revenue on the backs of local establishments that live and work here. I even bring in money from other states that you see in revenues and I am still paying more in Las Vegas fees to do just that. Go to a consumption based taxing method and we'll all be happier.

Cheers, Fly Safe,
Kelly

Kelly Smith
Owner
Command Pilot Services, LLC

Robert Summerfield

From: Eli Elezra <elielezra@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 3:34 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Amend Title 6- my request
Attachments: img-519152118-0001.pdf

Dear Sir/ Madam,
Please opened the attached letter regarding Title 6 amendments.
Thank you,
Eli Elezra

Please open the attached document.

Number of Images: 1
Attachment File Type: PDF

Device Name: WorkCentre 7242
Device Location:

For more information on Xerox products and solutions, please visit http://www.xerox.com/

Department of Planning
333 N. Rancho Drive
Third Floor,
Las Vegas, NV 89106
Attention: Mr. Robert Summerfield

May 19, 2014

Dear Sir/ Madam,

My Name is Eli Elezra, the owner of Souvenir Supermart on 322 Fremont Street.
I read your proposed ordinances, TXT-53834
I would like to ask you to delete item 6.50.360 as below:

6.50.360: Whenever a permit is required to be obtained for individual alcohol sales or a Restaurant is required to be maintained pursuant to an alcoholic beverage license, each licensee shall include the revenue of all alcohol sales in the calculation or payment of all fees required subject to 6.04.005.

Please delete the whole text or at least the following words:
for individual alcohol sales

Our license allows us to sell individual alcohol items, but we are not required to report those sales separately. This request does not apply to stores with a liquor license for off sales and thus needs to be changed.

Thanks for your help in this matter and please do not hesitate to contact me with any question.

Sincerely,

Eli Elezra
702-210-3444
elielezra@yahoo.com

Robert Summerfield

From: Sulimbert <sulimbert@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 5:55 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: TXT-53834 re: Update to Business License Fees

I am a local artist who has been fortunate to work with kind and generous gallery owners to gain the opportunity to share my work with the 18b community. I have watched local artists and gallery owners work their fingers to the bone while struggling to make ends meet and I know a handful of artists who spend what little spare money they have after bills are paid to rent that essential space to creat their artwork. To make and show local art is a great service to the community with very little financial reward or stability. To impose a 30% increase on artists and gallery owners will not only hinder the growth of the arts district, it will most likely push everyone I know to a point of having to close up shop. There is no good to come from this. Please reconsider.

Thank you for your time and consideration and for all of the positive change you have made for our community.

Sincerely, Su Limbert

Robert Summerfield

From: Guido Akerman <losakerman@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 6:15 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Amendment

Dear Sir/ Madam,

In regards to the following amendment:
6.50.360: Whenever a permit is required to be obtained for individual alcohol sales or a restaurant is required to be maintained pursuant to an alcoholic beverage license, each licensee shall include the revenue of all alcohol sales in the calculation or payment of all fees required subject to 6.04.005.

Please delete the following words:
for individual alcohol sales
from your proposed ordinances as this is a request that is not legitimate in a retail type of operation in other parts of Las Vegas.

Thanks,

Guido Akerman

Robert Summerfield

From: James Stanford <dharmajim@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 6:48 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Cc: Wendy Kveck
Subject: No Fee Increases For Artists

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for bars and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee, is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive. East Fremont has too many bars already.

As a former Las Vegas Arts Commissioner I would like to remind everyone, it is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,

James Stanford
Artist/Business Owner

Robert Summerfield

From: Wendy Kveck <wendykveck@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 10:28 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Comments RE: TXT-53834 re: Update to Business License Fees

To Whom it May Concern,

I am submitting comments regarding the proposed update to Business License Fees, TXT-53834. I am an adjunct professor at the College of Southern Nevada and a visual artist who exhibits my work locally and nationally. I actively support the growth of arts and culture in downtown Las Vegas through volunteer work and participation in the local arts community. As a visual artist who rents studio space in the 18b Arts District, I am directly impacted by the 30% fee increase in the "Visual Artist" license category and I would like to go on public record as opposing the fee increase.

