A meeting of the Carson City Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February 11, 2009 in the Capitol Conference Room, 201 North Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Robin Williamson

Member Jed Block Member Gary Cain Member Stan Jones Member Dan Neverett Member Gigi Valenti

**STAFF:** Joe McCarthy, Business Development Manager

Tammy Westergard, Deputy Business Development Manager

Melanie Bruketta, Deputy District Attorney

Kathleen King, Recording Secretary\*

**NOTE:** A recording of these proceedings, the Committee's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record, on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office. These materials are available for review during regular business hours.

- **A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM** (1-0013) Chairperson Williamson called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. A quorum was present. Member Cowan was absent.
- B. **APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES** (1-0015) No minutes were submitted for approval.
- C. MODIFICATION OF THE AGENDA (1-0016) None.
- **D. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS** (1-0017) None.
- **E. DISCLOSURES** (1-0019) None.
- F. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY THE ADOPTION OF REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS, SUCH AS EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS INCENTIVES, PRE-DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES AND LEASE AND RENT ASSISTANCE, ALONG WITH POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND INTERNAL BUSINESS PRACTICES, MISSION STATEMENTS, OBJECTIVES, MEASUREMENT INDICATORS, APPLICATION PROCESSES, FLOWCHARTS AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS (1-0021)-Mr. McCarthy reviewed the staff report. He thanked Melanie Bruketta for reviewing the documents to ensure their compliance with statutes. He asked for the Committee's recommendations, suggestions and comments to be summarized and forwarded to the Redevelopment Authority (RA) to finalize the program regarding accepting applications; giving the Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee (RACC) time to review and rank the applications, and send them to the RA to award all, part or none based on recommendations and budget availability.

(1-0090) Mr. McCarthy narrated a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was provided to the Committee members. He discussed the process by which applications are provided to RACC both for

Redevelopment Project Areas 1 and 2. He acknowledged that RACC is focused on Project Area 1 (PA1) and not Project Area 2 (PA2). Most of the programs are nearly identical for both project areas but PA2 has a couple of other programs as it is a larger commercial area. He asked for feedback on whether to establish an advisory group for PA2 and whether it should be the current RACC. A flowchart was presented to show how the process works. He advised that there will be multiple applications for review and two periods of accepting applications which are the Spring and Fall and they will compete for limited funds. The RACC will rank the pre-development incentive applications and if approved, return to the applicant to complete a property improvement application for review for RACC's recommendations. If accepted, the application is approved, an agreement is executed, and the project completed. The application completes an investment report which measures what RACC is getting out of participation in having these projects move forward. If RA denies an application, the project does not go forward with an incentive but the applicant can appeal the decision to the RA.

In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy replied that applications will be reviewed twice yearly. Direction has been given for a firm time by which to accept applications, have those applications compete for limited funds, and make recommendations to the RA. In response to another question, Mr. McCarthy replied that his office is looking at their ability to handle quarterly applications and if that is RACC's recommendation, it will be forwarded to the RA. Member Cain commented that it gives more flexibility to people who are contemplating spending money downtown. Mr. McCarthy acknowledged that a lot of projects cannot wait for specific application times. There may be just two periods to accept applications, but have a guideline for exemplary projects that need consideration at different times. The idea is to have applicants plan ahead. Discussion ensued regarding funding and time periods when there were no projects. It was discussed whether to give flexibility to applicants who go through the process of building permits, engineers, redlining, and various approvals which can delay a project for months. Mr. McCarthy sensed a consensus among the members that the RA should consider accepting quarterly applications. Member Block commented that it will make people consider the process a little farther ahead if the deadline is the same date every quarter. Mr. McCarthy commented that this is the first recommendation being sent to the RA.

(1-0294) Mr. McCarthy stated that the goal is to make downtown Carson City a premier destination. Every applicant is measured against the mission statement or vision with the objective to encourage business development and fill commercial spaces. An idea is to measure the number of businesses in operation within the redevelopment area - is it growing, diminishing, successful in a bad economy, stablizing or growing that number, what is the assessed value in the district? He added that residents police an area, keep it clean, safe, and shop, so residential units should be added.

