

Shelley Berkley, Mayor (At-Large)  
Brian Knudsen, Mayor Pro Tem (Ward 1)  
Kara Kelley (Ward 2)  
Olivia Díaz (Ward 3)  
Francis Allen-Palenske (Ward 4)  
Shondra Summers-Armstrong (Ward 5)  
Nancy E. Brune (Ward 6)



City Manager Mike Janssen  
City Attorney Jeff Dorocak  
City Clerk LuAnn D. Holmes

## Redevelopment Agency Minutes

Council Chambers · 495 South Main Street · Phone 702-229-6011  
City of Las Vegas Internet Address: [www.lasvegasnevada.gov](http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov)

January 21, 2026  
8:30 AM

### AGENDA

1. Call to Order

Minutes:

CHAIR BERKLEY called the meeting to order at 8:33 a.m.

PRESENT: CHAIR BERKLEY and MEMBERS KNUDSEN, DIAZ, ALLEN-PALENSKE, BRUNE, SUMMERS-ARMSTRONG, and KELLEY

ALSO PRESENT: MIKE JANSSEN, Executive Director, JEFF DOROCAK, City Attorney, and DR. LUANN D. HOLMES, Secretary

2. Announcement Regarding: Compliance with Open Meeting Law

Minutes:

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE: This meeting has been properly noticed and posted at the following locations in accordance with the noticing standards as outlined in NRS 241.020: City Hall, 495 South Main Street, 1st Floor; the City of Las Vegas website - [www.lasvegasnevada.gov](http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov); and the Nevada Public Notice website - [notice.nv.gov](http://notice.nv.gov).

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, come to the podium 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 Redevelopment Agency Meeting of December 17, 2025

Motion made by Brian Knudsen to Approve

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

For-Kara Kelley, Nancy Brune, Olivia Diaz, Shelley Berkley, Brian Knudsen, Francis Allen-Palenske, Shondra Summers-Armstrong;

## CONSENT AGENDA

**Matters listed on the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine and have been recommended for approval by the Submitting Departments. All items on the Consent Agenda may be approved in a single motion. However, if an Agency Member so requests, any consent item may be moved to the discussion portion of the agenda and other action, including postponement or denial of the item, may take place.**

5. For possible action to approve the audit report and the City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency (component unit) Annual Financial Report (AFR) for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2025

Motion made by Brian Knudsen to Approve the Consent Agenda except Item(s) None

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

For-Kara Kelley, Nancy Brune, Olivia Diaz, Shelley Berkley, Brian Knudsen, Francis Allen-Palenske, Shondra Summers-Armstrong;

## DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

6. RA-1-2026 - Discussion for possible action regarding a Resolution finding the proposed changes to amend the Business Security Grant Incentive Program by the City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency (Agency) to include buildings without retail storefronts, and tattoo shops as an eligible business type, to be in compliance with and in furtherance of the goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan and authorizing the approval of the changes by the Agency - Redevelopment Areas 1 and 2 - Wards 1, 3 and 5 (Knudsen, Diaz, and Summers-Armstrong) [NOTE: This item is related to Council Item 31 (R-1-2026)]

Minutes:

Items 6, 7, 8 and 9 were heard together.

