City of Las Vegas

NEIGHBORHOOD PARTNERS FUND BOARD
CITY HALL, 495 S. MAIN STREET
5TH FLOOR LARGE CONFERENCE ROOM
CITY OF LAS VEGAS INTERNET ADDRESS: www.lasvegasnevada.gov

MINUTES

June 19, 2018
2:00 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 CITYS WEBPAGE AT www.lasvegasnevada.gov.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Minutes:
CHAIR SANDECKI called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

PRESENT: CHAIR SANDECKI and MEMBERS SCHULTZ, TOUSSAINT, HOLMES, KIRK, KILPONEN, NORERO, CHRISTENSEN (excused until 3:22 p.m.), QUALEY (excused until 2:08 p.m.) BONAVENTURA and WILLIAMS

EXCUSED: MEMBERS WALTERS and POWELL

ALSO PRESENT: ALMA ESTRADA, Community Program Technician, 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. Review of additional application information requested by the Board members

Minutes:
ALMA ESTRADA, Community Program Technician, indicated she made changes that were submitted for the matched hours.

5. Review of evaluation scores on the Neighborhood Partners Fund Board Grant Program applications

Minutes:
Utilizing a spreadsheet, which was not submitted as backup, the Board reviewed evaluation scores of the grant applications beginning with 18b-The Las Vegas Arts District - Parade Float Project. CHAIR SANDECKI indicated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $4,000 and an applicant match of $6,100.

MEMBER WILLIAMS stated that there was $80,000 to allocate and 19 applicants whose requests totaled $2,411 more than that. He looked to ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TERI PONTICELLO for suggestions, and MS. PONTICELLO pointed out that the agenda item was to review the evaluation scores. She asked ALMA ESTRADA, Community Program Technician, if there was a preview of the Board's scores. MS. ESTRADA explained that MEMBER SCHULTZ mentioned that the applications could not be scored for some reason. MEMBER SCHULTZ stated that some Members conferred with him noting they had made the same observation. Something changed in the software that did not follow the normal process for entering scores; they could only enter funding amounts, which he felt was also okay.

6. Discussion for possible action regarding recommendation of funding for Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Neighborhood Partners Fund Board projects

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund 18b-The Las Vegas Arts District in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Arville-Oakey Neighborhood Watch Association in the amount of $1,170

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Beverly Green Neighborhood Association in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Bonanza Village Neighborhood Association in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Cedar Neighborhood Association in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Desert Shores Community Association in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 8; Against: 1; Abstain: 2; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-CHANCE BONAVENTURA; Abstain-GREG TOUSSAINT, GAIL QUALEY; Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

NOTE: MEMBER QUALEY abstained from voting on Desert Shores Community Association as she is the President of the homeowners association (HOA). MEMBER TOUSSAINT also abstained from voting on that item as his wife is the Vice President of the HOA.

Motion made by HARRY WILLIAMS to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund El Camino Community Association in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 8; Against: 3; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-ANNE KILPONEN, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ; Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

NOTE: An initial motion by Member Schultz to Approve the recommendation to fund the El Camino Association in the amount of $3,500 failed with Members Toussaint, Holmes, Kirk, Norero, Christensen, Qualey and Williams voting No and Members Walters and Powell Excused.

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund First Twin Lakes Neighborhood Association in the amount of $2,046 subject to securing approval from the appropriate City of Las Vegas officials for installation of the mini library in Lorenzi Park

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Glen Heather Estates Neighborhood Association in the amount of $4,500

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund La Mancha of Summerlin in the amount of $500 with the express stipulation that it be used for a community pot luck

Passed For: 9; Against: 2; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2

GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, GAIL QUALEY, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-JORDAN SANDECKI, CHANCE BONAVENTURA; Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

NOTE: An initial motion by Member Schultz to Approve the recommendation of not funding La Mancha of Summerlin failed with Members Schultz, Toussaint, Holmes, Kirk, Norero, Christensen, Qualey and Williams voting No and Members Walters and Powell Excused.

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Las Vegas Meadows in the amount of $3,500

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund McNeil Estates Neighborhood Association in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Palomino Gardens Homeowners Association in the amount of $5,000 with the express stipulation that the street to be repaired is a privately owned street; to the extent that it is not, the matter should be referred to the City of Las Vegas Public Works Department with no award made to the applicant

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Rainbow Family Park Neighborhood Association in the amount of $2,500

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Rancho Bel Air POA in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL
Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Rancho Manor Neighborhood Association in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2

GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Smoke Ranch Pines Homeowners Association in the amount of $3,695

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund Spanish Oaks Homeowners Association in the amount of $3,800

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Motion made by LARRY SCHULTZ to Approve the recommendation to City Council to fund West Woodland Hills Twin Lakes Community Group in the amount of $5,000

Passed For: 11; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
GREG TOUSSAINT, SHERESE HOLMES, LANCE KIRK, ANNE KILPONEN, MARIA NORERO, SALLY CHRISTENSEN, JORDAN SANDECKI, GAIL QUALEY, CHANCE BONAVENTURA, LARRY SCHULTZ, HARRY WILLIAMS; Against-(None); Abstain-(None); Did Not Vote-(None); Excused-SHELLY WALTERS, AJ POWELL

Minutes:
MEMBER WILLIAMS stated that the Board had $80,000 in funding to allocate to the applicants, but the applicants' requests are $2,411 more than that. He felt that all applicants needed to be funded, and he shared the following suggestions: 1) there are 13 applicants that requested the full $5,000, and if the shortage was divided among them, it would reduce their funding by $185 each; 2) the shortage could be divided among all 19 applicants, which would reduce their funding by approximately $126 each.

