



Historic Preservation Commission Minutes

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 Office of the City Clerk, 495 South Main Street, 2nd Floor or on the city's webpage at www.lasvegasnevada.gov.

1. **Call to Order**

Minutes:

CHAIR WHITE called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

PRESENT: CHAIR WHITE and COMMISSIONERS STOLDAL, LEVINE (excused until 12:04 p.m.), HOTCHKISS, SERFAS (excused until 12:20 p.m.), COSGROVE, LARIME, PALENCAR and HOWE (ex-officio member)

EXCUSED: COMMISSIONERS KLENK, McMILLAN -ARNOLD and BECK

ALSO PRESENT: ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, SIDNEY NOYCE, Planner II, SETH FLOYD, Deputy City Attorney, and ASHLEY FOSTER, Deputy City Clerk

2. **Announcement Regarding: Compliance with Open Meeting Law**

Minutes:

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE: This meeting has been 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:** Comment during this portion of the agenda must be limited to matters on the agenda for action. If you wish to be heard, come forward and 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 Meeting of February 27, 2019

Motion made by Bob Stoldal to Approve

Passed For: 8; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 3

For-Claytee White, Bob Stoldal, Jack LeVine, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Michelle Larime, Mia Palencar; Did Not Vote-Mike Howe; Excused-Patrick Klenk, Jarmilla McMillan-Arnold, Colleen M. Beck

5. HPC-76005 – Discussion for possible action regarding future site work at the Springs Preserve located at 313 South Valley View Boulevard (APN 139-31-602-003), C-V (Civic) Zone, Ward 1 (Tarkanian)

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that the application was received at the request of the Las Vegas Springs Preserve under the recommendation of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).

NATHAN HARPER, Preserve Archeologist at the Las Vegas Springs Preserve, introduced himself and stated that there were several projects planned for the Las Vegas Springs Preserve. Recent changes to SHPO regulations requests applicants approach the certified local government to obtain comments before moving forward with any projects.

Through a PowerPoint Presentation, which was distributed and has been attached as backup, MR. HARPER shared that the location has 180 acres, 110 acres of which are located in the back of the property. The site is located where it is because of the natural springs that have been flowing out of the ground for thousands of years. The springs were originally identified and named by Native Americans living in the area; he shared the Paiute names of some of the springs on the site. MR. HARPER noted that the north and south fork of the Las Vegas Creek flow out the springs and believed the largest spring mound of Las Vegas is also located on the property. He noted that spring mounds in other parts of the Las Vegas valley have been known to contain paleontological remains including mammoth, bison, mastodon and camel remains. An animal habitat is located on the 110 acres located in the back of the property.

The Springs Preserve was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1978, and on the site there are 21 archeological loci which are areas of archeological concern. These include five prehistoric Native American loci, nine early settler locations, and historic and various water procurement facilities. MR. HARPER shared a map, which was not submitted for the record, detailing all of the archeological loci on the site.

MR. HARPER shared that the earliest formal work completed at the Springs Preserve was by CLAUDE WARREN from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) who conducted a survey which identified two archeological sites, 26CK948 which is the space between the north and south fork of the Las Vegas Creek and 26CK949 which is the Spring Mound. He clarified that technically, 26CK948 is the recognized National Register of Historic Places site, not the entire Springs Preserve.

As he displayed a map of a prehistoric activity area within the Springs Preserve, MR. HARPER stated that in the late 1990s, the Harry Reid Center for Environmental Studies conducted a Class III Survey, which he explained as a walking pedestrian survey where they point plotted everything that they saw on the ground. MR. HARPER shared a map from that time period, noting that the blue dots were point plotted to show a hearth, thermal feature or roasting pit at this location, and 139 of these thermal features were identified. The other colored dots on the map identify pottery sherds and stone tools. That area was of such interest to individuals working at the Springs Preserve in the early 2000s that it was excavated, and they identified a habitation, which MR. HARPER pointed out on the map. MR. HARPER displayed an image of an excavated pithouse in which a fireplace was discovered and the radiocarbon dated back to AD 670-870. Additionally, different foods, as well as animal bones, pottery, and tools were discovered. He showed several images of the items discovered.