DINA BABSKY, Economic and Urban Development Director, utilized a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was submitted for the record, to share the updated and modernized incentives that the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) had since 2015 in order to achieve the goal of revitalization and eliminate blight in the downtown core and redevelopment area. The most recent incentive included the Business Security Program (BSP), which was brought forward to address security concerns in the Arts District and the downtown core. The BSP addressed security issues such as theft and broken glass, and the \$5,000 grant allowed businesses to install security upgrades. Since its inception last year, the program has reimbursed seven businesses, and seven additional businesses were actively installing the upgrades. The program change included expanding the eligibility to include not only the businesses but essentially the buildings themselves, allowing businesses to apply for the grant prior to the business moving in, and to allow tattoo shops to be an eligible business type. Next, the Commercial Visual Improvement Program (CVIP) was created to encourage property owners to uplift the facades of their buildings to make them more appealing. Since 2015, \$2.3 million has been invested by the Redevelopment Agency which leveraged \$30 million of private investment by property owners. The proposed changes included increasing the maximum award from \$25,000 to \$50,000 since construction costs were high. A two-for-one match was still required, meaning they would reimburse 50 percent of eligible costs up to \$50,000. They wanted to create a pilot program, starting with the Historic Westside, to eliminate the match requirement so the full \$50,000 could be made eligible for reimbursement of eligible construction costs for exterior improvements. The rest of the changes are cleanup language of the program including the significant improvement definition, including tattoo establishments for eligibility, and new construction would be considered ineligible since a brand new building built in the last 12 months would not have blight to eliminate. The Multifamily Residential Improvement Program was for multifamily rebuilds and was combined frequently with the CVIP, for improvements on the interior and exterior. Since 2017, the RDA invested \$1.5 million and leveraged \$13 million in private investment. Previously, multifamily was defined as a four-unit dwelling, but they wanted to be aligned with the industry standard of a five-unit dwelling. In addition, they wanted to increase from \$20,000 per door to \$30,000 per door to address rising costs. The remaining changes included cleanup language to define what a unit was and to ensure the blanket mass leasing contracts were not eligible. Last year, addressing downtown office vacancies became one of the priorities. Many downtown office buildings were not occupied due to the cost of the TI (Tenant Improvement) buildouts and many of the buildings downtown were class B and C office space, which meant they were old and previously used. It was difficult to compete with brand new office spaces and not having turnkey office space to attract potential tenants; therefore, they explored having a Tenant Improvement Program. This would rebate up to 10 percent of the total improvement cost and the maximum amount of \$50,000 for properties up to 5,000 square feet, and maximum amount of \$95,000 for properties over

5,000 square feet. Each tenancy and each office space would be eligible for its own incentive. With all of the RDA incentives they would require a certain number of jobs to be created and some of the ineligible properties identified were the cannabis-related operations and industrial since this was specifically designed for office buildout.

MEMBER KNUDSEN thanked MS. BABSKY and her team for their work and asked if marketing materials could be produced for Wards 1, 3 and 5 to put on social media or send to their constituents. He also wondered if the opportunities available through the City were being communicated to groups going through permitting processes. MS. BABSKY said they worked closely with the Community Development Department to collaborate and make the incentives known, and she could look into marketing materials. The Member stated this is what made the City innovative and creative, and he extended his appreciation to MS. BABSKY.

MEMBER BRUNE wondered if other peer cities had these types of programs and MS. BABSKY was unsure, noting she did not hear about the incentive programs for the Redevelopment Agencies in Henderson, North Las Vegas or Clark County. She thought they primarily worked on public improvements, and she would look into the information and report back. Next the Member asked if the return received for the CVIP and Multifamily Program was above industry standard, and MS. BABSKY said she would research the information.

MEMBER KELLEY thanked MS. BABSKY for the innovation, and MS. BABSKY advised the Member that the changes would start as soon as they were approved. MEMBER KELLEY wondered if there was money in the existing budget to satisfy the increases in contribution. MS. BABSKY explained they set aside money within the budget and had a line item for incentives. Essentially if they received more, they could adjust the budget, and she did not expect to exhaust all of the funds that were set aside. Since construction was expensive, there was a slowdown in terms of the applications being submitted. The line items would be expanded for the next fiscal year to meet the new limits. The Member asked if the funds would be first come first serve and if she could receive marketing materials for her ward as well. MS. BABSKY explained they had budgeted more than they received applications for, and she felt confident they could support many businesses. MEMBER KELLEY applauded MS. BABSKY for being creative.

MEMBER SUMMERS-ARMSTRONG thanked MS. BABSKY for updating the language for more inclusiveness since businesses were different. She asked if they were ensuring that the work met the requirements to have small businesses participation. MS. BABSKY responded that all of the requirements listed were met, such as the employment plan. She noted they had MBS Firm as a consultant to assist in meeting with the applicants to compile a list of eligible small businesses to work with first in order to satisfy the requirements, and the grant itself was not reimbursed until staff validated that whatever was provided in the application was delivered. Throughout that time, the grantee would report on small business participation and jobs created. MEMBER SUMMERS-ARMSTRONG wondered about the limitations of a landlord reapplying for a grant in the event that they pulled out of a lease agreement. MS. BABSKY said a five-year lease was required for each project, and within the five years they could not ask for another grant.