The proposed business license fee increase impacts visual artists working in "The 18b Arts Disctrict," where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, BUT HAS NOT DONE SO FOR VISUAL ARTISTS OR GALLERIES. Though much of the new development downtown is exciting and welcome, we are seeing an increase in downtown bars as gallerists struggle to keep afloat and studio spaces/potential studio spaces remain vacant in the arts district. This proposed fee increase alongside a lack of incentives discourages artists from renting space and working in the so-called "Arts District" or anywhere downtown for that matter outside of their own homes. This, in effect, discourages real growth and sustainability of the arts downtown. However, I believe that looking back at the early days of the revitalization of downtown, we'll find that there were artists and galleries taking risks and implementing positive change in these two previously blighted areas. A renewed commitment to and support of the **arts** in the "Arts District" is vital to its success, diversity and longevity.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Wendy Kveck
Visual Artist/Business Owner/Educator
557 Barbara Way
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104
702-869-9002
wendykveck@gmail.com

Robert Summerfield

From: Amanda Farrar <amandajfarrar@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2014 10:32 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Proposed artist license fee hurts Arts District

Hello,
I am writing to comment on **TXT-53834 re: Update to Business License Fees**.

The proposed fee increase of 30% for the Visual Artist category discourages the growth of our Arts District. The city has supported the bar/tavern industry in the designated 18b Arts District. So why would we increase the fee on artists? The artists, unlike bar/tavern owners, are often struggling. I do not want to see them priced out of the Arts District that they make unique. I strongly oppose this increase for Visual Artists.

Amanda J. Farrar
amandajfarrar@gmail.com
702.883.9084 mobile

Robert Summerfield

From: david ryan <dvdrion@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 11:24 AM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Business License for Artists

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,

David Ryan
Artist/Urban Lounger

Robert Summerfield

From: Mali Gabay <maligabay@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 12:00 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Comment

Dear Amend Title6,

We are requesting on behalf of Crazy Ely Western Village 321 Fremont, Famous Pioneer - 25 Fremont, and G&G Fremont - 24 Fremont to have a clause removed on a proposed amendment.

This is a request in regards to your proposed TXT-53834
TEXT AMENDMENT - APPLICANT/OWNER: CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Discussion and possible action to amend LVMC Title 6 related to business taxes, licenses and regulations to provide for changes to various fees, to offset costs of technology to process business licenses, provide online services for business customers and maintain service levels and to provide for other related matters.

6.50.360: Whenever a permit is required to be obtained for individual alcohol sales or a restaurant is required to be maintained pursuant to an alcoholic beverage license, each licensee shall include the revenue of all alcohol sales in the calculation or payment of all fees required subject to 6.04.005.

Please delete the following words:
for individual alcohol sales
from your proposed ordinances: our license allows us to sell individual alcohol, but we are not required to report those sales separately, and this request is not typical for any other retail operation in Las Vegas.

--
Thank you,

Crazy Ely Western Village LLC
6130 W. Flamingo Rd #402
Las Vegas, NV 89103
Cell (702)349-0264
Off (702)382-3005
Fax (702)382-700
5

Robert Summerfield

From: Erin Stellmon <erinstellmon@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 1:54 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: 30% increase on artist licence fees

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,

Erin Stellmon
Las Vegas Artist

Robert Summerfield

From: Victoria Leigh Morris <vmorris@saic.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 2:17 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Artist License Fees

Frankly, 150 dollars is too high for many working artists, who often barely sell - if they're lucky to have gallery rep at all. It's frustrating to see the City continually favor bar culture over real culture. At some point, the well-being of our permanent residents of Las Vegas have to come before what might attract tourist dollars.

In addition, the City really needs to consider inviting public-private investors to the 18b District to start constructing artist-only affordable housing and studio space. Look to the successful programs in Lowell, Massachusetts among others to start jump starting Downtown Re-development. Once a critical mass of people can afford to live downtown we will start seeing more interest in real grocery stores, real restaurants, etc.

Thanks for your time,
Victoria Morris, graduate of LVA.

Robert Summerfield

From: Stacey Kerby Torres <staceywaxpert@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 2:21 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Proposed increase in visual artist fees

To whom it may concern,

I'm opposed to any fee increases for artists. As a businessperson near downtown I'm concerned this will stifle growth and events that increase my business and tarnish the neighborhoods good reputation for the low and middle class clients I welcome. As a las Vegas native with 3 children also born and being raised here I'm appalled fee increases are even being considered when all downtown hotels now charge resort fees equal to the strip- where's that money going? The artists that have built the current revival of Fremont, first Friday and downtown with their passion should not be faced with increase that will narrow participants to only the well funded.