Because of the importance of the above-mentioned site, in 2008 a group from Ithaca College performed a ground-penetrating radar and resistivity survey across a one-acre site and discovered another possible pithouse. MR. HARPER shared a thermal image illustrating the discovery as well as two other pithouses that were found. He indicated there are plans to review the thermal features to determine dating from the site and

explained efforts to work closely with the College of Southern Nevada with DOCTOR LEILANI LUCAS and UNLV as well as the Archaeo-Nevada Society in the future.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL wondered what more could be learned as he thought a lot of information had already been gathered. He asked if any burial sites had been discovered to which MR. HARPER replied not to their knowledge. However, they were aware that some burials occurred in and underneath houses. He informed the Commissioner of efforts to fill in dates to understand that there was a continuous occupation of the Springs Preserve site from the earliest time through to the contact period. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked if there was a concluding point or if the opportunity was ongoing. MR. HARPER replied that one can only excavate so much adding that one of the tenants of archeology is to leave some artifacts behind.

MR. HARPER confirmed for COMMISSIONER COSGROVE that students from the College of Southern Nevada and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas would be working with the professors. COMMISSIONER COSGROVE pointed out this offered a learning experience for students.

MR. HARPER continued his presentation by showing an image of a roasting pit, which he described in greater detail. He pointed out that in one of the pictures, it looked like rocks had been scattered; however, during that time, it was a roasting pit.

He identified some of the other ongoing projects pertaining to the water procurement facilities discussing the Clark Street Pump Station and Reservoir #1 which was built in 1929 by the Las Vegas Land and Water Company.

MR. HARPER indicated the Springs Preserve was funded by a grant by the Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial, and MEL GREEN provided an evaluation and restoration plan for the water well derricks.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked if there would be an effort to use Paiute names in the future for some of the English-named springs. MR. HARPER did not believe so but thought that to be an excellent idea. He noted that the approval had been given to develop a conceptual plan and design of an ethno-botanical trail that would go north of Boom Town on the east side and there was a desire to use some of the Southern Paiute names for the plants and areas. COMMISSIONER STOLDAL felt it seemed the Native American presence was not there as much and wondered if that was part of the effort. MR. HARPER affirmed this stating that this was an idea and concept that has been discussed for several years and there are plans to redo some of the galleries and reimagine some of the Native American-inspired areas.

CHAIR WHITE asked MR. HARPER if anything else had been found out about JOHN HOWELL. MR. HARPER stated that he has been working with the Howell Town residents at UNLV. Additionally, he has conducted his own background research on MR. HOWELL and believes he may have identified where MR. HOWELL is from in North Carolina.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL wondered what action was to be taken on this item. MR. HARPER explained that compliance documentation to be provided to SHPO must indicate that information has been provided to the certified local government. He was unsure if a letter of support was also needed but would clarify. MR. HARPER thought it was important for the Springs Preserve to report back often to the Commission which it has been doing for several years.

ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Planning Director, suggested a motion. COMMISSIONER HOWE added that with an updated approval, each individual action will still be reviewed through the typical building permit review process that the Historic Preservation Officer will review for conformance.

Motion made by Bob Stoldal to Approve and, if necessary, directing staff to send an approval letter on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission endorsing the overall plan
Passed For: 8; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 3

For-Claytee White, Bob Stoldal, Jack LeVine, Donald Hotchkiss, Richard Serfas, Sondra Cosgrove, Michelle Larime, Mia Palencar; Did Not Vote-Mike Howe; Excused-Patrick Klenk, Jarmilla McMillan-Arnold, Colleen M. Beck

6. HPC-76006 – Report by the Department of Planning regarding the demolition of the El Cid and the surrounding block, located at 201 – 233 South 6th Street, C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 3 (Coffin)

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE reported that the item was in response to the outstanding actions the property has accumulated through Code Enforcement action. The City Council determined there would be a recommendation for demolition and with that came concerns in regards to what is being demolished. He noted he has been in conversations with the legal representative of the property owner, and the property owner has the intent to demolish the entire block which includes the M. I. Residential Hotel and the El Cid. COMMISSIONER HOWE felt there to be some challenges to this as he did not believe access would be given to the inside of the structures given there are ongoing abatement issues.

Acknowledging the backup documentation attached, CHAIR WHITE asked if there were more professional photographs available to which COMMISSIONER HOWE affirmed.

COMMISSIONER PALENCAR was confused by the term abatement. COMMISSIONER HOWE explained that there has been some discussions of hazardous materials as well as other contaminants within the El Cid which requires removal. ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Planning Director, specified that asbestos has been found within the building, and it must be removed prior to demolition.

COMMISSIONER PALENCAR asked about the date of demolition. COMMISSIONER HOWE replied that no date has been established noting the property owner wished to demolish the building quickly as possible but this was dependent upon abatement of the property.