MEMBER SCHULTZ stated that he was not aware of any legal requirement to allocate all of the available funding, and ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY TERI PONTICELLO replied that there was no mandatory requirement that the entire amount be used. MEMBER SCHULTZ believed the Board should discuss the merits of each applicant and not just follow a mathematical degradation to get to a particular funding amount. Additionally, he was not sure that at least one applicant was qualified to receive funding as it is a private for profit entity.

MEMBER NORERO agreed with comments about discussing the merits of each project and not reducing funding equally among all of the applicants. She suggested starting the discussion with projects they did not feel should be fully funded.

MEMBER QUALEY explained that she evaluated the information for each applicant and entered the funding amounts she felt were appropriate for each of them; after totaling those amounts, she came to $79,910.

MEMBER WILLIAMS agreed with the comments being made and noted that the Board was given $80,000 to allocate to the community. He wanted to make sure they allocated the full amount because any money left over would be returned to the City's General Fund and indicate that this amount of funding is not necessary. That could result in a reduction of funding for future years.

MEMBER TOUSSAINT suggested reviewing the applicants they would like to fully fund then move to the other applications.

MEMBER BONAVENTURA thought it was important to go through each application and determine the quality of each project, which would set the precedent for next year and set goals for people to meet in the future.

CHAIR SANDECKI thought that the projects the Board felt had merit and should be fully funded would move quickly. She also understood MEMBER WILLIAMS' point of using all of the funding and MEMBER BONAVENTURA'S point of the Members acting as stewards of the City's funds. She added that it is up to the Board to determine if the full amount of $80,000 would be allocated to the applicants.

18b-The Las Vegas Arts District - Parade Float Project - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $4,000, and the applicant match is $6,100. MEMBER NORERO stated that she was familiar with this neighborhood group and project. She explained that the Arts District is a group of neighbors fighting a lot of forces in their neighborhood including development and increases in studio rents for artists. She thought the project was great as a parade float would increase the awareness of the Arts District, increase engagement between the neighbors and increase morale in the neighborhood. MEMBER KILPONEN thought the project was creative and fits in with the downtown area. MEMBER SCHULTZ concurred with the comments and thought this project should be fully funded in the amount of $5,000. MEMBER KIRK added that he gave this applicant a high score as well; the amount he had recommended was $4,500 but he was in favor of $5,000.

Arville-Oakey Neighborhood Watch Association - Neighborhood Watch Signs Project - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $1,170 with a minimum request of $570, and the applicant match is $1,200. MEMBER SCHULTZ stated that this association presented a very concise and tight budget, and the presentation was well articulated. He recommended fully funding this project in the amount of $1,170. MEMBER TOUSSAINT wondered about funding $1,200, and MEMBER KILPONEN asked if that was allowable. MS. PONTICELLO cautioned the Members about using their discretion and setting a precedent. After further discussion, the Members agreed to the recommendation of $1,170.

Beverly Green Neighborhood Association - Knowing Who We Are The Beverly Green Sign Topper Project - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $4,000, and the applicant match is $5,005. MEMBER KIRK indicated that this was one of his highest scoring applicants because he typically looks for cash, in-kind and volunteer donations, and this applicant has all of that. He suggested fully funding this project. MEMBER KILPONEN did not initially understand the reason behind the number of sign toppers, but after the applicant's presentation she realized there were different neighborhoods that do not look like they go together, and she fully supported this project. CHAIR SANDECKI believed the group had done their homework to determine which would be the most amenable solution to establish a neighborhood identity and to do so in a way that was harmonious and compatible with what the City's standards. She concurred with fully funding the applicant's request of $5,000.

Bonanza Village Neighborhood Association - Beautification of Our Entry Project - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $4,000, and the applicant match is $292. MEMBER WILLIAMS was familiar with this project and believed the group put a lot of their time and sweat equity into it. He stated that the group pays their own water bill, and they are a neighborhood association so they do not have their own funds. The group has worked to improve their community, and he felt this project was worthy of fully funding. MEMBER SCHULTZ felt that their presentation was clear, succinct and supportable, and he agreed with fully funding the applicant's request of $5,000.

Cedar Neighborhood Association - Cedar Neighborhood Safety Initiative - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $4,700, and the applicant match is $6,120. MEMBER NORERO was familiar with the neighborhood association and reminded the Members that during their application, they explained the reason for becoming an engaged neighborhood and adding safety upgrades was due to one of their neighbors being shot and killed in front of their church. The group has also provided a lot of sweat equity, and she liked that they will not install a camera on someone's home unless they are willing to become a part of the Neighborhood Watch. She supported fully funding the applicant's request of $5,000.