MEMBER DIAZ thanked MS. BABSKY and the EUD (Economic and Urban Development) Department for being thoughtful and receiving feedback from current programs and acknowledging that modernization and improvements to the offerings was needed. Further, she believed it was nice for the tattoo shops to be included. She wondered what success looked like for the pilot launching for the CVIP to not require matching funds from those investing in commercial improvement and exterior. MS. BABSKY said the idea of the pilot came about after looking at the incentives that were done in the last few years, and the Historic Westside scored the lowest for applications; therefore, they tried to identify the limitations. Upon speaking with businesses, the match was what held people back from applying. She hoped within a year they would see how many applications would be received, and there was no set number to define success since there was no historical data in the area. She stated she could provide quarterly updates and after a year of collecting data, they could set the goal for success. MEMBER DIAZ believed it would be helpful to glean from the Ward 5 impact to see if it would be suitable for other parts of the city as well. For the Tenant Improvement Program, the Member wondered if the people leasing the space for five years would be the applicants. MS. BABSKY explained that the building owner could apply for individual space and a tenant moving in could also apply separately but not for the same grant; the building owner would have to agree. MS. BABSKY confirmed for the Member that if a building had multiple stories or suites, the incentive could apply more than once to the building.

Motion made by Brian Knudsen to Approve

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

For-Kara Kelley, Nancy Brune, Olivia Diaz, Shelley Berkley, Brian Knudsen, Francis Allen-Palenske, Shondra Summers-Armstrong;

7. RA-2-2026 - Discussion for possible action regarding a Resolution finding the proposed changes to the Commercial Visual Improvement Program (CVIP) by the City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency (Agency) to be in compliance with and in furtherance of the goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan and authorizing the approval of the changes by the Agency - Redevelopment Areas 1 and 2 - Wards 1, 3, and 5 (Knudsen, Diaz and Summers-Armstrong) [NOTE: This item is related to Council Item 32 (R-2-2026)]

Minutes:

See Item 6 for related discussion.

Motion made by Brian Knudsen to Approve

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

For-Kara Kelley, Nancy Brune, Olivia Diaz, Shelley Berkley, Brian Knudsen, Francis Allen-Palenske, Shondra Summers-Armstrong;

8. RA-3-2026 - Discussion for possible action regarding a Resolution finding the proposed changes to the Multifamily Residential Unit Improvement Program (MFR-UIP) and the Multifamily Residential Visual Improvement Program (MFR-VIP), and the creation of the Multifamily Renovation Incentive Program (MFRIP), by the City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency (Agency) to be in compliance with and in furtherance of the goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan and authorizing the approval of the changes by the Agency - Redevelopment Areas 1 and 2 - Wards 1, 3, and 5 (Knudsen, Diaz, and Summers-Armstrong) [NOTE: This item is related to Council Item 33 (R-3-2026)]

Minutes:

See Item 6 for related discussion.

Motion made by Brian Knudsen to Approve

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

For-Kara Kelley, Nancy Brune, Olivia Diaz, Shelley Berkley, Brian Knudsen, Francis Allen-Palenske, Shondra Summers-Armstrong;

9. RA-4-2026 - Discussion for possible action regarding a resolution finding the proposed creation of the Tenant Improvement Incentive Program by the City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency (Agency) to be in compliance with and in furtherance of the goals and objectives of the Redevelopment Plan and authorizing the approval - Redevelopment Areas 1 and 2 - Wards 1, 3 and 5 (Knudsen, Diaz, and Summers-Armstrong) [NOTE: This item is related to Council Item 34 (R-4-2026)]

Minutes:

See Item 6 for related discussion.