Thank you,
Stacey Torres
The Wax Genie
5150 rose st
Las Vegas, nv 89106

Robert Summerfield

From: Nancy Good <nancy@newlightfotodesign.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 2:31 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Proposed increase to Visual Artist License

It honestly numbs the mind to think that the City of Las Vegas could waive Urban Lounge and reduce Limited Tavern fees in the 18b Arts District to encourage business development, but yet consider increasing the Visual Artist License fees. Artists are the very "culture" of a city. There is no Arts District without Artists. Increasing fees 30% is not supportive of the people who continue to help make the area attractive to Urban Lounges and Limited Taverns. And attempting to make up budget short-falls on the backs of often "starving" artists is both short-sighted and irresponsible, and ultimately puts an imbalanced financial demand onto struggling individuals rather than businesses with investors.

Please vote "NO" on this proposal and begin showing support thoughtful consideration for the individuals who are the very backbone of the 18b Arts District.

Thank you,
Nancy Good

Nancy Good
Fine Art of Nancy Good & New Light Foto Design
www.nancygoodart.com
www.newlightfotodesign.com
www.pbase.com/bellanundo

Robert Summerfield

From: ramona burns <ramonakburns@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 3:02 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: No Increase in Artist Fees: Title 6

To Whom It May Concern: I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.
It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.
Most Sincerely,
Ramona Burns
Title: Artist

Robert Summerfield

From: Lisa Fields Clark <lfclark@aceweb.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 3:23 PM
To: AmendTitle6

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas; not only in art and small business, but supplemental arts education programs as well.

Most Sincerely,

Lisa Fields Clark, Artist
PO Box 42092
Las Vegas, NV
89116

Robert Summerfield

From: Lisa Fields Clark <lfclark@aceweb.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 3:25 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Business License Fees

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas; not only in art and small business, but supplemental arts education programs as well.

Most Sincerely,

Lisa Fields Clark, Artist
PO Box 42092
Las Vegas, NV
89116

Robert Summerfield

From: Michele Quinn <michele@mcqfineart.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 3:25 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: TITLE 6 Proposal

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists and galleries, thus further discouraging visual artists and professionals from doing business in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district have already pricing out the very community that helped build this area into a now sought after district. These are the people who are most directly impacted, through renting studios and creating a fine arts community, in the designated "The 18b Arts District". Was that not the purpose of this designation to begin with, help to build a community that promotes the creative arts?

When the city has effortlessly afforded generous tax and business incentives to urban lounges and taverns and other businesses in the area (such as Fremont East), it goes against logic that it would INCREASE fees to those who have helped support this area and create an environment of creativity. We have more than enough bars and places to drink, what we do not have is an urban environment that promotes diversity and creativity on a larger scale; one that is integrated into the community and creates a sense of place. This movement was only just beginning to happen, but with this pending negative change, it will only push this creative class out of the picture and what you will have left is once again a downtown that is driven solely by a commerce that is not conducive to a thriving community environment, but one that promotes only drinking and gambling at its lowest level. I think we as a community, have had ENOUGH of that and want to see support from the city and local governments in even the slightest of efforts, to help make this positive change by NOT raising these fees. Artists struggle every day to make ends meet – adding to this burden is only detrimental to our cultural growth. It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas. Please do not continue to push them out.

Most Sincerely,

Michele C Quinn
Principcal and Property Owner
MCQ FINE ART, LLC
620 South 7th Street
Las Vegas NV 89101
C: 702 219 0131
O: 702 366 9339
www.mcqfineart.com

Robert Summerfield

From: Donald Rilea <joemeow@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 5:10 PM
To: AmendTitle6

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,

Donald Rilea,

Las Vegas, Nevada.

Robert Summerfield

From: Ginger Bruner <gingerbruner@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 6:14 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: re: proposed business license fee increase on artists

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,

Ginger
Artist, Musician and "Our Las Vegas" Associate Producer/Lead Photographer

Robert Summerfield

From: dianebush@cox.net
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2014 10:55 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Title 6

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East).

The city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries.

One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. So we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant.

This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artists and galleries rather than to promote more drinking establishments, which really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

The artists and the art galleries fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas....please do not punish them for doing so.

Most Sincerely,
Diane Bush
Title: Artist/Business Owner

Robert Summerfield

From: Shawn Spanier <shawnspanier@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 8:48 AM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: AMEND TITLE 6

To whom it may concern
As a business owner in Las Vegas i oppose this change i am unable to speak for other owners but i can tell you in my businesses i will need to layoff multiple workers should this amendment pass. I would suggest if you do not have the Monies to spend do not spend it and cut like crazy it is time to be fiscally responsible and quick chasing dollars and start saving them.