Desert Shores Community Association - 30th Anniversary Celebration - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $4,000, and the applicant match is $11,990. MS. PONTICELLO asked

MEMBERS QUALEY and TOUSSAINT to state their reasons for abstaining on this project, which they did, and MS. PONTICELLO subsequently advised that they would not be participating in discussion for or voting on this item. MEMBER WILLIAMS was familiar with the Desert Shores community and believed they have been an outstanding steward of all previous funds they received from the City. Community engagement is a huge part of what they do, and their match is double the amount they are requesting; he believed everything was in order to fully support this project. MEMBER KIRK stated that he had a fairly high score for this applicant because of their community outreach as well as their impact to more than 10,000 people and felt this was a good use of funds. MEMBER NORERO said that she was usually uncomfortable funding these types of projects for HOA's (Homeowner Associations) that generate funds through dues, but she agreed that they have been great stewards of past projects and grants. However, when making her funding recommendation, she did not recommend fully funding this project. CHAIR SANDECKI agreed with both points and noted that the group was matching volunteer hours and cash as well. As this project will reach so many people and have a huge impact on the community, she wished to fully fund the applicant's request of $5,000.

El Camino Community Association - The Provident Community Garden - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $2,500, and the applicant match is $5,260. MEMBER KILPONEN commented that this was an interesting community association as it includes both City and unincorporated Clark County residents. She expressed concern regarding the project as the neighborhood the group depicted on their aerial map as being the primary beneficiaries was in unincorporated Clark County. She was also surprised that the group had not applied for matching funds through Clark County's small neighborhood grants as well. Although the garden is within the city limits, she would have liked to see more demonstration of City resident involvement and ensure that they are benefitting from this project. MEMBER WILLIAMS agreed, but he also saw a community benefit. He thought this was a great service to the community and suggested funding in the amount of $3,000. MEMBER SCHULTZ asked MEMBER KILPONEN what percentage of Clark County versus City residents were benefitting from this project, and MEMBER KILPONEN replied that was difficult to say, but the aerial map shown by the applicant depicting the location of the garden showed it was in the unincorporated area. MEMBER KILPONEN reiterated the garden itself is within the city, and it seemed like it is a joint City/County project. She added that City residents are involved, but she was unsure to what extent and thought the applicant should seek funding from Clark County as well. MEMBER TOUSSAINT stated that he would not fund the project if he believed it was for Clark County; however, it is within a park, and parks usually attract people from all around the area. He wondered if the park was within the city limits, and MEMBER KILPONEN confirmed it was. MEMBER TOUSSAINT stated that the project is designed to attract people from surrounding areas but will probably attract more people from the County. MEMBER NORERO believed that many residents do not know if they live in the city or in the county, but felt if the point of the project is to engage neighbors, this project fulfills that role. She supported funding this project at a lesser amount than the full request. MEMBER QUALEY was familiar with the project, which she thought was amazing as it is open to and encourages participation from everybody. She determined she would fund it at less than what was requested, but not for the reasons specified, and she recommended $3,000. The Board was in support. CHAIR SANDECKI commented that this city-based community garden will benefit City and County residents, and they are in favor of being community partners with all residents of the Las Vegas valley.

First Twin Lakes Association - Little Library in Lorenzi Park - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $2,046 with a minimum request of $3,500, and the applicant match is $2,880. She noted that there were some accounting issues with this application. MEMBER WILLIAMS thought this was unique project and liked that young people were involved. It is a successful project around the country, and having small libraries/bookstands is a city-wide initiative. The mathematical issues have been addressed, and he wished to fully fund this project. MEMBER SCHULTZ thought this was a compelling presentation, and he liked the project and appreciated that they resubmitted corrected paperwork. He asked how much the applicant requested upon resubmittal, and MS. ESTRADA thought they originally requested $5,000. She confirmed for MEMBER SCHULTZ that they need approximately $2,046 for the supplies for the box. MEMBER SCHULTZ wondered if the group had received permission to place the box at Lorenzi Park, and noted that when they submitted their documentation, it was for the Derfelt Senior Center. MS. ESTRADA replied that permission is still pending. MEMBER SCHULTZ stated that any funding awarded for this project would be explicitly contingent upon receiving permission for placement of the box. CHAIR SANDECKI informed MEMBER SCHULTZ that the applicant submitted a revised attachment noting they had amended their pledged volunteer hours along with a permission request letter. She added that the Derfelt Senior Center is located inside Lorenzi Park. CHAIR SANDECKI thought it should go without saying that staff would not allow them to move forward without official permission. MEMBER WILLIAMS was familiar with the park and the project, and he noted that the facility also houses Mother Hubbard's

Cupboard, a Youth Neighborhood Association Partnership Program (YNAPP) Grant recipient, so he did not anticipate any issues regarding permission. He suggested fully funding the requested amount of $2,046. CHAIR SANDECKI reiterated that the applicant was working with City staff and would not be able to spend any funds until permission has been secured.

Glen Heather Estates Neighborhood Association - Glen Heather Estates Block Party - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $4,500 with a minimum request of $4,500, and the applicant match is $4,712. MEMBER SCHULTZ thought that this applicant's presentation was compelling, well prepared and consistent with what the Board has approved in the past. He recommended funding the full amount requested. MEMBER TOUSSAINT agreed and believed the applicant wanted to hold parties before but did not have funding to do so. MEMBER KILPONEN stated that the applicant had been directly impacted by Project Neon more than any of the other neighborhoods, and it seems like a party is overdue. CHAIR SANDECKI recalled that the woman who made the presentation was involved in party planning and was taking an active role in this project. She felt the applicant was continuing with their community engagement, which builds a better community. CHAIR SANDECKI recommended fully funding the requested amount of $4,500.

