

City of Las Vegas

**CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE LAS VEGAS REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
CITY HALL, 495 S. MAIN STREET
CITY CLERKS 2ND FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
CITY OF LAS VEGAS INTERNET ADDRESS: www.lasvegasnevada.gov**

AGENDA

SEPTEMBER 28, 2015

4:00 PM

ITEMS LISTED ON THE AGENDA MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF THE ORDER PRESENTED; TWO OR MORE AGENDA ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION MAY BE COMBINED; AND ANY ITEM ON THE AGENDA MAY BE REMOVED OR RELATED DISCUSSION MAY BE DELAYED AT ANY TIME. BACKUP MATERIAL FOR THIS AGENDA MAY BE OBTAINED FROM LUANN D. HOLMES, CITY CLERK, AT THE CITY CLERKS OFFICE AT 495 SOUTH MAIN STREET, 2ND FLOOR OR ON THE CITY'S WEBPAGE AT www.lasvegasnevada.gov.

1. [CALL TO ORDER](#)

Minutes:

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m.

PRESENT: CHAIR MATHIS and MEMBERS MACK, ZURAWSKI, BONAVENTURE, SYLVAIN (excused until 4:11 p.m.) and DYKES

EXCUSED: MEMBERS CHERRY, KOVACS and SPRAGUE

ALSO PRESENT: SCOTT AUYONG, Senior Development Specialist, TERI PONTICELLO, Assistant City Attorney, and JACQUIE MILLER, Deputy City Clerk

2. [ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW](#)

Minutes:

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE: This meeting has been properly noticed and posted at the following locations: City Hall, 495 South Main Street, 1st Floor; Clark County Government Center, 500 South Grand Central Parkway; Grant Sawyer Building, 555 East Washington Avenue; City of Las Vegas Development Services Center, 333 North Rancho Drive.

3. [PUBLIC COMMENT DURING THIS PORTION OF THE AGENDA MUST BE LIMITED TO MATTERS ON THE AGENDA FOR ACTION. IF YOU WISH TO BE HEARD, GIVE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD. THE AMOUNT OF DISCUSSION, AS WELL AS THE AMOUNT OF TIME ANY SINGLE SPEAKER IS ALLOWED, MAY BE LIMITED](#)

Minutes:

None.

4. [For possible action to approve the Final Minutes by reference of the Regular Meetings of March 23 and May 18, 2015](#)

Motion made by LINDA A. ZURAWSKI to Approve

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 4

LINDA A. ZURAWSKI, LOIS MACK, BEVERLY S. MATHIS, JAMES BONAVENTURE, JERMAINE DYKES; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-ALBERT Z. KOVACS, SAM CHERRY, MARK SYLVAIN, R. BRANDON SPRAGUE

City of Las Vegas

5. [Report by Brian McAnallen, Government Affairs Manager, regarding Nevada Assembly Bill 445](#)

Minutes:

BRIAN McANALLEN, Government Affairs Manager, announced that a bill was adopted and signed by the Governor this legislative session regarding redevelopment and the City's Redevelopment Area 1. MR. McANALLEN reviewed a PowerPoint presentation which was submitted as backup, and gave a history of AB (Assembly Bill) 50, a bill regarding the extension of the redevelopment area. AB 50 was introduced, passed by the legislature and signed by the Governor in 2013 but during an amendment opportunity, the desired language regarding how the RDA (Redevelopment Agency) would operate under its parameters was not added. After that legislative session, a study was conducted by JEREMY AGUERO, Applied Analysis, to determine the assessed value of the projects in the redevelopment area. It was determined that under AB 50, there were at least eight projects that kept the City from qualifying for extending the RDA because the assessed value had decreased; therefore, staff knew that AB 50 needed to be changed. This was a top priority for the City, and a legislative team was assembled to work on this issue. There were no BDRs (Bill Draft Requests) submitted by the City, so the team had to find someone else to carry the legislation for the City.

