City Hall, 495 S. Main St.
City Clerk's 2nd Floor
Conference Room

March 7, 2019
10:00 AM

Building and Safety Enterprise Fund Advisory Committee 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 QUINN called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m.

PRESENT: CHAIR QUINN and MEMBERS POTTER, OSZAKIEWSKI (on behalf of MEMBER APPLEYARD), WALKER and McOSKER

ALSO PRESENT: JOSANNA ESPEJO, Senior Management Analyst, BRYAN SCOTT, Assistant City Attorney, and DEBRA A. OUTLAND, Deputy City Clerk

2. **Announcement Regarding: 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:** 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 October 24, 2017

Minutes:
Page 2 – Item 6 – MEMBER POTTER questioned the percentage stated in relation to the reported budgeted revenue versus the actual amounts. MEMBER McOSKER acknowledged the discrepancy indicating he may have misspoke and agreed the percentage as listed was probably inaccurate.

Page 4 – Item 7 – MEMBER POTTER pointed out although the minutes reflect that staff would look into and report back to the Committee on how the governmental expenses discussed were calculated, staff has not done so unless for some reason it was emailed and he did not receive it. MEMBER McOSKER was not aware of any response that was sent out. MEMBER POTTER asked staff to make note and respond accordingly.

MEMBER POTTER had additional questions and asked if it was appropriate to discuss them at this time or if they needed to be added to an agenda; regardless, he requested some dialogue to take place. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT stated he could ask his questions, but if action was needed, they would be added as a future agenda item.

Page 4 – Item 7 – MEMBER POTTER indicated he would like additional information with regard to outsourcing and asked MEMBER McOSKER if that would be covered during his report under a later item. MEMBER McOSKER stated he had not prepared anything specifically relative to outsourcing, but he could discuss it at this time. MR. SCOTT advised this item was for clarifying things in the minutes and not for adding additional information. CHAIR QUINN asked MEMBER McOSKER to clarify and requested that the Clerk's Office place a full briefing on the next agenda. DEBRA OUTLAND, Deputy City Clerk, stated that the Committee's staff liaison would handle placing it on the next agenda.

Page 5 – Item 8 – MEMBER POTTER commented when they last met a year and a half ago, there was the possibility of 10 inspectors retiring, and he asked the status of this. MR. SCOTT stated an item would need to be placed on a future agenda for staff to provide a staffing update. MEMBER POTTER indicated he did not want to wait another year and a half for a meeting to be held in order to discuss it. He believed according to statute they were required to meet more often and should have since there were topics that needed further discussion. MEMBER McOSKER agreed that a meeting should have been held sooner to address the outstanding issues. He pointed out there was a staffing update on this agenda so he would address that topic under that item.

Page 6 – Item 9 – MEMBER POTTER asked for a future agenda item to further discuss the new performance measures referred to as Results Vegas. CHAIR QUINN thought that could be included in staff's report since it related to staffing.

Motion made by Matthew Walker to Approve with comments made by Member Potter

Passed For: 4; Against: 0; Abstain: 1; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0

For-Kevin McOsker, Robert W. Potter, Matthew Walker; Quinn Oszakiewski; Abstain-Stephen P. Quinn

NOTE: CHAIR QUINN abstained from voting, as he was not in attendance at the Regular Meeting of October 24, 2017.

5. Report by Kevin McOsker, Director of the Department of Building and Safety, regarding the Large Projects List

Minutes:
MEMBER McOSKER provided the Committee with a snapshot of where the Department of Building and Safety was going in the future along with some of the projects currently in process as well as those coming forward. He noted the backup should include a full report of every project that exceeded $100,000 in valuation but that he would report on the larger projects.

He reviewed those projects which were recently permitted to include the Circa 18 Fremont project, which is a 777-hotel room tower with a supporting casino and parking garage; the Southern Land project, which is a five-story mixed-use development with 325 residential units in Symphony Park and is currently in plan review; and the World Market Center's 350,000-square-foot convention center, which is currently in plan review for the foundation only. Additionally, MEMBER McOSKER named some of the projects the City has land entitlements for, one of which is the Las Vegas Municipal Courthouse at 501 South First Street. This is a 138,000-square-foot courthouse project across from City Hall. Since this report was prepared, Aspen Heights has submitted; this is a five-story mixed-use project in Symphony Park with 290 residential units. The Fremont Hotel is planning a major expansion with a new 500-room 26-story hotel tower with amenities. The Meadows Mall multi-family project which is located on the vacant piece of land between the mall and the next commercial development is one of the first to get entitled that would potentially take advantage of the new 75-foot high rise definition.