La Mancha of Summerlin - Garage Door Refurb, Cleaning, Painting and Application of Neighborhood Watch Stickers - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $4,000, and the applicant match is $4,984. MEMBER WILLIAMS thought that this was a great idea, but he was not sure how many residents would participate. He also pointed out that this is a HOA, so they are collecting dues. MEMBER NORERO did not think this was a great project, and what they are proposing should be part of regular maintenance. She did not think repairing garage doors would engage neighbors with one another. MEMBER BONAVENTURA expressed concern regarding the garage doors being private property, and the grant guidelines state that the funds cannot be for personal use. He did not think that fixing up people's personal property was a good use of the funds. CHAIR SANDECKI recalled the applicant's desire to also put stickers in windows and was in favor of funding things that would make senior citizens feel safer. MEMBER HOLMES clarified that the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) would be providing the stickers. MEMBER TOUSSAINT stated that the Board funds repairs and maintenance on HOA private property all of the time, and this project would improve the appearance of the community. MEMBER BONAVENTURA understood MEMBER TOUSSAINT'S comment but noted that the Board has funded projects on common interest property and that is different than a garage door, which is not a common interest property for the community. MEMBER WILLIAMS suggested funding $2,500 for the Neighborhood Watch program and neighborhood celebration costs.

CHAIR SANDECKI read though the Board's guidelines and noted they address that the project must provide a public neighborhood benefit. While this would provide overall beautification, it is still beautification of individual homeowners' homes.

MEMBER WILLIAMS stated that the applicant requested funding for other things as well, including a party, and he suggested funding in the amount of $2,000 to $2,500. CHAIR SANDECKI said that the only funding requested on the vendor cost estimate sheet was $5,984 for painting garage doors. MEMBER NORERO pointed out that the application notes they will have a community pot luck to kick off the event, but they did not request funding for that.

MEMBER SCHULTZ did not feel this project qualified for funding based on the information discussed. MEMBER BONAVENTURA added that he would like to award funding as they put time and effort into this project; however, he did not think it was appropriate to provide funding for things they did not request, and the applicant could come back next year with a community property project.

MEMBER TOUSSAINT asked MS. PONTICELLO if she agreed with the differentiation of private property owned by an individual owner versus the association and this project being ineligible. MS. PONTICELLO explained that the intent of this Board is what was expressed by CHAIR SANDECKI, which is to promote community engagement. If all that is being requested in the application is for fixing individual garage doors, it is up to the Board to decide if there is something missing. MEMBER TOUSSAINT pointed out that they previously provided funding for screen doors for a community. MS. PONTICELLO stated that this is a policy call for the Board. There are a lot of aspirational and intended goals that this fund is to attain, and if the Board finds that something is missing in a project, it can make the distinction that it is not benefitting the entire neighborhood even though something similar was done in the past. CHAIR SANDECKI reminded the Members that they need a majority vote to make a recommendation, but everyone did not have to agree whether or not to fund projects.

MEMBER QUALEY recalled that the question was asked was about the garage doors during their presentation, and the applicant clarified that they are the responsibility of each homeowner where other aspects of the community are the responsibility of the association. She thought they should encourage the applicant to come back again. CHAIR SANDECKI appreciated that the applicant wants to improve their community, but the question is regarding personal property, and she felt this application was not hitting the mark. She was not comfortable beautifying personal property. MEMBER NORERO stated that during presentation they explained that they wanted to beautify the property in order to reduce crime and increase pride in the general neighborhood.

MEMBER WILLIAMS suggested that if the Board chooses to not fund this project, staff should send the applicant an encouraging letter so they come back with another project next year and do not give up on this process. He also wondered if there was a way to help with the pot luck, which would bring neighbors together. CHAIR SANDECKI appreciated the sentiment, but stated that the Board needs documentation regarding what the funds are being used for, and the pot luck was not the specific intent of the request. MEMBER WILLIAMS stated that applicants amend their project once funds are awarded and they are working with staff. MS. ESTRADA indicated that sometimes applicants may receive donations, and they do not use the funding for what it they intended for, but as long as it is used within the scope of the project they can do that. She takes care of the budget and makes sure everything is in compliance, and it is up to staff to determine if it is appropriate. CHAIR SANDECKI looked at the applicant's volunteer pledge hours, and there were 41 hours listed for a party. Considering MEMBER WILLIAMS' suggestion, she thought they could support the neighbors having a party and getting together and building community. MEMBER BONAVENTURA stated that if the budget worksheet showed a funding request for a pot luck, he would be in favor; however, he was not comfortable granting money presuming they would use it for that and thought it would be setting a precedent. MEMBER WILLIAMS commented that they award funding presuming the project will get done, and some of them do not. MEMBER KIRK thought they needed to stick with what was requested and felt that speculating was harmful. MS. ESTRADA stated that if the Board chooses to support the party, she would ensure that is what the funding is used for.