COMMISSIONER PALENCAR asked about the demolition of the M.I. Residential Hotel being postponed as it was mentioned it had historic value. MR. SUMMERFIELD informed the Commissioner that the Councilman for the Ward had requested a delay but because the property does not have a historic designation, the property owner requested the issuance of a demolition permit. He believed demolition may occur around the upcoming Spring.

COMMISSIONER LARIME asked if anyone had seen the interior of the Mission Inn Hotel and if there were any interior elements that should be photographed or documented. COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that the property owner was willing to make accommodations available and staff would have to work with the Building and Safety Department to ensure that the MI Residential is safe to enter.

COMMISSIONER LeVINE asked what M.I. stood for to which a few of the Commissioners and MR. SUMMERFIELD believed the Mission Inn.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL was concerned the city was losing almost all of its late 1920s and early 1930s structures. COMMISSIONER COSGROVE believed the cause to pertain to the city's issues with homelessness, and COMMISSIONER LARIME believed in reviewing a demolition ordinance and an adaptive reuse ordinance.

7. HPC-76007 – Report by the Department of Planning regarding Historic Preservation Commission reviews of applications within the Las Vegas Boulevard Scenic Byway Overlay District requiring Downtown Design Review Committee review

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE reported that the Downtown Design Review Committee (DDRC) has the responsibility to review all commercial signage located on the Las Vegas Boulevard Scenic Byway. The scope of that signage review is based upon the historic aspect of the Scenic Byway. He explained the DDRC's responsibility in looking

at the conformance of the lighting of the signage which requires all proposed signage to have at least 75 percent neon, some animated lighting and of the 75 percent, at least 50 percent can be LED-equivalent (light-emitting diode) or different types of scintillating lighting. The purpose of the requirements to capture Las Vegas in its heyday up to present. Some of the challenges with the new signage are existing signs that are at least 50 years old being reused by having all of the scintillating lighting, the animated lighting, and the neon removed and adapted to contemporary standards.

COMMISSIONER HOWE was interested in including either a Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) member or the full HPC as part of the process when a request is received by the DDRC to renovate signage as at two recent DDRC meetings, there was a request for the opinion of the Commission. He believed to protect and preserve the Scenic Byway, the historic elements must be recognized and noted that some of the property owners and developers are more reluctant to keep neon signage, opting for something more contemporary. He acknowledged that this was a bit of an aesthetic argument, but the Commissioner believed it was also a cultural argument. He asserted the City was committed to the preservation of the signage and thought it seemed fair to obligate the neighboring properties to make that commitment, as well.

COMMISSIONER HOWE believed a procedure could be laid out to synchronize the DDRC review with the option for an HPC review.

CHAIR WHITE asked how to follow through with COMMISSIONER HOWE'S suggestion. COMMISSIONER HOWE said he would have to provide draft proposals to the Commission; however, he noted there are some technical issues, and he would have to seek guidance from legal counsel. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD stated that based on the Commissioner's comments, this would likely be a code change which would occur outside of the HPC and the DDRC.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked about the other functions of the DDRC. COMMISSIONER HOWE replied that the review of signage on the Scenic Byway was mainly their responsibility. COMMISSIONER HOWE wished to grow the responsibilities of the DDRC, but noted this would also require a code change.

ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Planning Director, explained the efforts of staff to convert the DDRC into something that addresses items that may require more than an administrative review but may not require action by the Planning Commission or full City Council. He thought the present discussion was more about whether the Commission felt comfortable in providing a recommendation on signage as it relates to the Scenic Byway; if so, changes to the code may be required in order for comments to be provided as part of the process.

CHAIR WHITE felt the Commissioners would desire participating in the discussion.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL suggested consideration be made in regards to relocating the DDRC's responsibility of historic signage to the Commission.

MR. SUMMERFIELD did not believe any signage has been designated as historic within the city; if there was, it would be within the purview of the Commission. Otherwise, these are signs staff believes to be historic as they lend to the cultural element of the Scenic Byway but are not designated and are technically not within the Commission's purview. Expanding the Commission's purview to include a review of sign modifications in the Scenic Byway would be part of the conversation as it relates to modifying the code.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL wondered who has the responsibility to declare a sign as historic. MR. SUMMERFIELD stated the Commission would be the one responsible in hearing an application to designate a sign as historic but the sign owner would have to put forth the application for such a designation. MR. FLOYD confirmed MR. SUMMERFIELD'S response.