Other projects currently in the pipeline include a Loop project downtown, a Northcap Medical District building and AC Hotel by Marriott project in Symphony Park. He stated there are a lot of new, significant projects coming to the city of Las Vegas in the near future.

MEMBER POTTER asked if these projects were being plan checked in-house or outsourced to third parties. MEMBER McOSKER explained it would depend on staffing and current workload, but in terms of those already in the plan review process (Circa and Southern Land), those were both outsourced to a third party consultant. He explained staff will review in-house when possible; however, if they cannot provide a fair level of service to the customer, then projects will be outsourced to meet timeframes. MEMBER POTTER asked if customers were paying for an expedited process; MEMBER McOSKER stated to the best of his knowledge, most were not expressed and that the last significant project that was expressed was the Palace Station remodel. MEMBER POTTER asked about the third party's ability to handle express requests. MEMBER McOSKER responded via the contract, there is not necessarily a mechanism for this, but the City can bring the third-party plan checkers in-house to do plans express, which has been done on some occasions.

CHAIR QUINN asked if the City also performs some sort of a review when a project is outsourced or if it just gets rubber stamped. MEMBER McOSKER stated staff relies heavily on the plans examiners at Bureau Veritas to conduct the project plan review. If there is an issue that comes up and there is a discrepancy with the plan review team, the City will work with the client and the consultant to rectify those issues. Staff will perform a broad-based review to complete the data entry for the project but not a full audit.

MEMBER POTTER commented on how the customer/contractor is impacted when a project is sent to a third party and the associated delay when a revision is necessary. He spoke of inspections as they relate to when a revision is submitted and how he would like to see MEMBER McOSKER, as the Director, look at that process so it is more practical. MEMBER McOSKER stated since the Committee last met, the department lost a number of plans examiners, and he noted the challenge involved in hiring plans examiners to fill those vacancies. They have seen more success over the past couple of months which he indicated would be part of his report under the next agenda item. He added the level of counter service is currently an issue due to staffing. As far as the inspection process when a revision is submitted, changes have been made that no longer require the building to be put on hold.

MEMBER POTTER asked if staff was able to handle a minor revision to a project that was plan checked by a third party or if it still had to go to the queue. MEMBER McOSKER stated typically it is sent back to the third party because they are the ones who have the knowledge and background on the project, but staff does have the ability to pull it back. While it is a small percentage, they do have the ability to keep them in-house if they so choose.

MEMBER WALKER commented since MEMBER McOSKER came onboard at the City, the payment system has been streamlined for revisions, and any holds now only pertain to the areas where the revision applies instead of how previously no inspections were done on a structure until all revisions were processed and paid for. That change was very beneficial to the residential construction industry, and he thanked MEMBER McOSKER for the work he did on that.

CHAIR QUINN agreed with MEMBER POTTER'S comments relating to the timeline associated with revisions which could result in an additional cost to the general contractor of $3,500 to $6,000. He described how he speeds up the process by submitting to the MP&E engineers simultaneously since that is the goal. MEMBER McOSKER stated there are some applications where they allow the inspectors some flexibility with small revisions. MEMBER POTTER experienced this recently which allowed the contractor to move forward rather than stop and go through the queue. CHAIR QUINN commented how the system has changed as the city has grown.

6. Report by Kevin McOsker, Director of the Department of Building and Safety, regarding a Department Staffing Update

Minutes:
MEMBER McOSKER provided the following staffing update.

Vacancies – Five inspectors retired since the last meeting with the possibility of five more inspectors retiring within the next three years. In the FY2019 budget, there are two vacant Combination Inspector positions and two vacant Permit Technicians. There are three vacant Combination Plans Examiner positions, which the department has had a difficult time filling; however, one of these will be filled from the Permit Technician pool bringing the number of vacancies down to two. There is still a vacancy for a Structural Plans Examiner. MEMBER McOSKER stated they have been more successful hiring Inspectors than they were a year or so ago. It has since become more difficult to hire Plans Examiners so they have refocused their energy on that and modified the recruitment process for these positions to increase the pool of people. He noted they like to use in-house Plan Reviewers as much as possible, especially on quick turnaround applications.