MEMBER SCHULTZ in general did not understand the notion of not spending all available funds; he thought that if funds were not needed, they should not be spent. MEMBER WILLIAMS stated that staff does not give applicants the money and let them go wild. Additionally, Councilpeople expect that their wards will receive beautification benefits and neighbors will get to know one another through projects funded in this process, which is why Council staff are on this Board. CHAIR SANDECKI added that everything staff does is to build community to make life better. She informed the Members that all of the money is spent by staff on behalf of the applicant. If the Board was in favor of moving forward with funding this applicant, she would be comfortable awarding $984 as it matches the volunteer hours specifically associated with party. MEMBER NORERO added that if they decided against a party, the funds would not be dispersed. She stated that the City has made a policy decision that they would like to fund neighborhood projects, and MS. ESTRADA makes sure the groups follow through and complete the projects successfully.

MEMBER BONAVENTURA reiterated his position of not wanting to award money based on presumptions. He also mentioned that unused funds do not disappear; if they are reverted into the City's General Fund, they will be used for other City expenses. MEMBER TOUSSAINT understood but they want to build community, and discouraging people who want to improve their community is not the best way to do that. He liked the idea to support the pot luck with $500, and if they do not hold the pot luck, the money will go back to the City's General Fund anyway. MEMBER BONAVENTURA suggested that if the Board votes to support the pot luck, they add conditions when voting. CHAIR SANDECKI stated that based on the Board's consensus they would tentatively recommend funding in the amount of $980 and will add conditions amenable to the spirit of what the money is to be used for.
Las Vegas Meadows Ltd. - The Meadows - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $3,500 with a minimum request of $3,000, and the applicant match is $9,480. MEMBER SCHULTZ stated that the requested money is to be used for security cameras, lights and monitors. He thought it sounded like a good idea; however, it appeared as though the applicant is a private for profit entity, which says that the physical assets would be owned by a private for profit entity. He said this would help the lives of the residents, but it is a company not a neighborhood association or community group. MEMBER TOUSSAINT concurred. MEMBER KIRK recalled that one of the people was from a company and one was a volunteer. MEMBER TOUSSAINT recalled that the woman who was a member of the community was chairing the project and employed the company to provide services, but they had to find funding outside of the community to pay for it. MEMBER KILPONEN stated that this is essentially a mobile home park where some own and some rent their units.

MEMBER WILLIAMS expressed concern about the barbed wire around the property, which indicated there is a major concern for safety. MEMBER NORERO stated that these are modular homes, and people pay for a space. The fees are minimal and probably barely cover the cost of water and minimal maintenance. Many of the residents are senior citizens, and a lot of these communities have to plan their own engagement activities and entertainment. She fully supports this project. MEMBER KILPONEN added that they have had an active Neighborhood Watch group for many years and it has expanded to seniors helping seniors in the community. It is located adjacent to industrial areas and other apartments, and security has been a concern for a while. CHAIR SANDECKI stated that there have been other instances where requests have been made for apartment-type, rent-to-own or owner-occupied unit communities, and the Board supported them because they felt it was in the best interest of the community to do so. She was in favor of fully funding this to allow them to have a resident dinner and install security cameras. MEMBER QUALEY agreed with fully funding noting this is the first time they have applied for a grant, and they will potentially apply again to make additional improvements. MEMBER CHRISTENSEN was familiar with this area and thought it was sad to see how it had gone downhill and barbed wire was installed for safety purposes. She was in favor of fully funding this as she thought it would help the community come together.

McNeil Estates Neighborhood Association - 10th Annual Neighborhood Block Party Community Comes First and McNeil Calming Circle Grand Reveal - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $4,500, and the applicant match is $23,400. MEMBER SCHULTZ thought that this was a meritorious, well presented project, but when doing the math, he could only support $3,000 in expenditures. When he questioned the applicant, it seemed like they asked for a little extra for things that could come up. He was not comfortable with that but asked for additional input. MEMBER WILLIAMS believed that was accurate; however, it would also depend on the donations they would be able to secure, and it would be up to staff's discretion how the funding was actually spent. MEMBER KIRK concurred and added that he liked that they had cash, in-kind and volunteer donations. He recommended fully funding this project. MEMBERS NORERO and TOUSSAINT agreed, and MEMBER TOUSSAINT stated that he was the Chair of a committee that did this type of thing for many years. Because you do not know the amount of money that will be available, you plan for what you can afford; if there is additional funding, there can be more activities. MEMBER NORERO pointed out that the applicant has been doing this for 10 years. MEMBER BONAVENTURA referred to the cost estimate provided and wondered about the $1,082 for four large flower pots and $560 for sandstone boulders. CHAIR SANDECKI believed that was for the Calming Circle, which was to be a community common space. MEMBER KILPONEN confirmed that was correct, and MEMBER NORERO added that the City is installing the circle, and the applicant is making additions to beautify it. MEMBER BONAVENTURA thought that amount seemed excessive for four flower pots, and MEMBER QUALEY thought that price was probably accurate. CHAIR SANDECKI reiterated the consensus to fully fund in the amount of $5,000.