SHAWN SPANIER
C.E.O.
OFFICE: *702-944-4200*
FAX: *702-944-4201*

Robert Summerfield

From: Roy Hessinger <poet@unlv.nevada.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 9:10 AM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Proposed 30% increase for the Visual Artist license

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District.
The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East)
the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is
discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown
as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or
downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee
incentives in order to thrive. It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Also a question.
Why is there a proposed 30% fee increase on Visual Arts License and not on other businesses, which would clearly bring in more revenue and have less of an
impact on those businesses?

Until you can answer that question this move seems punitive towards the arts district.

Sincerely,
Roy Hessinger

Robert Summerfield

From: Jerry Schefcik <jerry.schefcik@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 10:41 AM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Buisness license fee increase

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase for artists located in the 18b Arts District. This continues to discourage artists from participating in the Arts District revitalization. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. This fee is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. We see an increase of bars downtown, but galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the "Arts District," or downtown. It makes much more business sense to institute long term incentives for the artist and gallery to locate in the arts district rather than encouraging them to leave for somewhere else. Urban lounges, or bars, really don't require fee incentives to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas. Why place the fee increase on the backs of those who you want in this district?

Most Sincerely,
Jerry Schefcik

Robert Summerfield

From: Laura Henkel <drlaura@sincitygallery.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 1:45 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Tax Increase

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,

Laura Henkel
Business Owner

Sin City Gallery

Robert Summerfield

From: J K Russ <info@jkruss.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 1:47 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Re Proposed Increase for the Visual Artist license

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,

JK Russ
Artist/Business Owner

Robert Summerfield

From: jevijoe vitug <jevitug@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 2:36 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: No 30% Fee Increase For Visual Artist Licenses

To Whom It May Concern:

The proposed business license fee increase on visual artists will discourage local artists to make more art here in Las Vegas. Artists need studios professionally in which other major cities like LA, Berlin and New York, government and corporate entities subsidize artist studio spaces; affordable studios in our art community are needed to foster creativity and also cultural diversity. Art as a profession or being a professional full-time (exhibiting) visual artist here in Las Vegas is not a lucrative career at the moment, this is the reason why a lot of artists here have day jobs just to make ends meet, so any increased or additional fees could be a burden to artists. Ultimately, local artists create cultural entity and not business entity for future generations to enjoy.

Sincerely,
Jevijoe Vitug
Las Vegas artist

Robert Summerfield

From: depio168@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 3:09 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: No to 30% Fee Increase for Visual Artist Licenses

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a full-time artist here in Las Vegas. Year after year there is an increasing number of actively participating artists in downtown events in spite of a financial crisis and a lack of steady income. Many of us are in the low income (or no income) bracket, and are pursuing this career mostly because we are passionate about creating art and propagating our works in whatever way we can. Recently, there has been some talk about a proposed business license fee increase on artists. I vehemently oppose this proposed increase because even at its current rate, many of us artists simply cannot afford it. If your intentions are to generate more funds for the city, I am sure there are more appropriate avenues of income from many of the high-revenue businesses around the district.

Sincerely,

Gig Depio
Artist

Robert Summerfield

From: Alisha Kerlin <alishakerlin@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 3:13 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Fee increases for artists

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,

Alisha Kerlin
Title: Artist/UNLV Marjorie Barrick Museum

Robert Summerfield

From: Yoshabel Cortez <yosha_cortez@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 4:09 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Concerns about Title 6

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,

Yoshabel Cortez

Artist

Robert Summerfield

From: Alison Chambers <snapitlv@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 4:15 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Proposed business license fee increase on artists

To Whom It May Concern:

I have recently become aware that there is a proposed business license fee increase on artists, thus further discouraging artists from participating in the 18b Arts District. The rents in the district are already high. Those most impacted are renting studios in an area downtown designated "The 18b Arts District" where (in addition to Fremont East) the city has created generous tax and business incentives for urban lounges and taverns, but not for artists and galleries. One of the problems with this sort of fee is that it is discouraging the very artists and galleries that are creating the positive transformation of these areas in the first place. And so we are seeing an increase of bars downtown as galleries come and go and studio spaces remain vacant. This proposed bill discourages artists from renting studio space and working in the so-called "Arts District," or downtown for that matter. I would rather see long term incentives for the artist and gallery rather than to promote more drinking establishments, who really don't require fee incentives in order to thrive.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Most Sincerely,
Alison S. Chambers
Arts Patron
Las Vegas Resident