MEMBER POTTER asked what the qualifications were for a Combination Plans Examiner versus a regular Plans Examiner. MEMBER McOSKER stated the department does not have any budgeted positions for regular Plans Examiners, but a Combination Plans Examiner is required to hold eight certifications; i.e., plumbing, mechanical, electrical and a building certification through the International Code Council. They are also required to have four additional certifications that involve accessibility, energy compliance along with two others. He noted part of the challenge has been finding individuals with this skillset.

MEMBER POTTER asked how the City's pay scales compared to other jurisdictions. MEMBER McOSKER explained staff has that conversation with Human Resources frequently. Additionally, Human Resources conducts a class compensation evaluation on positions for the region. He thought the City of Las Vegas modeled most closely with the City of Henderson in terms of workload, staffing and budget, but Henderson provides for faster acceleration. While that jurisdiction may pay more, generally, the mid-range pay scale for positions is similar. He noted that in some cases, it is more difficult to make the comparison; i.e., Clark County does not have Combination Plans Examiners.

MEMBER POTTER asked which retirement system City employees participated in. MEMBER McOSKER explained City employees are eligible for PERS Nevada (Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada) once vested. He clarified those who are outsourced part-time or are under contract are not a part of PERS.

MEMBER WALKER commented he saw some trainee positions, and it seemed as if in today's environment growing your own staff should be an area of focus instead of hiring individuals from the outside. He asked if staff was looking to expand that training amongst other categories. MEMBER McOSKER confirmed the department does have a couple of trainee positions, but in trying to manage the current workload, taking on the training positions would take away from the current work resource. The training positions require two years of active training before those individuals are actively put out into the field. He agreed there is some benefit to growing your own, but currently they do not have the in-house capabilities to take an employee offline to train someone for a couple of years within that job classification. Because it does have merit, staff should continue to look at that process moving forward to see if they can make that happen, but currently they are just sitting on those two positions.

MEMBER WALKER suggested this topic be re-agendized for further discussion whether it is for bringing in veterans or other lateral entry programs to continue the focus on home-grown qualified candidates. He thought the general conditions of the market would continue to be tough for some of the specialized positions. MEMBER McOSKER agreed noting there has been some discussion regionally on how to work together. He emphasized the City of Las Vegas, Henderson and North Las Vegas have somewhat limited resources, but could maybe work together to combine those resources. It is complicated and a big item to overcome, but they have had those conversations to try to figure out a way to develop a workforce in a nontraditional sense. The challenge is always trying to get the job done that is needed now.

7. Report by Kevin McOsker, Director of the Department of Building and Safety, regarding an overview of the Final Enterprise Fund Budget for Fiscal Year 2018

Minutes:
Since the Committee had not met in some time, MEMBER McOSKER thought it appropriate to review the final budget for FY18. He reviewed the figures for actual revenue, budgeted labor, other budgeted expenses, actual expenses and ending total revenue. He noted there have been some adjustments to the FY18 budget. Six

hundred thousand dollars was returned to the General Fund for employee benefits, and Finance adjusted the deferred revenues $980,000. The total budget then became $438,000 in excess revenue, with an ending fund balance of $6,633,216. This put the unreserved working capital under the statutory limit by $201,000.

MEMBER POTTER asked for further discussion relating to this. MEMBER OSZAKIEWSKI explained in FY18 an adjustment had to be made related to buybacks of time employees had accumulated for paid time off. This has never been included in the employee rate and has somewhat been absorbed in the Employee Benefits Fund over the years, and that fund has been depleted with the extreme number of retirements the City has been experiencing. Since it is not included in the rate charged out to all of the departments, that money needed to be recouped into the Employee Benefits Fund which was beginning to go below the required limits. As a result of this, all funds in the City received a cross charge. He pointed out typically in the past, the Department of Building and Safety would have sellbacks in the amount of about $200,000, but in 2018, there were sellbacks to the Employee Benefits Fund of almost $650,000. A fund was never built up to accommodate paying out the huge increase in the sellbacks being seen.