Palomino Gardens Homeowners Association - Street Resurfacing Project - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $1, and the applicant match is $5,820. She said this is for an oval-shaped area that has a smaller voluntary homeowners association, and the streets had not been resurfaced in over a decade. MEMBER WILLIAMS thought that they were going to do a slurry seal, and this request would offset the expense. If they did not receive this grant, the HOA dues would be increased for the seven or eight members; he was not sure how much the area is used by people other than those who live in the circle. MEMBER KILPONEN liked that the applicant presented three bids. MEMBER BONAVENTURA stated that the street is common property and is a small portion of the overall cost of repaving; he thought it would improve the neighborhood. MEMBER SCHULTZ referred to the minimum request of $1 noting that when he asked the applicant about that, they said it was a mistake and orally amended that amount to $4,500

during their presentation. MEMBER KIRK recalled that each homeowner contributed $300 as well. CHAIR SANDECKI reiterated the consensus to fully fund.

Rainbow Family Park Neighborhood Association - The Community Picnic - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $2,500 with a minimum request of $1,500, and the applicant match is $3,312. MEMBER WILLIAMS thought the applicant was doing a good project for $2,500, and they would get to know their neighbors. MEMBER NORERO agreed. CHAIR SANDECKI asked that $2,500 be allocated for this project.

Rancho Bel Air POA - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $2,500, and the applicant match is $31,320. She said this is a park landscape proposal for tree replacement and decorative rock along Rancho Road. MEMBER BONAVENTURA said that this was one of his favorite projects because it gets everyone in the community involved, and the money is to offset the community engagement that is already there. He pointed out that the major portion of the applicant match was volunteer hours. MEMBER CHRISTENSEN likes this project because it is an improvement project along a busy street. CHAIR SANDECKI asked that $5,000 be allocated for this project.

Rancho Manor Neighborhood Association - Rancho Manor Entrance Beautification Project - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $5,000, and the applicant match is $6,744. MEMBER WILLIAMS thought this was a good applicant as they put time, effort and volunteer hours into their neighborhood year round citing that they painted two to three miles of block wall as a community. The City put two monuments on two entrances to the neighborhood. A big part of this project is to be consistent in the rest of neighborhood, and they are doing this project on their own. He recommended fully funding. MEMBER NORERO agreed and added that this is a fairly new neighborhood association and thought it would be good to keep their momentum going in the right direction. CHAIR SANDECKI said that there was a revision to their application because they severely undervalued their volunteer hours. She stated that the consensus was to fully fund in the amount of $5,000.

Smoke Ranch Pines Homeowners Association - Community Beautification Project - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $3,695 with a minimum request of $3,000, and the applicant match is $3,709. MEMBER WILLIAMS stated that the City did a paint job on the other side of the street, and he thought this project would tie in with that and benefit the entire neighborhood. MEMBER KILPONEN thought that the wall painting projects make a tremendous impact to the community. MEMBER CHRISTENSEN said that communities that paint their walls see less and less graffiti on them. CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the consensus was to fully fund in the amount of $3,695.

Spanish Oaks Homeowners Association - Spanish Oaks 2018/2019 Safety Project - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $3,800, and the applicant match is $7,876. MEMBER WILLIAMS was concerned that this association charges more than $200 each month for dues. The community is gated and they have guards, and they already have security measures in place. MEMBER NORERO was concerned as well, but recalled that the applicant mentioned that they do two volunteer hours each month for their safety committee. She thought that the volunteer hours were not related to this specific project, but were related to what they already commit for the safety committee. She felt that it seemed like they were not going above and beyond to commit to this project. MEMBER NORERO recommended funding the minimum request in the amount of $3,800, and CHAIR SANDECKI confirmed that was the general consensus of the Board.

West Woodland Hills Twin Lakes Community Group - Neighborhood Watch Crime Prevention Project - CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the applicant requested $5,000 with a minimum request of $5,000, and the applicant match is $14,758. MEMBER WILLIAMS thought that the applicant made an awesome presentation as they have been working with Metro and came with examples of how additional cameras will benefit the community. He recommended fully funding. MEMBER SCHULTZ concurred. MEMBER BONAVENTURA asked about ownership of the poles the cameras would be installed on, and MEMBER SCHULTZ thought they belonged to the association. MEMBER WILLIAMS stated that they are a neighborhood association so either people voluntarily put the poles in their own yards or have something the cameras can attach to. MEMBER BONAVENTURA asked if the neighborhood association was responsible for poles in the streets, and CHAIR SANDECKI explained that the individual homeowners were contacted and gave permission to have poles in their yards. MEMBER BONAVENTURA was concerned about them being public street poles, and CHAIR SANDECKI indicated that they would be installing new poles. MEMBER WILLIAMS explained that there would be a SIM card in the

camera, and information could be pulled from that if there was criminal activity. CHAIR SANDECKI confirmed that the consensus was to fully fund this project in the amount of $5,000.

CHAIR SANDECKI stated that the Board had $80,000 to allocate, and based on the discussion by the Members, they have recommended funding in the amount of $75,191. She recessed the meeting so the recommended funding could be entered into ZoomGrants. Upon reconvening the meeting, she announced that MS. ESTRADA was currently unable to enter the recommendations into ZoomGrants; therefore, she would track the information in a spreadsheet and transfer it to ZoomGrants when able to do so.

CHAIR SANDECKI asked if they should make an overall motion or do them one item at a time, and MS. PONTICELLO recommended making motions for each individual item.