Robert Summerfield

From: YASMINA CHAVEZ <yasminachavez@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 4:22 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Business License Fee Increase on Artists

Whom It May Concern:

The proposed business license fee increase on artists, which will no doubt inhibit artists growth and participation in the 18b Arts District should be carefully reconsidered. The artist community is small and is in a constant struggle to survive. And although that is the case it has survived by the dynamic energy and passion of a few cemented artist fueled and accented by the participation of the more transient community. This kind of proposal is a disdainful act. And the kind of thing that is put into motion by ones that lack compassion and understanding for their community. It is a passive aggressive measure of intolerance, simply put it's "kicking us while we're down." For this reason, I implore the people considering this proposal to reconsider the gravity of this action. You must nurture and allow a tree to grow and thrive and produce before picking its fruit or else you might just kill it. Sure the business license doesn't seem so expensive, but consider what we already pay. Taking an additional $150 from our pockets is like taking half our rent or two months of art supplies or forcing us to cancel a show. We are small, so please consider that we function on very little, but we make it happen month after month maybe surviving purely on enthusiasm but that is the by-product of passion. On that note, please instead consider giving this struggling and commendable community incentives, try to imagine what could be if we were given a little more water and sunlight.

Most Sincerely,
Yasmina Chavez
Local Artist, Former Gallery Owner, Arts Advocate and Enthusiast,
Most Importantly Concerned Citizen

P.S.

It is the artist and the art gallery that has fueled the positive change in these two formerly blighted areas of the City of Las Vegas.

Robert Summerfield

From: Waiters Ralston, Diana <DWAITERS@amfam.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2014 4:54 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Annual Business Fee license

This will cause a hardship to my agency. I can barely pay the $200 now, not to mention $200 for my employees. They don't have a business license. Why would they have to pay?

Thanks

Diana Waiters Ralston | Diana Waiters Ralston Agency | American Family Insurance
3530 E Flamingo Rd, Suite 105 Las Vegas, NV 89121
Phone 702.435-1132 | Cell 435-625-1553 | Fax 702-441-2739 www.dianawaiters.com

"We want your 10!"
You may receive American Star Survey to evaluate our services. If there is any reason we do not deserve a 10 for your experience with your Agent and Agency Staff, please let us know.

American Family Insurance Company | American Family Life Insurance Company | American Family Mutual Insurance Company | American Standard Insurance Company of Ohio | American Standard Insurance Company of Wisconsin | Home Office - 6000 American Parkway | Madison, WI 53783

*If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this e-mail, any attachments and all copies.

Robert Summerfield

From: Randa Bishop <randa@pobox.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 08, 2014 12:29 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Visual Arts - $200 can be an unreasonable fee

Does the City of Las Vegas, really think that EVERY visual artist makes a lot of money??? or enough money to warrant paying a flat fee of $200???

Frankly, I believe it would be FAR MORE FAIR to charge a sales based fee for all artists - unless you want to CAP it for them at $200.

So, I am retired - I am a photographer - Here are two different scenarios yet BOTH are UNFAIR in my opinion.

2012 - In 2012, I earned 19690 Gross and 5670 net and I paid a flat fee of $200 (During this same year, if I were on the sliding scale for sales based fee, I would have paid only $110)

2013 - In 2013, I earned 991 Gross and had a loss of (8,202) - however I still paid a flat fee of $200, whereas if I were on a sliding scale for sales based fee, I would have paid only $110)

On your sliding scale - people who GROSS
up to $60,000 only pay $110 per year
and from $60,000 to $360,000 only pay $200 per year

I think, during my entire career I only grossed in the region of $100,000 one or two times and that was when I lived in a major city New York

Now I am essentially retired, but I still occasionally make sales more as a visual artist than anything else - but you are putting a heavier burden on me as a retiree and as a visual artist than you would put on someone earning up to $60,000

My opinion is that you need to re-evaluate the Visual Artist category - and allow us to pay lower fees if we are not earning up to $60,000 a year.

