



Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 6.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF MAY 19, 2015

DEPARTMENT: FINANCE
DIRECTOR: VENETTA APPELYARD

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT:

Public hearing for possible action regarding Fiscal Year 2016 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget and Fiscal Year 2016 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Final Budget

Fiscal Impact

☐

No Impact

☐ Augmentation Required

☐

Budget Funds Available

Amount:

Funding Source:

Dept./Division:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

The Fiscal Year 2016 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget was filed with the Nevada Department of Taxation on April 15, 2015. Council will review and possibly amend that Tentative Budget and adopt the revisions as the Fiscal Year 2016 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Final Budget.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends adoption of Fiscal Year 2016 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Final Budget, as amended with guidance from Council.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Fiscal Year 2016 City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency Tentative Budget

Motion made by STEVEN D. ROSS to Approve

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0

BOB COFFIN, RICKI Y. BARLOW, LOIS TARKANIAN, CAROLYN G. GOODMAN,
STEVEN D. ROSS, STAVROS S. ANTHONY, BOB BEERS; (Against-None); (Abstain-None);
(Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-None)

Minutes:

MAYOR GOODMAN declared the Public Hearing open.

VENETTA APPELYARD, Finance Director, reported that the only difference between the Redevelopment Agency tentative budget and the slide of the final budget shown was that there were some additional expenditures in the Program Expense category for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015. She noted that the excess (shortfall) for both FY15 and FY16 finished in the positive.

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF: MAY 19, 2015

MS. APLEYARD reported that the tax increment grew 12 percent between FY14 and FY15 and an eight percent growth was anticipated in FY16. The expenditures were growing approximately seven percent but were matching the revenues, resulting in an Ending Fund Balance of \$20.3 million.

MS. APLEYARD presented the Key Budget Takeaways, noting that this would be the first balanced budget since FY07. The next step would be to file the budget with the Department of Taxation on June 1, 2015, and the five-year Capital Improvement Plan would be due to the Department of Taxation on August 1, 2015.

She thanked the Finance staff for putting the budget together, the Departments and Directors for their efforts and the Council for their support. MAYOR GOODMAN relayed her gratitude as well.

MS. APLEYARD clarified for COUNCILMAN BEERS the difference between the \$12 million authorized for parking bonds that MORGUE CER VANTES, Executive Director, Community Development, referenced and the Tourism Improvement System (TID) bonds. COUNCILMAN BEERS then questioned if the TID was in the budget and if it would be a project of the City or Redevelopment Agency. MR. CER VANTES responded that the TID was part of the five-year Capital Plan. The monies would be used for the parking structure and other infrastructure needs within Symphony Park. CITY MANAGER ELIZABETH FRETWELL clarified that today's action would create the authorization for \$45 million in the Capital Improvement Plan, not the bonding action.

CITY MANAGER FRETWELL confirmed for COUNCILMAN BEERS that there was both a revenue item for the bond proceeds and an expense item and it was currently set at a not-to-exceed dollar figure, but the final amount had yet to be determined. Although there were portions of the budget that COUNCILMAN BEERS disagreed with, he stated he would be voting in favor of the budget because he believed the overall Capital Plan to be good.

COUNCILMAN COFFIN commented that the TID action was a smart move by authorizing the \$45 million. CITY MANAGER FRETWELL commented that that conversation would be better suited for the City Council meeting on May 20, 2015, but as far as the budget, what was being proposed was what staff believed revenue could support in a bond. COUNCILMAN COFFIN remarked no budget was perfect, but he liked what was being done with the parks.

COUNCILMAN BARLOW stated that he did not see the expansion of full-time employees (FTEs) in this part of the budget. CITY MANAGER FRETWELL stated that the recommendation was to reassign the three Neighborhood Planner positions to the Council wards that have expressed a need for additional support and no new positions would be required in order to accomplish that. COUNCILMAN BARLOW would like to see all of the options as the Neighborhood Planners may not wish to work under the Council.

SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY MEETING OF: MAY 19, 2015

CITY MANAGER FRETWELL presented the various options which included either reassigning the Neighborhood Planners to the Council Office (Option 1), creating three new Special Assistant positions (Option 2), reassigning the Neighborhood Planners to the Council Office along with creating four new Special Assistant positions (Option 3) or leaving the Neighborhood Planners in Administrative Services and creating seven new Special Assistant positions (Option 4). The budget impact would be \$0; \$300,000; \$400,000 and \$700,000, respectively. Staff recommended pursuing Option 1 to see how it would work and adapt accordingly throughout the year.