MEMBER POTTER was surprised that given the sophistication within the City, why this would not have already been allocated through normal processes rather than putting it in the Employee Benefits Fund and asked if this was standard practice. MEMBER OSZAKIEWSKI stated it is standard practice to have an Employee Benefits Fund. He described it as taking all the money the City is required by the government to pay for such things as health insurance, 401Ks and Medicare and using a standard rate to even it out among the entire City. There is not direct charging for each individual line item for every employee; instead a rate is charged and then paid to the entity when it is due.

MEMBER POTTER referenced asking for a report in 2017 regarding how the City charges the Enterprise Fund and that is also a part of this process. MEMBER OSZAKIEWSKI stated it is a similar process.

Referencing the worksheets in the backup, MEMBER WALKER asked about the significant difference between the budgeted and actual salary and wages amount for 2018. He asked if that was due to unfilled positions or if there were other considerations that accounted for this difference. JOSANNA ESPEJO, Senior Management Analyst, stated they have a labor budget that is inclusive of salaries and benefits; vacancies factor into that by lowering their numbers as does time not worked. She noted, however, that the Finance Department was going to change the way they were charging going forward.

MEMBER POTTER did not think it was appropriate to get a large amount of information at the meeting. He thought it was needed weeks in advance in order to be able to decipher it and ask questions. MEMBER WALKER added the Residential Construction Industry would appreciate having a chance to review and weigh in on the budget prior to it being adopted by the City Council so they can perform their advisory role. If they are not in a position to digest the numbers, they cannot advise Council appropriately. MEMBER McOSKER accepted the constructive criticism and agreed there is a lot of information to digest in a short amount of time. He stated if there was an appetite, another meeting could be scheduled within 30-60 days to give them the opportunity to review the information and resolve the issues brought up under Item 4. CHAIR QUINN acknowledged MEMBER McOSKER has only been with the City a short time, but he recollected the request to provide the information sooner being made repeatedly over the years since the creation of the Enterprise Fund. MEMBER McOSKER indicated he would like the opportunity to revisit these topics after the Committee has time to review the documentation in more detail.

MEMBER WALKER asked if it was an appropriate time to discuss the Building and Safety Fire Plan Review position. MEMBER McOSKER indicated this would be discussed under Item 9.

8. Report by Kevin McOsker, Director of the Department of Building and Safety, regarding the status of the Enterprise Fund Budget for Fiscal Year 2019

Minutes:
MEMBER McOSKER reviewed figures for the budgeted revenue, year to date revenue, budgeted labor, actual labor, non-labor expenses, projected revenue for FY19, projected labor and projected expenses. If the current projected figures play out, a $1.9 million revenue increase to the department is anticipated. The current fund balance is $5.5 million, and as of this date, they are over their unreserved working capital of approximately

$175,000. He noted they are still having to deal with the Employee Benefits Fund issue going forward in the amount of $2.4 million.

MEMBER POTTER expressed confusion being $2.4 million upside down since it was stated under Item 7 that $650,000 was spent to satisfy that fund. MEMBER OSZAKIEWSKI explained the $650,000 related to one year, but it has been going on since 2009. The sellbacks that have been occurring have not been recouped in the Employee Benefits Fund, and that is being evaluated to decide whether that money can be recouped or if they should start anew, but a decision has not yet been made. Depending on what is decided, a prior period adjustment to the financial statements may be required. Technically, it is due to the Employee Benefits Fund; an expenditure was made, but the funds were not charged for it. MEMBER POTTER asked who was taking this under advisement. MEMBER OSZAKIEWSKI stated it is a discussion occurring between the City Manager, the Chief Financial Officer and the Director of Finance.

MEMBER POTTER asked statutorily what ability the Committee had with regard to providing input on that decision-making process. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT explained the Committee could do discuss it at a meeting under an agendized item, make a recommendation to MEMBER McOSKER who could then relay that recommendation to the Council in a briefing. Council could then take it under advisement and place it on an agenda to be discussed at a Council meeting, if they desired. MEMBER POTTER stated he would have to read the actual law because he is finding out the Committee has very little impact whatsoever, and he was not sure the Enterprise Fund was set up to be so ineffective. MR. SCOTT explained most of the committees the Council appoints members to are advisory committees. Others, such as the Planning Commission, have the authority for final action on certain items, but the City Council has the ultimate decision-making authority. He stated he could review the Bylaws to determine what type of authority the City Council may have given this Committee. He reiterated this is a recommending body so it can direct MEMBER McOSKER to conduct studies, surveys and things of that nature, but when it comes down to spending City dollars, that would have to be discussed with management and the Council.