Thank you.
Randa Bishop | Randa Bishop Photography, LLC | Tel: 702.240.4777 | Cell: 702.336.4777 | www.randabishop.com | randa@pobox.com

Robert Summerfield

From: Tschopp, Kristen R <Kristen.R.Tschopp@ehi.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 06, 2014 12:36 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: TXT-53834 re: Update to Business License Fees

Categories: 3-year Retention

I would like to clarify a couple of items regarding the proposed update to business license fees for a number of license categories. First, automobile leasing appears to include all short term vehicle rental locations, is this correct? Also, these automobile leasing currently has an annual license fee of $200.00. Since automobile leasing has been struck through under section 6.04.060 Annual business license fee - ~~$200.~~ $250.00, does this mean that automobile leasing would fall under the section 6.04.005 Sales-based fee, which would be paid semi-annually?

Thank you,
Kristen Tschopp

ENTERPRISEHOLDINGS.

Kristen Tschopp
Tax Specialist
Accounting Dept

702-597-1600 office
702-730-1001 direct
702-932-9414 fax

Kristen.R.Tschopp@ehi.com

Enterprise Leasing Company-West, LLC
Group 54
6855 Bermuda Road
Las Vegas, NV 89119
USA
enterpriseholdings.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed and may contain confidential and privileged information protected by law. If you received this e-mail in error, any review, use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of the e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and delete all copies from your system.

Robert Summerfield

From: beautysparkles@aol.com
Sent: Monday, May 05, 2014 7:17 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Hardship - Do not increase Fees Please!

Hi. My business (Beauty Sparkles) is very small 300 to 400 a month gross sales. The increase of fees would make a hardship on my fragile business. At lease propose a 0-$5000 semi- annual gross sales category at the $25 current rate. 0 to $30k is such a vast difference in income for the $55 proposed fee. Please do not increase the fees.

Thank You,

Gail Gallegos
Beauty Sparkles
P.O. Box 370993
Las Vegas, NV 89137

Robert Summerfield

From: Darla Graham <darla_graham@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 02, 2014 10:47 AM
To: AmendTitle6

Less government NOT more is ALWAYS best. Please consider allowing the American population to regulate it's self.

Robert Summerfield

From: Meron, Matthew L <MMERON@amfam.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 3:41 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Comments on proposed amendment

I believe if you approve the proposed changes to insurance agencies you will reduce the amount of newer agents hired and slow down the job growth in Nevada. I currently employ myself and 1 other staff person and was planning on hiring an additional staff person this year. With the proposed increase of the business license I now am reconsidering if we can manage with what we have versus incurring the additional cost. I realize that large agencies have appeared in the state recently and they are paying the same amount that us smaller agencies are paying, although I don't agree that this will promote job growth with the small businesses. I would suggest to set the cost similar to what is done with gross sales 1-5 agents, 6-10, 11-15 etc.

Thank you,

Matthew Meron

AMERICAN FAMILY INSURANCE

MATTHEW MERON, AGENT | AMERICAN FAMILY INSURANCE
6440 Sky Pointe Dr Ste 120 | Las Vegas, NV 89131
Office: 702.260.8022 | Fax: 702.260.8910

email | website | quote | map

AMERICAN STAR · "Excellence in Customer Experience"
American Star Certified Agency

American Family Insurance Company | American Family Life Insurance Company | American Family Mutual Insurance Company | American Standard Insurance Company of Ohio | American Standard Insurance Company of Wisconsin | Home Office - 6000 American Parkway | Madison, WI 53783

*If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this e-mail, any attachments and all copies.

Robert Summerfield

From: Chuck Strickland <stricklandcomputerservices@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 3:16 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Comment on Proposed Change

This proposed change will result in raising my license fee to more than double what it is now. I feel that this is grossly unfair and is an extreme hardship and may cause me to have to close my business.

Chuck Strickland
Strickland Computer Servicces
(702) 241-6653

Robert Summerfield

From: Scott Brooksby <brooksby1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 3:00 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Business license fee increase comment

Dear Sirs:

In an environment in which businesses are struggling to make ends meet, we are finding that many government entities throughout the city, county, state and country are increasing their fees.

The question I must ask is why? In my business, as we have entered the depression, people are less willing to part with what little they have left. Many are loosing their jobs, their homes and beginning to live on much less than they have had in the past. I have had to reduce my staffing because of a reduction in income. I have had to reduce my own spending for business expenses.

What about government? The work load has decreased. Instead of reducing the number of employees they have decided to increase the fees that they charge. Inspectors are now going around looking for more violations simply to prove that they belong. The end result is that we end up paying more and more for government services.