MAYOR GOODMAN pointed out that there was already a new position budgeted to help with special events. CITY MANAGER FRETWELL stated that a Reduction in Force occurred during the recession in the technical production unit so the City was only able to staff and run one mobile stage even though it had two. The second stage was being restored in this budget, along with three technical support individuals and a special events coordinator to work with CHRISTIE GARNESS Events Specialist. This would help with the deployment of special events out in the community. Prior community survey results confirmed that special events helped build community, commitment, volunteerism, and social engagement so staff felt this was a smart investment.

MAYOR GOODMAN wanted the public to understand that while the Council members were part-time, their office staff were full-time.

COUNCILMAN BARLOW asked what direction staff needed from Council. CITY MANAGER FRETWELL explained that if Option 1 was not the direction the Council wanted to go that they needed to direct staff to include the budget impact of the chosen option in the budget at this meeting.

Based on his concerns of moving a union-protected individual to the Council office, who would then work at the discretion of the Council, and the overtime involved with weekend work, COUNCILMAN BARLOW stated he was in favor of Option 2. CITY MANAGER FRETWELL stated that that decision was up to the Council but reiterated that the City had a \$1 million positive number in the budget for the first time in seven years, and Option 2 would cost \$300,000. Staff tried to develop an option that would allocate the bodies and then work through any issues with the union and those employees. If that was not an option the Council wished to go with, the Neighborhood Planner positions would have to be re-evaluated. COUNCILMAN BARLOW indicated that there were other areas in which the costs could be spread across the budget.

COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN asked if there was a way that the Neighborhood Planners could be utilized while trying to work with those involved and the union. CITY MANAGER FRETWELL stated that staff could be reassigned immediately if the Council wished, and schedules could be changed to adapt to weekend work. COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN suggested trying Option 1 but putting tentative money in the budget for new positions in case that did not work. So as not to impact the budget, MAYOR GOODMAN also suggested trying

**SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF: MAY 19, 2015**

Option 1, and if it did not work, augment the budget and hire additional staffing at a later time. CITY MANAGER FRETWELL stated that it came down to budget prioritization, and choosing Options 2, 3 or 4 would lower the ending fund balance.

COUNCILMAN BARLOW shared that his needs were best covered under Option 2. COUNCILMAN COFFIN favored Option 1, as he needed someone immediately but understood that everyone had different needs. CITY MANAGER FRETWELL stated that staff compiled the different options to try to simplify things, but it depended on the Council's needs and what the budget could handle.

Additional discussion took place between MAYOR GOODMAN, CITY MANAGER FRETWELL and COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN regarding what each ward was requesting, the various options and the budget impact.

COUNCILMAN ROSS stated that the General Fund Revenue Actuals represented the hard work of every City employee in this organization to bring the City where it needed to be. He commended CITY MANAGER FRETWELL and her team for bringing the City through the worst recession in time.

Subsequent to COUNCILMAN ROSS's motion to adopt the budget as presented, COUNCILMAN BARLOW commented how everyone in the organization had to cut back and do more with less, and it was commendable to see how far the City had come but there needed to be equitability in all areas. There was much more work to do, and he again expressed the need for additional staff for his ward. As such, he supported Option 2 and not the current budget as presented.

COUNCILMAN COFFIN presented data relating to the increased workloads in Wards 1, 3 and 5. He wanted to ensure that the motion did not preclude COUNCILMAN BARLOW'S request. Relating to the data presented, COUNCILMAN BEERS commented that there needed to be an understanding of what the work requests were for and that those work requests were handled by staff. Although there were significant differences in the number of service calls between wards, City staff responded accordingly and got the job done. He supported COUNCILMAN ROSS's motion. COUNCILMAN COFFIN acknowledged the oddities in the data as suggested by COUNCILMAN BEERS but noted that his staff came up with the same ratios. No matter what, Wards 1, 3 and 5 needed help.

MAYOR GOODMAN asked COUNCILMAN ROSS to restate the motion. COUNCILMAN ROSS commented that no one was denying that additional help was needed in Wards 1, 3 and 5, but he believed that Option 1 was worthy to try. He modified his original motion to include some additional language.

COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN stated staff was getting burned out because they could not keep up with the workload. CITY MANAGER FRETWELL reminded Council that the City had been working slowly through a restoration. Non-public safety positions were still down 21 percent, but the City had mastered reprogramming resources to fill in the gaps. A suggestion

**SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
MEETING OF: MAY 19, 2015**

was made that if the needs of the Council were not met with Option 1, Option 2 could be brought back for consideration in October after the books were closed on the current year. Another suggestion was to authorize the three additional positions but then freeze them immediately until the workload analysis was completed.

See Item 5 for related backup.

MAYOR GOODMAN declared the Public Hearing closed.