MEMBER POTTER believed they got their authority from the State and not the City. MR. SCOTT asked that a copy of the Bylaws be brought into the meeting so he could review them because he was not familiar with a Committee that had the authority to bind the City with regard to funds, staffing, etc.

MEMBER POTTER argued they were not set up as a Committee by the City, but rather by State statute. MR. SCOTT explained the members are appointed by the Council. Further discussion took place between MEMBER POTTER and MR. SCOTT with regard to the Committee's authority. It was agreed that MR. SCOTT would review the Bylaws and the State law to determine what authority the Committee had.

MEMBER WALKER asked about where the transfer of money discussed was reflected in the worksheets. MEMBER OSZAKIEWSKI stated in FY18 it was charged to the employee benefits line item as a benefits charge and was not reflected in transfers so it would be a crossover to the department. It is not yet reflected in future years as discussion on this topic just occurred the week prior. MEMBER WALKER stated he would like to see this as an ongoing line item for budgets. MEMBER OSZAKIEWSKI indicated staff would take that under advisement.

9. Report by Kevin McOsker, Director of the Department of Building and Safety, regarding the Enterprise Fund Budget for Fiscal Year 2020

Minutes:
MEMBER McOSKER stated staff is currently working through the proposed budget process. He reviewed the budgeted labor expense of FY20, non-labor expenses and the total budgeted expense. He stated part of their request for FY20 is to add three Combination Inspectors, to include a new Special Inspection Auditor and to increase their outside plan review services and their professional services contract by $400,000. They have an additional request in the budget of banking service funds in the amount of $100,000, electronic plan review stations in the amount of $100,000 and a request to include Fire & Plans Examiner overtime of $35,000.

He noted they are looking to have a budgeted inspection pool to react and to be able to provide services to the construction community. They felt three positions were needed in order to meet the demands of the industry, which would be in addition to the two currently vacant. If the workload moves in the direction anticipated, they would like to fill those positions as the need arises and not just for the sake of filling them. He is interested in filling the Special Inspection Auditor position because the City of Las Vegas does not have a third party audit program. Staff felt it important to make sure that the third party agencies were filing reports on time, using qualified staff, tracking and documenting noncompliances and resolving those in a timely manner.

Based on past professional services contracts, they would like to add $400,000. Generally, most of this fund comes through the plans review source. This would allow them to provide a level of service to their customers without long wait times for plan review when big projects come in. Banking services is an issue due to increased credit card charges when customers pay via a credit card through one of the online portals. MEMBER McOSKER noted they have been fairly successful in utilizing the online portal for some of the inspection services and permit services. The plan review stations being requested are a luxury item. As they are moving towards an electronic plan review system, they are looking to upgrade their technology platform from a computer monitor system that is on a desk vertically to one that is a more horizontal application. Ergonomically, it is similar to how plan reviews are performed. This would involve 12 different stations at a cost of about $8,000-$10,000 per station. He also spoke of overtime in relation to the services provided by the Fire Plans Examiners. He recognized this was a lot of information and would like the members to have an opportunity to review it.

MEMBER WALKER asked if the overtime related to Fire was due to more plans coming in the queue. MEMBER McOSKER stated they were not looking to add any staff; it was simply in order to meet the demand of their customer base with the larger projects. MEMBER WALKER asked if the Department of Building and Safety had their own merchant services agreement or if one was used city-wide. JOSANNA ESPEJO, Senior Management Analyst, explained their department is in a group merchant services account with the Department of Planning and Business Licensing and that the merchant fees are determined by volume.

MEMBER POTTER asked how the third parties established their charges. MEMBER McOSKER stated they have a specific contract with their third party outsource plan review team where they receive 70 percent of the plan review fee collected by the City for their process, and the City keeps 30 percent. If there are special services involved, there are hourly charges that may apply in the contract. MEMBER POTTER asked for an example of a special service. MS. ESPEJO explained they are listed in the contract but provided the example of express services and if the third-party trained any of the City's new plan reviewers that needed additional training. MEMBER McOSKER added something outside the scope would also be an extraordinary plan review associated with a project that was not anticipated; i.e., taking several rounds for the design team to answer all of the questions, in which case an hourly charge would be assessed.