CHAIR WHITE restated the Commission's desire to be a part of the process.

COMMISSIONER LeVINE asked about membership of the DDRRC. COMMISSIONER HOWE and MR. FLOYD stated that members of the DDRRC are appointed, similar to the Commission, based upon certain qualifications. COMMISSIONER LeVINE wondered if some of the board's seats could be held for or expanded to include members of the Commission. COMMISSIONER HOWE replied this was one of the options he was reviewing and would have to review if HPC members could be appointed to the DDRRC.

MR. FLOYD believed staff had heard the opinions of the Commission and imagined that if there is a draft to change anything, it will be brought before to the Commission before the City Council for approval.

COMMISSIONER LARIME asked if a sign survey or report had ever been completed for the Scenic Byway. MR. HOWE believed one had been done, although he did not have it. He plans to look into where some of the sign determinations came from, as he believed an inventory had been made; however, not a thorough one. MR. SUMMERFIELD added that there was an inventory, but not at the level of what the Commission would be familiar with, as there was not a lot of analysis completed.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL wondered what role the new Historic Preservation Officer (HPO) would have with regard to the DDRRC. MR. SUMMERFIELD said that the HPO would be included in discussions if there was a historical sign coming before the DDRRC for review that impacts the Scenic Byway. He also explained how the previous HPO acted as the Urban Design Coordinator for the DDRRC, as well as the HPO for this Commission; however, MR. HOWE, under his current duties, has been assigned these roles until a replacement is identified for the HPO position. Once this person is on board, MR. SUMMERFIELD will be looking at how to incorporate them into the organizational flow for the Urban Design Coordinator and HPO roles.

A discussion ensued among the Commissioners, MR. HOWE, MR. FLOYD, and MR. SUMMERFIELD regarding the importance of the Commission being able to declare signs and buildings as historic. MR. SUMMERFIELD provided a brief overview as to how the Commission could get the City Council to enact legislation that would provide a process for things of this nature. MR. FLOYD suggested that a discussion on passing a possible resolution could be included as a future agenda item.

COMMISSIONER PALENCAR wondered if the pink plastic welcome sign across Sahara Avenue and Las Vegas Boulevard was part of the Scenic Byway standards. MR. SUMMERFIELD clarified that it was not, as it was initially intended to be a limited display for the Rock In Rio Festival a few years ago. He stated that regardless of whether people like or dislike the sign, it started an in-depth conversation about the importance of the gateway to the City at this location. He noted that there are plans to replace this structure with a significant landmark style sign at some point in the future. Additionally, improvements are planned for pedestrian circulation in this area through a collaborative project between the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Clark County and the City.

8. HPC-76008 – Report by Department of Planning regarding Director's updates

Minutes:

ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Planning Director, reported that the Historic Preservation Officer posting is out and the deadline was extended an additional 10 days. As of the 24th, 61 applications have been received; however, only 34 applications have met the minimum qualifications. Of those 34 applications, two candidates have doctoral degrees in history or historic preservation and two doctoral candidates have applied. Additionally, of those 34 applications, all have a bachelor degree in a related field and 25 candidates have master degrees in a related field to architecture or historic preservation. MR. SUMMERFIELD was comfortable in having a very good group of applicants to consider; however, he mentioned about half of those who met minimum qualifications requested a salary outside of the funding range approved by the Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial. The Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial will discuss an adjustment to the allocation given at an upcoming meeting.

He added that the Historic Preservation Officer will be responsible for both the Historic Preservation Commission and the Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial and this was complimentary as the Planning Department is now responsible for the Commission for the Las Vegas Centennial.

MR. SUMMERFIELD shared that North Las Vegas has also requested a Historic Preservation Officer in their budget for next year. The municipality has requested more funding for the position than what the City of Las Vegas has requested.

MR. SUMMERFIELD would not have the final list for possible interviews until the end of the first week of April, and credentials, experience, and education will be evaluated and ranked accordingly. From there, an interview panel will be created; COMMISSIONER STODAL will serve on the interview panel. MR. SUMMERFIELD hoped to have the individual begin working by mid- or late June.

COMMISSIONER LeVINE asked why the opening had been extended. MR. SUMMERFIELD explained that 61 applicants was not a lot given half of the applicants did not meet the qualifications. Also, when Human Resources provides a list of applicants, they provide a recommendation on whether or not to extend the application timeframe.