At the North Las Vegas Airport where I teach on occasion they often have three people staffing a desk that probably could be handled by one, even if there were a little more work to do. The costs of aviation fuel is currently $6.05 per gallon. Avgas used to be one dollar per gallon more expensive, now it is two. I was in the Boise area two weeks ago and the fuel costs there were about $5.25 per gallon. They are out in the middle of nowhere, but their costs are lower because the government fees that are added are less. The Department of Aviation imposes a 2% tax on any business at the airport. This might make sense at McCarran where there is a large captive audience still willing to spend a lot of money, but at a smaller general avaition airport that 2% tax has for many been the difference between success and failure.

It is time for government to downsize. If government must employ fewer people then so be it. That is what I have had to do in my business. Increasing the fees during a depression simply makes things worse. Fees should be reduced, taxes should be reduced. City government should become more business friendly and do all that they can to encourage growth, not tax it.

--
I hope this helps,

L. Scott Brooksby, DDS, DICOI, MACP
8960 W. Cheyenne #190
Las Vegas, NV 89129
702-367-4121
lvimplant.com
brooksby1@gmail.com

Robert Summerfield

From: Kitty Lakis <klakis@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 2:46 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: PLEASE DO NOT RAISE OUR LICENSE FEES!!!

ActionTo: Dept. of Planning,

We have a small swimming maintenance business, and we from time to time being asked why our rates are higher than the other companies. We tell them that with the costs of running a legitimate business, (taxes, insurances such as liability, unemployment, workers comp. and gas for our trucks) it cost a little more, and we have to pass that on to our customers, otherwise we will be running a HOBBY, if no small profit is made.
So we're pleading that any changes that are made to streamline the licensing dept. is fine as long as it doesn't raise our licensing fees. We'd like to stay in business without having to compete with the unlicensed companies out there. Thank you,
Mark and Kitty Lakis (Lakis Pool Service)
KLakis@msn.com

Robert Summerfield

From: Mike Nesler <filmprosinc@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 1:31 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Cost of doing business

As a one time business owner in California, (12 years in San Diego)I would just like to point out how the State of California ran many small and large businesses from the state by increasing the cost of doing business. Increasing fee's may help things in the short term. Please lets not become like California!

Mike Nesler
Film Pros Inc
Since 1974

Robert Summerfield

From: term2 <term2@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 1:23 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Increase in Licensing Fees

I would like to make a few general comments:

1) I do not see why License fees have to be raised, when the City doesn't do ANYTHING to actually promote business in this time of recession. Tax increases result in retail price increases, which result in reduced business volume, and deepening of recessions and reduction of employment. Every $100 of increased taxes simply pays for more inflated government salaries and more regulations. Taxes always seem to go up, regardless of the benefit the resulting government gives to the citizens.

2) Manufacturing is nearly nonexistent in Las Vegas, and what appears to be a doubling of our license fee to manufacture will definitely make it more difficult to actually make anything here, and will cause us to increase our reliance on imports from china, and reduction of employment here in Las Vegas.

3) Given the exorbitant salaries and benefits which the City employees enjoy, along with constant requests for additional tax money across the board here in Clark County, I would definitely recommend to business people asking my advice that they NOT locate in the city of Las Vegas, as its known for difficult and bureaucratic building permitting, as well as high fees. If Las Vegas wants business other than Casinos to locate here, its going to have to be a LOT more business friendly.

4) My recommendation is to ELIMINATE all licensing fees for Manufacturing businesses whose gross sales are less than $1m per year, as an incentive for existing businesses to return the profits back into their businesses, as well as attracting new ones.

Every large business was ONCE a small business

James Weigl
Primate Assembly Inc
3310 Sunrise Ave #104
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Robert Summerfield

From: cinderbretta@centurylink.net
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 11:59 AM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: [Marketing Mail] City License Fees

What is the matter with you, there are many businesses who are struggling to get by at the fees charged now. You say it is a small amount, but when you add in the small amount to the small increase in power, water, printing, rental and everyone else who increases the fees "just a little", you will be putting more businesses out of business. We can't raise our prices or we loose customers, and most businesses if they raise their prices, that means they pay more for their license.

You say you want to be business friendly, but everything you seem to do proves otherwise. I know quite a few small businesses who will close their doors with another hike in costs.

I hope you think this over. My license already tripled in the the last couple of years and I can't absorb much more of this and that is why so many people try to conduct business with no license. They can't afford it.

FREE Animations for your email Click Here!