10. Report by Kevin McOsker, Director of the Department of Building and Safety, regarding a brief history and overview of the Fee Study concluded on May 29, 2018 and explaining options and potential outcomes for the City and Industry

Minutes:
MEMBER McOSKER reported the City engaged CHAD WOLFORD as a consultant in 2016 to conduct a fee study evaluation of revenue and expenses associated with running the Enterprise Fund; that report was concluded in May 2018. Department staff reviewed the data and conditions in the report and found in many cases, significant fee increases are required in order to be fee neutral. In looking at the Enterprise Fund itself, the fund is healthier than the fee study supports. However, moving forward, there appears to be a situation where budgeted expenses for 2020 exceed revenue projections. Staff scoured the report to determine a reasonable level of fee increase and determined a 16 percent fee increase was appropriate. Going through the thousands of data points, the three key elements identified were single-family residential tract construction, office buildings and office building tenant improvements. He described the various percentages associated with each square footage tier which averaged out to a 16 percent total increase. They also took into consideration the fee study which evaluated what the actual expenses were. Any time that fee increase exceeded what was suggested in the study, they capped it at what the Wolford study suggested.

Referring to the last page of the document, MEMBER McOSKER noted the five applications that were reviewed. In some cases, it was considered to increase the plan review fees in a different format because of the extremely low fees some were charged. He noted they also used Henderson as a benchmark as the City's closest competitor. He provided various examples of what the current fee was as compared to what was found in the report and what Henderson charges for various square footages. He also spoke of the projected revenues and a budget shortfall. With an anticipated five to six percent increase in construction and the 16 percent fee increase, budgetary requirements should be met.

He specifically noted miscellaneous permits for things such as a patio cover will only increase eight percent and the fee structure for mechanical, plumbing and electrical will decrease eight percent total because of the fact that through the fee study evaluation, those were found to be currently overcharged.

MEMBER McOSKER asked for feedback from the Committee as far as what information would be valuable to them so when they meet again, they can have a good dialogue. This is an important issue, and dialogue needs to continue.

MEMBER POTTER stated he was disappointed the Committee had not met since October 2017 and the study had been completed in May 2018; he thought it appropriate for the Committee to have the report in order to analyze it. MEMBER McOSKER had no objection to sharing the report. He indicated staff would also provide them with the spreadsheets from the Wolford study.

JOSANNA ESPEJO, Senior Management Analyst, informed MEMBER POTTER the last fee increase was in 2014. MEMBER POTTER commented this had to be represented to the various groups the Committee members represent who will be asking why, and it is embarrassing when they cannot provide that information. He stressed the need to have a good understanding so they can justify what the City is doing to those groups he represents. MEMBER McOSKER thought that was fair. He stated he would like an indication from the Committee as to whether they are moving in the right direction with the fee increase. He wished this to be taken to the industry to review the fee structure if the Committee agreed it had merit so that the Committee would not be the sole source of industry input. He acknowledged the Committee members needed to be able to answer to their constituents.

MEMBER WALKER asked if Henderson was utilized for comps in the study to provide a reference for the Committee or if it was a benchmark selected by the City during the process of the study. He also wondered if thought was given to taking a regional approach since Henderson seems to be the priciest jurisdiction. MS. ESPEJO indicated they looked at other jurisdictions after the fee study was completed, and the fee study was based on the cost recovery. Since staff found the city of Las Vegas to be most comparable to Henderson in size, number of staff and budget, it made sense to use them.

MEMBER WALKER asked if the study took into consideration how long it would take for the reserve to be spent down. MEMBER McOSKER indicated he would have to defer that question, but staff can evaluate whether the Wolford study considered that factor. MEMBER WALKER spoke of the statutory maximum and having further discussion on that.