Member Jones pointed out an inconsistency in PA1 and PA2: 'fill vacant store fronts' vs. 'fill vacant commercial spaces'. Ms. Westergard confirmed they should both say 'fill vacant commercial spaces'.

Mr. McCarthy summarized that facilitating aesthetic improvements, improving public infrastructure, facilitating special events, and supporting historic preservation, are the components of RACC's mission and objectives. Member Jones thought a guideline should be no competition with private enterprise. Discussion ensued among the members regarding stand alone projects and facilitating events which need the assistance of the public sector. Member Neverett suggested that an indicator of success might be the number of partners involved in an event. Mr. McCarthy stated that the role of RACC is to look at applications for incentive programs but events coordination isn't a role of RACC. What is really needed is the advice of RACC as it reflects the business and residents of the community. There was more

discussion on events coordination and the role of the RACC. Member Valenti agreed with Member Jones about not competing with private industry. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding competing with private enterprise and partnering with the Convention and Visitors Bureau. Mr. McCarthy commented that trying to not compete against each other is not a good idea as people need choices. The greenhouse issued was also discussed in length and those contacted who were in that business did not see it as a competition. The main issue concerned government not competing with private industry; the ice skating rink was discussed as an example.

Mr. McCarthy discussed the mission objectives in PA2. In response to a question, he replied that he could not recall any primary residence in the historic district ask for assistance although a number of former residences that were converted to businesses have requested help. The concern is getting a building rehabilitated so it's back serving the community. One of the primary aspects of redevelopment has been to help sustain and grow the historic district because those buildings are marketing tools for the rest of the business community. He cited the Brewery Arts Center rehabilitating St. Teresa's Church into a concert hall as a perfect example of historic preservation.

(1-0723) Regarding bolstering the economy, Mr. McCarthy stated the need to look at jobs, property values, and sales tax. The community needs to be shown that their money is being put to use where it is actually bolstering the economy. Discussion ensued regarding measuring sales volume accurately through sales tax.

Mr. McCarthy reviewed the pre-development incentive program and explained the process used with D'Vine Wine as an example. Pre-development is a good incentive that is being encouraged so the process of getting a final building is facilitated. In response to a question, Ms. Westergard replied that there is not a 'go-to' list of design professionals although they do have to be licensed. The property owner comes to RACC with their design professional and have to prove they are worthy of assistance. RACC will get applications before the project begins, and will be able to ask questions, get feedback, rank the projects, and forward them to the RA. The applicants are first come, first served. She read into the record, "the initial steps of program participation is completion of a pre-application form. The applicant will be asked to describe the proposed project and the way in which the proposed project meets the objectives of the Redevelopment Plan. The pre-application will be reviewed and ranked by the Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee and recommended for either approval or denial by the Redevelopment Authority. Upon ranking by the RACC for approval by the RDA, a complete application detailing the project will be completed and submitted to the RDA. Once approved by the Redevelopment Authority, a project agreement shall be completed and presented to the Redevelopment Authority and Board of Supervisors for approval. Upon completion of the project, the applicant may submit receipts for reimbursement up to the amount listed on the agreement." Ranking would be a recommendation to the RA. Mr. McCarthy commented that no money is involved in the decision and this is a way for RACC to have an impact on what projects come to downtown.

Mr. McCarthy reviewed the property improvements program citing facade improvements, landscaping, and signage as examples of things RACC has approved. In response to a question, Ms. Westergard replied that in order to receive funding, a project can't be started or finished without a pre-application. Mr. McCarthy added that the RACC has complete control and there will be no going half-way through a project and then asking for help. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy explained the business assistance program which is geared toward the tenant and not the property owner. He used the St. Charles Hotel and

Sweetland building as examples. It is a loan to grant program and has been modeled after the Henderson downtown redevelopment district. Ms. Westergard read a new iteration of the rent assistance program into the record and finished by saying that the process is similar to the other programs.