Prior to a motion being made regarding the Desert Shores Community Association project, MEMBER BONAVENTURA expressed concern regarding the cost for the event, including $16,750 for a concert. He wondered if they need the money. Other applicants' events include more volunteer hours and outreach with much less allocated for entertainment/music. He felt that this grant is for people who want to involve the community, but do not have the money for their event. He was not sure that just adding more money to something just because it is possible was appropriate. He requested additional input from the Board. CHAIR SANDECKI referred to their previous discussion regarding this applicant and recalled that this applicant has been a good steward of City funds up to this point, and it is an incredibly large event that will benefit more than 10,000 people in the community. This funding would be used for parking, enforcement and security-related costs. MEMBER BONAVENTURA was opposed because it seems like they already have funds and does not seem necessary to recommend using tax dollars for it. MEMBER KILPONEN asked if the items the funds would be used for are considered eligible expenses, and CHAIR SANDECKI recalled that this is a 10-year anniversary very large block party in an incredibly active HOA with a large community base. MR. WILLIAMS noted that Desert Shores is made up of a lot of sub associations; this project stated it was for 10,000 people/3,300 homes, and he thought this would be money well spent. MEMBER BONAVENTURA thought this was a great community association and they are doing great things in the community; however, he felt this funding should be used for communities that have less money that cannot afford a community event or make improvements. MEMBER CHRISTENSEN was in favor of moving forward with this as it is an extraordinary event that is bringing the community together.

Subsequent to MEMBER SCHULTZ making a motion to recommend $3,000 for the El Camino Community Association project, MEMBER QUALEY thought that though this seemed like it is a City/Clark County project, it really benefits the entire city where many projects impact a smaller part of the city. Noting that their recommendations were less than what they could allocate, she requested that they fund more than $3,000. MEMBERS NORERO and WILLIAMS agreed and MEMBER WILLIAMS recommended fully funding this project. MS. PONTICELLO indicated that the motion maker could amend the motion if he wished. MEMBER SCHULTZ understood the comments, but remembered clearly this is a project that benefits Clark County and City residents, which is why they curtailed it. He was willing to amend his recommendation to $3,500. That motion failed. MEMBER WILLIAMS made a subsequent motion for approval of $4,000 but confirmed for MEMBER NORERO that he was willing to amend it to recommend $5,000.

Subsequent to MEMBER SCHULTZ making a motion to recommend $980 for the La Mancha of Summerlin pot luck, MEMBER NORERO requested that the amount be amended to $500. She felt that $980 was a very generous amount for a pot luck. MEMBER BONAVENTURA reiterated his disagreement with funding them for something they did not request in their application. He thought they should make their recommendations based on material that was submitted and requested that the motion be amended to recommend no funding before moving to a greater amount that may be more amenable to the Board. MEMBER SCHULTZ agreed to make that recommendation. That motion failed. He made a subsequent motion to recommend $980, but agreed to amend that motion to $500 upon MEMBER TOUSSAINT'S request.

Subsequent to MEMBER SCHULTZ making a motion to recommend $5,000 for the Palomino Garden Homeowners Association, CHAIR SANDECKI requested that he amend his motion to include a stipulation to ensure that the street to be repaired is privately owned, and if it is not, it be recommended to the City of Las Vegas Public Works Department to repair.
Subsequent to MEMBER SCHULTZ making a motion to recommend $2,500 for the Rainbow Family Park Neighborhood

Association, MEMBER TOUSSAINT asked if the park is located entirely within the city, and MEMBER WILLIAMS confirmed that it is.

CHAIR SANDECKI announced that their final recommendation total was in the amount of $76,711.

7. Discussion for possible action on recommendations to amend the application process or documents used for the annual Neighborhood Partners Fund Program cycle

Minutes:
MEMBER WILLIAMS suggested that staff investigate changing the amounts HOA's (Homeowners Associations) are eligible to receive versus neighborhood associations since HOA's have the ability to collect dues and neighborhood associations do not. He felt it was important to help the associations that have no capacity to fund projects. MEMBER NORERO agreed that it is easier to award money to neighborhood associations because they are volunteers and do not collect dues. However, there are some HOA's that are low income and do not collect much, and they struggle to do projects other than those that are required. She felt that there is still a need for neighborhood and community engagement in areas that collect dues and have wealthy residents. She suggested asking applicants about the amount of dues they collect so the Board could determine what kind of budgets the HOA's are working with. MEMBER WILLIAMS concurred and was also in favor of increasing the amount that could be awarded to neighborhood associations.

MEMBER BONAVENTURA recalled issues with the budget worksheets in the application and thought there could be a more detailed set of guidelines for applicants to follow. He thought examples of what can and cannot be done could also be provided. ALMA ESTRADA, Community Program Technician stated that she sends samples, conducts workshops and guides applicants through their applications as well as provides an opportunity for them to make corrections. MEMBER BONAVENTURA recalled that the YNAPP (Youth Neighborhood Association Partnership Program) application asked why applicants were asking for the grant and what benefit their project would provide. MS. ESTRADA explained that there is a question in the application that asks for a description of the project and how it will benefit the neighborhood.