Motion made by Brian Knudsen to Approve

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

For-Kara Kelley, Nancy Brune, Olivia Diaz, Shelley Berkley, Brian Knudsen, Francis Allen-Palenske, Shondra Summers-Armstrong;

## **REDEVELOPMENT AREA 1**

10. Discussion for possible action to amend the City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Plan for the Downtown Las Vegas Redevelopment Area and commonly referred to as Redevelopment Area 1 - Wards 1 and 5 (Knudsen and Summers-Armstrong)

Minutes:

DINA BABSKY, Economic and Urban Development Director, utilized a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was submitted for the record and requested approval of the amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for

Area 1. The RDA (Redevelopment Agency) had previously amended the plan in 1988, 1996, 2006 and 2015. The amendment would add additional parcels that are eligible in the area. The two areas that would be included in the plan were highlighted. One of the subject sites was the former Grant Sawyer building which is surrounded by the Redevelopment Area, but the site was not included when the Redevelopment Area was initially created as it was a state-owned building and property; however, now that the state is selling the site, the plans would be changed to include this site as it aligns with the Redevelopment Plan. Future development would potentially be dependent on the Redevelopment Agency support they could provide. The site is 22.77 acres, built in 1995 and the surrounding area is a prime redevelopment area. The second site is the former Grace Presbyterian Church in the Medical District. This site is also surrounded by Redevelopment Areas on the north and west and moved up to the east. For similar reasons as the other site, they thought this would be a church site for many years; however, now the state is selling the site, and they envisioned a great redevelopment area opportunity. The site is nearly five acres and identified as a prime redevelopment area. The public hearing was posted in the Review Journal and if approved, it would be posted once more for a public hearing at the February 4th City Council meeting. Upon the first hearing of the ordinance to amend the Redevelopment Plan, a second hearing would occur at the February 18th City Council meeting.

MEMBER KNUDSEN thanked MS. BABSKY for all she was doing to help revitalize Downtown Las Vegas.

Motion made by Brian Knudsen to Approve

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

For-Kara Kelley, Nancy Brune, Olivia Diaz, Shelley Berkley, Brian Knudsen, Francis Allen-Palenske, Shondra Summers-Armstrong;

11. RA-5-2026 - Discussion for possible action regarding a Resolution finding the Agency Reimbursement Agreement (Agreement) between the City of Las Vegas Redevelopment Agency (Agency) and Same Page LLC (Tenant) concerning certain tenant improvements in connection with the retail lease between the City of Las Vegas and Tenant for certain space at 70 East Bonneville Avenue, Suite 150 (APN 139-34-201-027), is in the best interest of the public, is in compliance with and in furtherance of the goals and objectives of the City of Las Vegas Downtown Master Plan, and authorizing the execution of the Agreement by the Agency (\$1,000,000 - RDA Special Revenue Fund) - Redevelopment Area 1 - Ward 3 (Diaz) [NOTE: This item is related to Council Items 36 (R-6-2026), 37 and 38 (R-7-2026)]

Minutes:

DINA BABSKY, Economic and Urban Development Director, said she would save the big presentation with the details for the City Council meeting. Essentially, this is a reimbursement agreement with a future tenant in Civic Plaza for a new restaurant in the amount of \$1 million with \$300,000 being reimbursable through the amortized period of the lease. She opined this would be a wonderful location to visit and mentioned the approval of the reimbursement agreement was contingent upon the approval of the actual lease.

For MEMBER DIAZ, MS. BABSKY stated the initial lease was being signed for 12 years with two options of five years each. The Member looked forward to a new offering in the neighborhood.

Motion made by Olivia Diaz to Approve

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

For-Kara Kelley, Nancy Brune, Olivia Diaz, Shelley Berkley, Brian Knudsen, Francis Allen-Palenske, Shondra Summers-Armstrong;

## **CITIZENS PARTICIPATION**


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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:11 a.m.

Respectfully submitted:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Yvett Lozoya, Deputy City Clerk

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. LuAnn D. Holmes, MMC, Secretary

\*\*\*\*\*

THIS MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED AND POSTED AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NOTICING STANDARDS AS OUTLINED IN NRS 241.020:

The City of Las Vegas website – [www.lasvegasnevada.gov](http://www.lasvegasnevada.gov)

The Nevada Public Notice website – [notice.nv.gov](http://notice.nv.gov)

City Hall, 495 South Main Street, 1st Floor