Deputy District Attorney Bruketta advised that rental assistance money cannot be given to a business because it's not legal. She explained that the RA would have to enter into a lease agreement with the property owner and sublease the property which is more of entering into a loan. If the conditions of the loan are satisfied, it will convert to a grant.

Chairperson Williamson commented that regarding PA2, several restaurants are not doing well and are in rent arrears. This may be an opportunity to keep them in business, protect their investment and employees and get them through a certain period.

Mr. McCarthy commented that RACC will be comparing the market rent that the landlord charges with the business plan of the relocating business to see if there's a gap. The cash flow will not be enough to sustain a business to be successful unless they get help for a period of time. He explained that it is subsidizing their rent with the payback as the measurement. The payback needs to be far and above the subsidy. Ms. Westergard commented that RACC can rank its preferences based on the niche business preference. "Maybe you're not seeing this as a good redevelopment tool for one applicant over another so those will be your comments. A lot of second store openings for entrepreneurs might be good fits. Their fixed costs can be managed for a period of time that may set the hook and bring them in." She added that if they don't make the grade they have to pay it back. Member Valenti commented that the program sounds like business welfare. It sounds like micro-managing between the landowner and tenant rather than redevelopment. It's wrong for taxpayer redevelopment money to pay for rent. There will be major problems if loans are given out because of the required regulations. It's getting into the banking realm and that's not any part of RACC's purpose. Mr. McCarthy commented that the success that Henderson has had with this program is that they do the loan, provide a subsidy for rent, and after three years the program ends and it turns into a grant. They've had great success attracting business. "I'm just letting you know the other side of the coin is the opportunity to build the kind of clustering of downtown businesses that are consistent with Roger Brooks' presentation." Member Valenti commented that if they're asking for rent assistance, they're in trouble and the City will never see any money back. Mr. McCarthy commented that many businesses are in trouble now only because cash flows are down. He'd rather try to retain the business than have them go out of business. He wants to get them through this bumpy period and have that mechanism by which they're given temporary help for a period of time to keep them open. This is just another tool to use to try to build the business mix that would foster further development.

Member Jones suggested hearing the Board of Supervisors' (BOS) comments. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy replied that it was rephrased to business assistance. Member Block commented that subsidizing rent vs. helping improve the inside to attract business makes more sense. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy replied that security will be through personal property and if a business goes out of business, the chance of getting money returned is not a reality. A bond could be posted. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding whether the role for redevelopment is to assume securing investments. Member Block was concerned about businesses failing after being given money that could have been used for infrastructure improvements. Mr. McCarthy referenced a few restaurants that are having difficulty but are still generating employment and food and beverage tax for the community. "If you're successful and that business stays open, you have the benefit of food and beverage tax which goes into the City's general

fund." If there isn't foot traffic downtown, others are going to suffer. Member Jones commented that unless there is collateral or something to secure it, he is opposed to it.

(1-1461) Member Cain wanted to assure the taxpayers that their money is being protected. Member Block suggested placing liens on private residences. Mr. McCarthy commented on how successful the RACC has been in helping property owners rehabilitate their properties and there is an opportunity to place the right tenants. Member Valenti recommended scrapping this entire section. Member Block commented that if a physical improvement is done to a space, another tenant will come in and appreciate it. Member Valenti commented that the break even point on helping someone is too much. "You're trying to keep them in and they can't pay their rent, but if their sales aren't there, it's an ongoing problem. It's counter-intuitive because they're not getting enough sales if they can't make the rent." Ms. Westergard commented that this concerns start-ups. There is a provision if an established business is falling on hard times. The criteria is an established operator meaning that it may be a second store start-up. Member Valenti commented that if a business has issues with paying their rent, if they're established and go through rough times, they know how to get out of it. It's not up to the taxpayers. Mr. McCarthy commented that he wants to give RACC the tools to do something about it. "You get to say no, but you have the tool." This could be made into a business assistance program so the taxpayer gets something viable out of it, a construction tenant improvement in the site that if they go out of business, it's there for the next tenant and is valued by the assessor for property tax purposes. Member Valenti commented that that fits more into RACC's function. Mr. McCarthy commented that instead of rent, it's helping with a cost they've lined up. "If it gives you more comfort to have only those kinds of applications, we can definitely put a program like that together." Member Valenti commented that that falls under property improvements, and doesn't need a new program. Mr. McCarthy commented that property improvements are structured for the property owner, not the tenant. Member Valenti commented that there would be different rules of securing it if it were tenant vs. property owner. Mr. McCarthy expressed his understanding that business assistance should be emphasized rather than rent assistance but have something securable and a proven business that generates more in additional assessed value and food and beverage tax or sales tax to pay for minor incentives they've been given.