MR. McANALLEN referred to a slide that showed the 2015 topics of interest for the legislative session, noting that there were 1,075 legislative bills introduced, and the City was interested in 408 of them. He also mentioned that 20 of the 63 legislators were brand new and had to be educated regarding the City's issues. Since there was no BDR, a senator introduced the bill as a standalone measure that included the desired language in it. This bill went into committee on the Senate side and faced no opposition from legislators with the exception of Clark County, who was in a neutral position, but critical of redevelopment and the impact it has on Clark County. Because of Clark County's strong concerns, the bill had some challenges on the Senate side, so the City's legislative team added the desired language to Section 2 of the City of Henderson's redevelopment bill, AB 445. The issues addressed in Section 2 included changing the calculation of assessed value from "each project" to the "aggregate" number of projects within the redevelopment area and eliminating the \$100 million in total outstanding debt requirement for the RDA. Those provisions should address the issues from AB 50, extend the life of the RDA, allow for the flexibility needed to implement projects and give the Economic Development team the tools they need to move forward. MR. McANALLEN noted that this bill was the last bill passed by the legislature on the last night of the session with six people voting against the bill as they, philosophically, are not fans of redevelopment or redevelopment agencies. This issue will be monitored for the next 18 months, and if there is still something that needs to be fixed, it will be a top priority for the 2017 session.

MEMBER ZURAWSKI asked why Clark County and some of the senators were opposed to redevelopment, and MR. McANALLEN replied that there are quite a few legislators that are against the redevelopment agencies. Clark County School District will always raise concerns about the revenue, its offsets for schools and how they are held harmless. Clark County put their issue on the record for all of the redevelopment associated bills; they claim to be in a neutral position, but their testimony comes off strong and becomes problematic.

CHAIR MATHIS congratulated MR. McANALLEN for working alongside the City of Henderson.

6. [Report by Rich Atkins, Redevelopment Officer, regarding the expansion of the Las Vegas Redevelopment Area](#)

Minutes:

RICHARD ATKINS, Redevelopment Officer, reported that it has been decided to expand the existing RDA 1 (Redevelopment Area 1), which was created in 1986, and is also known as the Downtown RDA. MR. ATKINS distributed and submitted as backup, maps of the proposed expansion areas. Expansion Area 1 includes the Medical District. Expansion Area B is in Ward 5, is mostly residential but has opportunities for residential/commercial areas as well. It was originally included in a 2006 expansion, but due to stakeholder concerns at the time, it was removed. Expansion Area C is in Ward 3, and those parcels were also removed from the 2006 expansion but have been put back in because of outreach to the property owners and businesses who want to be in the RDA (Redevelopment Agency) area. It will also include Maryland Parkway from Sahara Avenue to Charleston Boulevard.

MR. ATKINS reported that on August 5th, the RDA had a public hearing to discuss the proposed expansion of the redevelopment area, and the Planning Commission will hear this item on November 3rd. A study is also being done to show that these areas are blighted. If approved at the Planning Commission with no significant changes, this will go before the City Council for approval in December and should go through the ordinance process in January, 2016. When the item

City of Las Vegas

goes before the City Council, staff will also present a plan to amend and restate the redevelopment plan for Redevelopment Area 1. This will include text changes, creating a revolving loan fund, the 15-year extension and the new revised employment plan. MR. ATKINS will provide the blight study to the Members once it is done.

In response to MEMBER BONAVENTURE'S inquiry regarding the maps, MR. ATKINS confirmed that the big red area on Oakey Boulevard and Maryland Parkway was Bishop Gorman High School.

7. [Report by Brenda Hughes, Senior Economic Development Specialist, regarding the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement between City Parkway V, Inc. and PH Symphony Park, LLC for Parcel E at Symphony Park](#)

Minutes:

BRENDA HUGHES, Senior Economic Development Specialist, showed a map of Symphony Park and pointed out Parcel E, which is a 5.84 acre parcel. The original plan for the parcel was a high-rise development that included residential, but due to the recession, that became unfeasible. A few years later, the agreement terminated and there was the Cordish agreement for the arena/stadium; that did not work out either. The current plan for the property is with PH Symphony Park, LLC, a subsidiary of the Molasky Group of Companies, who is located across the street. The project is a 250,000 square-foot Class A office and service retail project. The ENA (Exclusive Negotiation Agreement) went before the City Council on September 2nd, and the developer has until March 3, 2016 to move forward with the project or give up their rights to the land.