Robert Summerfield

From: Jim Flihan <jflihan1@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 4:44 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: proposed new fees

The semi-annual fees look to be increasing by quite a substantial sum.
Is this really necessary??
I can see where paying almost double or more on a semi-annual basis will hurt a lot of businesses.
Ours included.

Robert Summerfield

From: David VanZanten <dave@sourcedirectpromos.com>
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2014 10:49 PM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Keep fees the same

Guys,

Keep the fees put. The changes seem to just be a headache with a slightly-increased cost for those with smaller businesses. Focus on growth strategies to entice new businesses to set up shop, not on increasing their fees please.

--Dave

Robert Summerfield

From: ArtistLZ@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 1:45 AM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Business license fees

It looks to me as if it's unfair to people on the low income scale like myself, to have my fee more than doubled.
Right now, the semi-annual fee is $25 for persons making up to $12,000 semi-annual gross. Now you want to raise this to $55 semi-annual?
My business is very tiny, and I don't even make $10,000 for the entire year.....yet you want to raise my license fee this high?
I hope you will reconsider this increase for people like me who make so little money. At least leave it as it is now, for us who make $12,000 and under.

Robert Summerfield

From: Scott Corbett <toolserviceinc@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 7:56 AM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: title 6 amendments

To whom it may concern,
Having struggled for the past several years as have most businesses, and making little or no profit, I resent having to pay an additional fee for my business license. Granted, it may not be a huge amount, but with so many governing agencies feeling the need for more revenue, the dollars add up. I vote no on the Title 6 amendment.

Sincerely,

Scott Corbett

Tool Service Inc
2912 S Highland Ste C
Las Vegas, NV 89109
702-734-9161

Robert Summerfield

From: Sonja Bettendorf <Sonja@tipsytotes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 9:24 AM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Title 6 - remarks

To Whom It May Concern

I am upset that you are attempting to raise fees for licensing in the downtown area. We have been downtown almost two years. Business is bad here. You are not cleaning up the homeless problems, often it takes the police 35 minutes to several hours to show up for problems. The homeless people are walking around the area and sleeping on the sidewalks and chase any potential clients away coming in to our store not to mention begging for money, plus leaving our parking areas full of trash and it's a mess. So not only are we creating jobs for people and trying to support a business, we are also have a parking lot cleaning detail because of the junk the homeless are leaving around. Do you know how many times I have gone to Costco on MLK and watch the homeless using the sidewalk as a bathroom, and you want us to pay more money when this isn't stopped. Where do you think our business will come from in that type of atmosphere? Before you want to raise our fees I would think you would want to keep our businesses in the downtown area and make it more conducive to help us make a living. Its strange that all you can think about is raising fees and not providing good services.

I am so angry about this raise - it will double our fees and we are doing everything in our power to turn a profit, put people to work and get customers in our door to purchase items. I feel we get little cooperation from you to make us want to stay in the downtown area. Not only do you want to raise our fees, the State of Nevada has a bill in congress to start taxing business that make over One Million in sales not profit. We are not near that but I know from government taxing it will come down to hit the rest of us because heaven forbid there might be a dollar I have that someone else needs.

Sincerely your

Sonja Bettendorf
Tipsy Totes

Tipsy Totes

Stylish Wine & Spirit Carriers
(702) 366-0399
1549 W. Oakey Blvd.
Las Vegas, NV 89102
www.TipsyTotes.com
Facebook.com/TipsyTotesVegas
@TipsyTotes
Youtube.com/TipsyTotesVegas

Robert Summerfield

From: George Gekakis <ggi@gekakis.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 01, 2014 9:55 AM
To: AmendTitle6
Subject: Proposed Changes to Licensing

To whom it may concern,

Upon review of the proposed changes to the licensing fees and definitions, we are concerned about Section 6.04.005 Sales-based fee.

At the time of obtaining a business license for a senior apartment complex, the licensing department made us apply for 2 licenses. One for the general business and another for the private laundry room on-site for use by the residents. We are currently paying the $25 semi-annual license fee and only average around $2500 per 6 month period. To increase that fee to $55 semi-annually when we are not a commercial laundry facility is not acceptable. The nominal fee charged to the residents is simply to help maintain the machines and not a large of source of income.

In summary, not only are we opposed to the license fee increase, but we would like the licensing requirement for private, non-commercial laundry facilities removed.

Thank you for your consideration and if you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Marci Edwards

George Gekakis, Inc.
2655 South Rainbow Blvd., Suite 401
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
Phone (702)364-8027
Fax (702)364-4925