Mr. McCarthy commented that RA may like the program. "The rents that are being charged by the property owners that are inconsistent with the taxpayers or the lobbied businesses, we're going to see businesses starting to shut down." Member Block commented that money could be given to move to another place. Mr. McCarthy commented that Shelly Aldean suggested getting an equal match from the landlord. Member Valenti commented that if there was a relocation from one downtown area to another, RACC could help them with tenant improvements on the new place. Member Block suggested if a business is struggling and has an unreasonable landlord, find them a reasonable landlord and help them make the transition. Mr. McCarthy commented that the business assistance program could be rewritten to be a separate program geared specifically for tenants with a lot of similarities to the property improvement program. Ms. Bruketta commented that she is unsure if this program is legal but is trying to make it fit within the statute.

In response to a question, Member Valenti replied that RACC has no business getting involved with fixed equipment as it can be leased. Member Jones agreed stating that in most new restaurants, everything is either rented or lease purchased so there is no value. Mr. McCarthy asked, what would be the approach used to help land a top notch restaurant in downtown but wouldn't come without assistance? Member Valenti replied tenant improvements and tax incentives but they're going to get people to come because they have a good facility. Member Jones opined that redevelopment is under the microscope so it should

be kept as simple as possible. Member Valenti commented that within a certain framework RACC can be successful, but shouldn't be financing people's businesses. Using the St. Charles as an example, Mr. McCarthy posed this scenario: A property has been previously incented and given the full max. They've filed another application because they want to go to the 2 and 3<sup>rd</sup> story. Would you entertain a second application? Member Jones said he wouldn't. Member Valenti said she would entertain the application because it's something new and an improvement, it would bring more people in and would follow through on the same criteria. Member Jones clarified that the second time around has to be a diminished amount, not another \$100,000. Member Block stated that a new project could be reexamined that's improving the property one more time. Chair Williamson commented that if the St. Charles wanted to make upscale condo apartments, that would fit within their framework. There could be property tax increases and additional revenues downtown because people are living there. "It comes back to the framework that is consistent with everyone that would be coming up to the same thing and we evaluate it and if we didn't like it we'd give it a low rating and if we did, a high rating." Member Block said that would have to be after the first tax lien is over after a period of seven years. Member Valenti suggested adding language that they couldn't apply for another redevelopment project on that property until the tax lien is satisfied. Member Jones commented that they shouldn't be restricted but set a lesser amount. Mr. McCarthy suggested capping it at \$25,000. Member Cain said as long as it didn't duplicate some of the same requests from the original application, there shouldn't be an issue considering it as a separate act. Member Valenti stated that there should be something stated that the applicant is contingent on the whole project, not upon phases. Ms. Westergard stated that one thing that's great about the ranking system is that each member will be able to assign a number to the application based on their perception of what is happening and individual differences in philosophy. In response to a question, Ms. Westergard replied that the Members would have a worksheet, but most information will be included in the application. The feedback will go to each of the Members with their own individual numbers but as a group, will reach a consensus on whatever it is that will be an average of the rankings. Mr. McCarthy commented that due to the feedback of the business assistance program it may possibly be folded into the property improvement program. Deputy DA Bruketta commented that there's two findings that the RA has to make before getting the incentives out and it's important for this group to make those findings before ranking the projects. The first link is that the building facility structure improvements are a benefit to the redevelopment area or the immediate neighborhood and no other reasonable means of financing those facilities, structures, or other improvements are available. "We don't want to see a project after it's completed because clearly they have the financing to complete the project. You wouldn't be able to give them an incentive. You would look at the objectives to make the decision that it passes, and your mission statement and everything else that is adopted. The second is what the RA adopts. The second one is the financing. It's important to make everyone aware of what the law is."