The developer is bidding on an RFP (Request For Proposal) that a government entity put out for a 130,000 square-foot building that would be located on the north portion of the property. There would be general parking for this with additional parking across the street at the Molasky Corporate Center. The developer will know if this project will move forward in approximately six weeks. They are also negotiating with private companies for a second building that would be 250,000 square feet of Class A office space with some service/retail. The City has a \$100,000 good faith deposit from the developer, which would increase considerably if the project moves forward to a DDA (Disposition and Development Agreement).

MS. HUGHES confirmed for CHAIR MATHIS that the project is for Class A office space.

MEMBER MACK pointed out that the existing Molasky building is near the IRS (Internal Revenue Service) building, and paying to park there is expensive; she wondered if this project would be the same way. MS. HUGHES stated that there is not a parking garage scheduled with the first building, and she did not have further details regarding parking. There would be a negotiated agreement between Molasky and the government entity for employee parking. The second building will likely include construction of a pay-to-use parking garage, and there will be some ground and street parking as well. MS. HUGHES pointed out that if someone was visiting the offices, parking would probably be validated.

MEMBER SYLVAIN asked what the City's goal is for the acreage and if there is a public value to the buildings. MS. HUGHES replied that there are requirements that there be at least 250,000 square feet of office space and that the project will be placed on the tax roll. She explained for MEMBER SYLVAIN that the purchase price for the land will be negotiated if the project moves to the next phase.

8. [Discussion regarding topics for future agenda items by the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency. Comments made by individual Committee Members shall refer solely to proposals for future agenda items and any discussion shall be limited to whether or not any such proposed item\(s\) is/are within the purview of the Board and/or whether such proposed item\(s\) shall be placed on a future agenda. No discussion regarding the substance of any such proposed topic shall occur and no action shall be taken regarding the proposal.](#)

Minutes:

SCOTT AUYONG, Senior Economic Development Specialist, distributed and submitted for the record, a list of topics for future agenda items.

MEMBER BONAVENTURE wondered about having better coordination with City planners regarding street closures when working on the redevelopment. He commented that all of the closures are creating a mess around town. MR. AUYONG thought that was a great point, and he will have someone from the Public Works Department attend a future meeting and

City of Las Vegas

explain how projects are planned.

CHAIR MATHIS recalled that the Committee received a report from the architectural project manager regarding the Westside School some time ago and wondered if the Members could receive another update; MR. AUYONG responded in the affirmative.

9. CITIZENS PARTICIPATION: PUBLIC COMMENT DURING THIS PORTION OF THE AGENDA MUST BE LIMITED TO MATTERS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE BOARD. NO SUBJECT MAY BE ACTED UPON BY THE BOARD UNLESS THAT SUBJECT IS ON THE AGENDA AND IS SCHEDULED FOR ACTION. IF YOU WISH TO BE HEARD, GIVE YOUR NAME FOR THE RECORD. THE AMOUNT OF DISCUSSION ON ANY SINGLE SUBJECT, AS WELL AS THE AMOUNT OF TIME ANY SINGLE SPEAKER IS ALLOWED, MAY BE LIMITED

Minutes:

None.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Minutes:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Jacquie Miller, Deputy City Clerk

Beverly S. Mathis, Chair

Facilities are provided throughout City Hall for the convenience of disabled persons. Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate physically handicapped persons. If you need an accommodation to attend and participate in this meeting, please call the City Clerks office at 702-229-6311 and advise of your need at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting. Dial 7-1-1 for Relay Nevada.

THIS MEETING HAS BEEN PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:

City Hall, 495 South Main Street, 1st Floor
Clark County Government Center, 500 South Grand Central Parkway
Grant Sawyer Building, 555 East Washington Avenue
City of Las Vegas Development Services Center, 333 North Rancho Drive