MEMBER TOUSSAINT thought that the degree of need is an important concept, but the Board needs to be careful about coming up with solutions as they may find that only three wards end up applying for grants. While it is true that someone may do an event with or without the funding, the event would be better with the funding than without it. If building community in all parts of the city is important, then it is important to look at the whole city. MEMBER SCHULTZ recalled this same discussion last year. He originally felt the same way as MEMBER WILLIAMS, but after consideration, he felt awards should be distributed equally throughout the city, and they need to encourage people in all parts of the city to apply. If there is an abundance of applications, the Board can weigh the needs.

CHAIR SANDECKI felt that the point of this board is to be the discerning body and discuss the need of the community and the spirit of the project. She agreed with MEMBER NORERO about adding a question on the application regarding whether or not dues are collected, and if they are collected, the amount and what the dues are used for.

MEMBER KILPONEN thought that they could ask about assessments, but those are based upon what needs to be maintained in the community, and she was not sure the assessment would provide an accurate representation and lead the Members to what they are looking for. She thought they should consider eligibility and determine whether or not the criteria need to be reevaluated to make it more clear to the Board Members and the applicants.

MEMBER TOUSSAINT agreed with CHAIR SANDECKI'S comment regarding the discretion of the Board. He thought a less intrusive solution would be to add a question to the rating criteria regarding how important the project is to the community. Each Board Member could make their determination and score accordingly.

MEMBER NORERO did not think that limiting funding for HOA's versus neighborhood associations was fair for all wards. Additionally, some HOA's are not well funded and do not have options to use their money for neighborhood engagement and beautification projects.

MEMBER SCHULTZ felt that the consensus of the Board was not to limit the funding for HOA's any differently than neighborhood associations. He thought that staff needs to implement a quality assurance process, and there should be validation of the mathematics prior to the application coming to the Board because when the numbers do not add up, the project is discredited.

MEMBER NORERO stated that sometimes they are teaching neighborhoods to apply for grants. She hoped that this Board would not lose sight that it should be welcoming, and the quality assurance process would be seen as an educational opportunity and used to empower, teach and educate people instead of disqualifying applications. Many people do not know how to apply for grants because they have not done it before, and it is an intimidating process. MEMBER

SCHULTZ indicated that he would volunteer to provide remedial help to the applicants. MEMBER QUALEY agreed with MEMBER NORERO about it being an intimidating process for applicants, and she volunteered to review applicants' information prior to them making their presentations so they have an opportunity to make corrections.

CHAIR SANDECKI pointed out that MS. ESTRADA is the only person reviewing the applications and does not have dedicated staff to help with that. She wondered about the time between the submittal deadline and the actual presentation being extended to allow more time for review. She also thought that there should be more standardized guidelines for making corrections and getting the corrected information back to the Board. MEMBER QUALEY added that if she could have reviewed the applications prior to the first presentation, she could have let MS. ESTRADA know if something did not add up.

MEMBER TOUSSAINT stated that he would like to see any issues taken care of on the administrative side prior to the applications coming to the Board. He felt that the City needs to have the resources allocated to do this annual project properly so the Board receives information that has been vetted and corrected internally.

MS. ESTRADA indicated that she works with applicants on their applications and gives them a week or so to make corrections, but she cannot make the applicant submit corrected information. CHAIR SANDECKI suggested that MS. ESTRADA alert the Board if she requested revisions and they were not submitted.

MEMBER SCHULTZ said he would appreciate having the ability to actually talk to the people and see some of the projects when they are complete. MEMBER NORERO offered to show MEMBER SCHULTZ all of the Ward 3 projects. MEMBER CHRISTENSEN would also like to see the projects or photos of the projects.

MEMBER TOUSSAINT stated that in the past, the applicants would make their presentations and invite the Members to their celebrations. Since that does not seem to happen, he thought that could be suggested to the applicants.

MEMBER KIRK has applied for grants, and at the conclusion of the project, he would provide a final summary of what was done. He thought it would be beneficial to provide that information to the Board.

MS. ESTRADA stated that she has suggested that instead of being a 12-month cycle to complete a project, it be seven months to allow time for her to prepare a summary of the projects to give the Board for the next funding cycle. CHAIR SANDECKI recommended that the Board receive some sort of report regarding finalized projects. MS. ESTRADA indicated that she could provide contact information for the project leads so the Board could contact them if they chose to do so. CHAIR SANDECKI was concerned about providing personal information as that may make applicants feel undue pressure. MS. PONTICELLO informed the Members that other boards and commissions usually work with their board liaison to arrange a visit.

CHAIR SANDECKI suggested asking if the project was a public event and finding out if applicants would be comfortable hosting a few Board Members. MS. ESTRADA indicated that she would speak with the applicants for this funding cycle, and CHAIR SANDECKI stated that if applicants were not interested in that, she was fine with receiving a report and photos of the events.

MEMBER TOUSSAINT pointed out that the Board hears all of the presentations in two days and requested that the meetings be somewhat equal instead of having one go long. CHAIR SANDECKI added that they should have built-in time for scheduled breaks.

8. 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.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Minutes:
The meeting was recessed at 4:01 p.m., reconvened at 4:08 p.m. and adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

____
Jacquie Miller, Deputy City Clerk

____
Alma Estrada, Community Program Technician

Facilities are provided throughout City Hall for the convenience of persons with disabilities. Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate persons with disabilities or impairments. 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