Mr. McCarthy commented that there are similar plus two additional programs in PA2. Everything done to bring new retail to south Carson has gone directly to the RA, but they have requested RACC's input as to whether to form an advisory committee for that area. He asked the RACC members if they would be interested in sitting as an advisory committee for PA2 or if they would prefer to stay as advisory committee for downtown only and advise the RA to create another committee for PA2. Member Jones commented that the auto dealers should have their own input and committee. Member Valenti agreed stating that they have different business models. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy replied that PA2 contained all kinds of businesses, including auto sales, grocery stores, and the old Wal-Mart building. Member Valenti commented that it would be good to have a citizens committee for that area as they would want to have a say of what goes on.

Ms. Westergard wanted to be sure that everyone had a strong working knowledge of the three kinds of components in the information packet. She explained the connecting information that has to be linked in all three so they are all in compliance. Mr. McCarthy asked the Members for recommendations or suggestions regarding the application. Member Jones commented that the first time they go through it, they may have a lot, so it may be changed.

In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy replied that the RA has asked him to research the idea that as projects are completed, to pull them out and add other blighted areas of comparable value. The plan has to be amended, there are open meetings, public meetings, ordinance readings. When the plan is opened, it's opened to every property owner in that district who may want to opt out of this district. It could take months and may undermine the ability to complete work because it could reduce tax increments. Chairperson Williamson commented that there are bonding requirements in PA1. Mr. McCarthy commented that everyone on the RA has suggested adding the entire area to Northgate into the district and will be brought up for public discussion when time allows. Chairperson Williamson commented that between the two redevelopment districts, it's still about 6 1/2 percent of the assessed value of the entire community. Statute allows up to 15 percent. Member Jones commented that more money should be spent on infrastructure and suggested targeting specific amounts rather than using it for incentives. Mr. McCarthy stated that there isn't much money left in the unspent fund proceeds. A portion has been set aside to cover the costs associated with a preabandonment lawsuit settlement. Part of it would be improvements in and around the Nugget that would satisfy the terms of the settlement. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy said there will be improvements on the parking lot, Curry Street, and lighting in and around the area. There could be infrastructure improvements on the parking lot that would be a benefit to the entire community. "We are very optimistic and you have the tools by which to partner with the Nugget in a really effective fashion." In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy replied that he would ask Patrick Pittinger of Public Works to speak with RACC regarding their infrastructure schedule.

Ms. Westergard commented that the ranking system is going to be helpful and cited as an example, those that have preferences for infrastructure projects can be ranked higher than other projects. There doesn't need to be concern over rules and regulations as RACC can rank projects to their preferences. Member Jones commented that he doesn't think infrastructure improvements should be competing with applications for downtown. Mr. McCarthy said you can make recommendations to the RA. Using unspent bond proceeds to target specific infrastructure will go before the RA on the 19<sup>th</sup>.

Chairperson Williamson entertained further discussion or possible action on policies and procedures. Mr. McCarthy suggested a motion to recommend with recommendations put in writing, and sent to RA with improvements, etc. Member Block moved to approve with comments including comments and suggestions. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