9. HPC-76009 - Report by Department of Planning regarding Project Update list

Minutes:

COMMISSIONER HOWE reported that MEL GREEN is working with the Public Works Department to perform an assessment for the preservation of the hay barn at Floyd Lamb Park to determine restoration costs. There was the potential of grant funding and fundraising opportunities as there is a lot of interest in the hay barn.

Regarding the Historic Properties Update category, COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that the Requests For Proposals (RFP) for the Motor Court Survey have been received and staff was looking at making a selection. Staff wished to review the survey in detail with the RFP candidates to address newly vacant lots. Discussion ensued regarding the scope of the survey. COMMISSIONER HOWE informed the Commission the Motor Court Survey focuses primarily on Fremont Street and Las Vegas Boulevard. He did not believe Main Street was not included as a different survey was completed within the last 10 years.

COMMISSIONER HOWE did not have an update regarding the Las Vegas High School Nomination Update. He noted an RFP was out but was unsure of the status.

Regarding the Moulin Rouge, COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that he was trying to coordinate a location for the columns. At the moment, the columns were still on the site. The next stage is to mobilize the columns, and he wished to be present to prevent damage to the columns.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked the location of the Blue Angel statue, which COMMISSIONER HOWE informed him is at the West Yard. It was unclear which of the two Blue Angel statues was located at the West Yard; however, COMMISSIONER HOWE would find out.

COMMISSIONER HOWE continued his report by stating that he had no update on the Reed Whipple Building.

Regarding the Scenic Byway, COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that the annual inspection was being conducted by SYDNEY NOICE and LORENZO MASTINO, and with that inspection, staff has included the duty of also reviewing The Neon Museum's signage in the medians.

COMMISSIONER HOWE believed the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) was going through court proceedings with the current owner of the Huntridge Theater; therefore, he did not have an update.

Signage had been proposed for the El Portal regarding the Taco Bell Cantina; however, COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that the signage deviated considerably from what was approved. No revisions have been submitted.

COMMISSIONER HOWE stated that the Form-Based Code is being incorporated within the Fremont East District. He explained that the Form-Based Code puts an emphasis on form and character and there is an effort for the Form-Based Code not to push out things like some of the historic motels. He said staff was waiting on the Motor Court Survey to identify those specific sites and use it as an accessory tool for preservation.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL asked if attention was being given within the City in regards to the Reed Whipple Building and Huntridge Theater. In regards to the Reed Whipple Building, ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Planning Director, stated that the property was owned by the City and discussions are underway with a potential tenant which he provided brief explanation of. Huntridge Theater was a matter of SHPO but is still on staff's radar. He asserted staff was actively working to ensure that the historic assets of those two buildings are recognized and taken into consideration with whatever the approach ends up being.

CHAIR WHITE asked what could be done immediately to put the Reed Whipple Building on some type of preservation list. MR. SUMMERFIELD said since the City was in negotiations for either selling or tenanting the building, action would have to wait.

10. HPC-76010 - Report by Department of Planning regarding historic and archaeological resources in local media

Minutes:

CHAIR WHITE expressed difficulties accessing some of the local media resources; the other Commissioners provided some assistance.

ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Planning Director, and COMMISSIONER HOWE provided an explanation of how to navigate the City's website and the new Meetings and Agendas page.

11. HPC-76011 - Discussion regarding topics for future agenda items by the Historic Preservation Commission. Comments made during this portion of the agenda by individual Commission 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 Commission 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:

COMMISSIONER COSGROVE informed the Commission of Senate Bill No. 448 sponsored by SENATOR JULIA RATTI pertaining to affordable housing. She asked if COMMISSIONER HOWE could review the bill to which he replied he would.

COMMISSIONER LeVINE wished to discuss honorary designations.

COMMISSIONER LARIME asked to obtain information on proposing a demolition or adaptive reuse ordinance. She also wished for more information about the Las Vegas Boulevard street improvement project.

COMMISSIONER STOLDAL noticed a new edition of the Open Meeting Law had been issued by the Attorney General. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SETH FLOYD acknowledged this stating that he did not believe the new edition to include anything substantive but he would review the document.

12. **Citizens Participation:** Public comment during this portion of the agenda must be limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. No subject may be acted upon by the Commission unless that subject is on the agenda and is scheduled for action. If you wish to be heard, come forward and 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.

13. **Adjournment**

Minutes:

The meeting was adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Ashley Foster, Deputy City Clerk

Michael Howe, Planning Section Manager

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 Clerk's 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