MEMBER WALKER asked staff to speak to the large decrease in the number of rollover inspections in terms of the level of service the industry expects and the service targets associated with the additional positions. MEMBER McOSKER stated they have had a checkered past with regards to timeliness of inspections, and they were probably close to 90 percent a year or so ago when he took over. He noted factors included manpower, positions, how work was being organized and how they were dealing with staff. Great strides have been made in hiring new employees and replacing those that retired, and everything is being done with the allocated resources available to bring their inspection services back to a level that is more palatable to the industry. The goal with stakeholders prior to his employment was a same-day inspection rate of 98 percent. MEMBER McOSKER proudly reported that during the previous month there were 38 rollovers out of about 7,500 inspections. He noted the fee study currently does not have specific targets in terms of increased service levels, but the electronic plan review system will make an impact on how business is done moving forward. MS. ESPEJO noted electronic plan review also allows for simultaneous review by multiple departments and eliminates the transport time.

MEMBER POTTER asked when staff planned to implement the fee proposal and whether the 2020 budget included the additional fee. MEMBER McOSKER noted it did not include the increase, and they would like to move forward as soon as possible, but he understood there is a process and the best time would need to be discussed with this Committee and the industry. MEMBER POTTER asked if the fee increase would have to go before the Council which has a notice requirement. MEMBER McOSKER confirmed there is a formal process where it would have to go back to Council. He emphasized staff was not expecting this to be implemented in the next 30-60 days; it needs to be evaluated and industry meetings need to be held.

MEMBER WALKER asked if the 2020 budget was reflective of the additional positions. MEMBER McOSKER confirmed it was. As a steward of the Enterprise Fund, they do not anticipate hiring anyone until necessary as the projects come up. There are some positions they wish to fill immediately so the inspectors can be trained and hit the ground running when projects such as the World Market Center and the parking garage obtain permitting. The three positions in next year's budget will depend on what other projects come up and workload, but they want to have the flexibility in case the positions are needed.

11. **Citizens Participation:** Public comment during this portion of the agenda must be limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee. No subject may be acted upon by the Committee 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:
Prior to hearing this item, CHAIR QUINN asked that an agenda item be placed on the next agenda to elect a new Chairman. He noted he has been Chairman for 14 years and that it was time for him to step aside and give someone else the opportunity to serve in that capacity.

With regard to the earlier discussion that took place under Item 8 relating to the authority of this board, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT stated the Clerk's Office provided him with a copy of the Resolution that created the advisory board as well as the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) provision. Copies were distributed and are attached in the backup. He called the members attention to Paragraph 4 of the Resolution which he read into the record along with the Purpose and Mission section found on Page 2. He also noted that NRS 354.59893 could be found on Page 3. He summarized this Board is a recommending body that can make recommendations with regard to staffing and things of that nature, but because those involve budgetary items, the Board does not have the final authority. MEMBER McOSKER could take those recommendations to the City Council in an advisory form, and the Council would consider that advice. MEMBER POTTER stated MR. SCOTT answered his questions adequately. MR. SCOTT spoke of the 33 different committees that the City Attorney's Office oversees and this was a learning lesson for him as well since the authority varies with each.

MEMBER WALKER commented he intends for this to be his last meeting as the representative for the residential construction industry and stated he would be willing to serve if a new appointment could not be made prior to the next meeting. MR. SCOTT explained any appointment would have to go before the City Council so MEMBER McOSKER should work with the City Clerk's Office to get a new appointee placed on an upcoming Council agenda. AMANDA MOSS, Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association, thanked the Committee for having the meeting open to the public so she could sit through a meeting. She wished to publicly submit her interest on the record for MEMBER WALKER'S seat and would follow up with MEMBER McOSKER and MR. SCOTT regarding the application process.

MEMBER McOSKER expressed appreciation for CHAIR QUINN'S service and looks forward to working with the new Chair. He enjoys working with the members, as it provides a great opportunity for discussion, and he was saddened he was not more proactive in scheduling a meeting sooner. After the topic of MEMBER WALKER'S term expiration was raised, MR. SCOTT indicated it expires on June 7, 2019. MEMBER McOSKER added that given the circumstances, it would be prudent to hold a meeting prior to the expiration of MEMBER WALKER'S term.

MS. MOSS noted that other municipalities have an item on their agenda prior to Citizens Participation relating to topics for future agendas. She added this helps in preparing for the next meeting.

MEMBER POTTER commented on the good job MEMBER McOSKER is doing and congratulated him on his position as Director as when they met last, he was in an acting capacity. MEMBER McOSKER thanked him.

12. **Adjournment**

Minutes:
The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted:

____
Debra A. Outland, Deputy City Clerk

____
Kevin McOsker, Director of Building & Safety

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