G. UPDATE ON OTHER REDEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES - Chairperson Williamson introduced this item and Ms. Westergard advised that communication is moving to an online format and the RACC's new "home place" will be <a href="www.downtownanswers.com">www.downtownanswers.com</a>. She then navigated through a demonstration of the website. Mr. McCarthy commented that this is an opportunity to be transparent and get information to the Members. Ms. Bruketta cautioned the Members to be careful when responding to e-mail from Mr. McCarthy, to respond to just him, so there is no violation of the Open Meeting Law. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy replied that monthly meetings have been established, however, an amendment to the resolution could change them to every other month as a lot of committees are moving

to less meetings because of the reduction in staffing and ability to get things done. A change to every other month would be discussed. He suggested not having a meeting if it wasn't necessary. Member Block suggested a monthly meeting until this is finalized, but perhaps then moving to quarterly meetings based on the applications. Ms. Westergard commented that it's important for the Members to see how the website will work as a communication tool. Mr. McCarthy commented that it's not meant to subsidize the public process. Ms. Bruketta reiterated that care be taken in using the website so as not to violate Open Meeting Laws. In response to a question, Ms. Westergard replied that an applicant would be able to go on the website and access an application. In response to another question, Ms. Bruketta replied that if everyone is on Facebook at the same time and discussing RA issues, it would be a violation of the Open Meeting Law. The discussion board is an ability to communicate back and forth and a place to go and get information without having to organize meetings. Discussion ensued regarding who can be on a Facebook discussion at any one time. Ms. Bruketta stressed that as long as there are three or less members in a discussion or as long as the discussion isn't related to redevelopment, it is not an Open Meeting Law violation. There was more discussion regarding quorums and the Open Meeting Law. Mr. McCarthy advised that he would prepare an informational guide of what can and cannot be done. In two years, the Open Meeting Law is going to allow for this as long as there's transparency for all citizens. It only makes sense because of transportation issues and costs of providing space. The other side of the coin is the citizens have to be assured that decisions and discussions aren't being made without their ability to review them.

Chairperson Williamson advised that Sportsman's Warehouse is proceeding on track, is solvent and going forward.

Ms. Westergard advised that she is working with Lee Plemel and Patrick Pittinger regarding way-finding throughout downtown; the community has participated in needs assessment and given their input and the recommendations are reflected in the Envision Carson City Master Plan. She advised that the Transportation Department, Planning Department and Convention and Visitors Bureau are all involved in implementing the design document of the system. Three levels of state bureaucracy are also involved in the process. There's an attempt to get a draft of the map regarding the regulations and once the draft is prepared, she will bring it to RACC. At that point, the actual drawing of the construction document will continue. The team is in the process of checking the information for the first draft. Then everyone will come back with input and that will get on a second draft and that's what will go to RACC. The second draft should be available by the end of this month.

Member Jones commented that he and Member Block were recently appointed to a signage committee for the Downtown Business Association (DBA) and there was concern that the DBA has not been included in the process. Ms. Westergard responded that no one was left out and there was a lot of input into the part of the decision that the downtown businesses, citizens, or anyone else can input. She explained that she is working on compliance issues regarding transportation and partnership with the State of Nevada. Member Jones disagreed, stating that no one from DBA had been notified of a meeting on signage. Ms. Westergard replied that, "they have in the sense that through the master planning process and branding study, that input is reflected in that document because it calls out some of the marketing details, fonts, and colors which are the things that input from the business community needs to have input in. The business community is precluded from having input on things that have to do with health, safety and transportation regulations." In response to a question, Ms. Westergard replied that DBA would not be able to install street signage if they're in the right-of-way. Considerable discussion ensued regarding way-finding signage vs.

directions to particular businesses and it was determined that the group was talking about different things. Ms. Westergard reiterated that way-finding is not within the purview of the DBA. Member Block agreed but expressed his concern with keeping the DBA involved. Ms. Westergard advised that on the 27<sup>th</sup>, the team would be getting back to its key stakeholders and clarified that it's about letting RACC know this is coming and not about sign placement. Member Block expressed his understanding but advised letting the DBA know. Member Jones commented that he's wasted a lot of time because there's been no communication. In response to a question, Member Jones replied that communication should be done with the DBA if it concerns downtown signage. Ms. Westergard responded that once the map is available that is her intention but there has to be a certain amount of information as a starting point. In response to a comment, Ms. Westergard replied that Ms. Duncan is responsible for inventorying specific points of attraction pertinent to visitors and residents. Mr. Pittinger's contribution concerns the flow of transportation. Mr. Plemel's contribution concerns compliance with all of the sign ordinances, and her own contribution is to ensure that the community and downtown businesses are aware that this way-finding system is on the horizon and creating a time line for its implementation. In response to a question, Ms. Westergard replied that DBA will have input in the areas they are allowed, but not in directional signage placement. Member Block commented that from DBA's standpoint, it appears that Mr. Pittinger and Mr. Plemel are telling them what's best for their businesses. Chairperson Williamson reiterated that there will be a map available at the end of February for everyone to have a chance to review. Ms. Westergard advised that the only kind of information on a way-finding system has to do with parking, civic points of interest, activity areas, and restrooms which is completely limited by federal regulation. There are universal standards of way-finding for pedestrian corridors, just as there are universal standards of way-finding on interstates. It doesn't have anything to do with individual businesses. Mr. McCarthy commented on the need to help people navigate to certain business districts or businesses. The way-finding is the first step to get people moving around town through quality signage consistent with federal and state regulations. The approved program is laid out on how to establish blade signs and all other signs to get people to individual businesses. Member Jones commented that there is a strong feeling that there is not a spirit of communication within town. "There's things that go on that everyone should be involved in or at least be aware of." Mr. McCarthy said, "we just have to continue to try to do our best and come up with a better way to have an open dialog so there's no misinformation that the City is proceeding without the DBA's input. In fact, a way-finding signage system is being established that has a complicated set of rules and laying out of planning and construction documents to build it." In response to a question, Ms. Westergard replied that www.downtowncarsoncity.com has a downtown events calendar. Member Block said that there are lots of events going on and not everyone is fully communicating. Member Jones commented that he's active in the Chamber so he's fairly well apprised of what's going on. Ms. Westergard expressed her frustration that the way-finding is a big project to put together with the goal of trying to get it up and running before the high season hits. She hoped to have a street lighting program that will continue to keep the buzz light in downtown. In response to a question, Ms. Westergard replied that the 16<sup>th</sup> is the last day for the ice skating rink. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy replied that if there is the ability to do the farmer's market, they will try to roll out a fully functioning street light program for next year.

Mr. McCarthy advised that one of the applications RACC will be seeing is the old carriage house behind the Olcovich House purchased by Casey, Neilon & Associates. They may want to begin construction early. Another project in escrow is the Nevada Association of Counties is looking at the one story building next to the The Basil. Whether they go forward has to do with the kinds of plans they have in place. They want to add a second story to add another 1,000 square feet. One of the issues is the cost of installing an elegant fire escape. There's also a parking waiver they'll need by adding another 1,000 square feet. There's a cost

associated with giving up parking that goes into a fund, which will have to be decided by the BOS, but that may be an incentive RACC can provide.

In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy replied that Mercury Cleaners is for sale and has been discounted significantly. A new buyer could potentially apply for Brownsfield funding. If there is no buyer and nothing is done, the NDEP can come in and raise the building. In response to another question, Mr. McCarthy replied that a private buyer could obtain the funding, although the current owner cannot. Chair Williamson commented that she has talked to potential purchasers who are trying to figure out how to avoid the liability. Member Block commented that it's a lot cheaper to blow the building up and scoop out the dirt. Mr. McCarthy commented that this is very doable for a purchaser if they can get it at a price that the seller agrees to. He advised that there is no avenue to help other than accepting an application from the new purchaser to assist in the initial clean up.

In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy advised that the City Bank building is being offered for sale at \$2.1 million. Mr. McCarthy advised that the Copeland lumber building is in serious negotiations regarding its disposal. However, financing is dismal. For commercial loans, even the most quality applicants cannot get financing for any commercial project. It was listed for \$2.6 million based on a 2006 appraisal and there was a cash offer on the table for \$2 million which was turned down.

Chairperson Williamson called for any further matters and when there were none,

**H. ADJOURNMENT** - Member Valenti moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

The Minutes of the February 11, 2009 Carson City Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee meeting are so approved this 6<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2009.

ROBIN L. WILLIAMSON, Chairperson

\*Minutes transcribed by Jano Barnhurst