

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Redevelopment Authority was held during the regularly scheduled Carson City Board of Supervisors meeting of Thursday, October 21, 1993, held at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, which began at 9 a.m.

PRESENT: Tom Tatro Chairperson
Marv Teixeira
Greg Smith
Janice Ayres
Kay Bennett

STAFF PRESENT: John Berkich City Manager
Mary Walker Redevelopment Director
Paul Lipparelli Deputy District Attorney
Katherine McLaughlin Recording Secretary
(B.O.S. 10/21/93 Tape 1-3135)

Mayor Teixeira recessed the Board of Supervisors session and passed the gavel to Chairperson Tatro, who immediately convened the Redevelopment Authority. Chairperson Tatro indicated for the record that the entire Authority was present constituting a quorum. (See Board of Supervisors Minutes of October 21, 1993, for discussion/action on the other Agenda items.)

A. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - September 2, 1993 (1-3165) - Member Teixeira moved to approve. Member Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

B. REDEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR - Mary Walker - ACTION ON APPROVAL OF IMPLEMENTATION OF REDEVELOPMENT SEISMIC RETROFIT PLAN AND INCENTIVES PROGRAM (1-3175) - Clarification by Ms. Walker indicated the need for Board direction and approval in concept of a program to look for methods which would address the Conservation Code requirements for seismic improvements. Her introduction included a history of the UBC and Conservation Code adoption by the Board, impacts the Conservation Code was having on the downtown revitalization program, Mel Greene's experience in this field, and his suggestions which would modify the Code. Chairperson Tatro noted Mr. Greene's role in reopening the State Museum. Member Teixeira also noted the difference between the original improvement costs and Mr. Greene's program. Ms. Walker outlined the Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee discussion on this issue and the creditability issue which was encountered as a result of the seismic requirements. Discussion between the Board and Ms. Walker included adoption procedures for the Conservation Code, public safety issues, Code modification procedures, potential options, impact change in uses have on Code requirements, (2-0415) Ms. Walker's recommendations and costs, potential State and Federal grants, and justification for the request to identify the unreinforced masonry structures.

(2-0592) Mainstreet Chairperson and Cactus Jack's owner Steve Brown supported the merits of the plan and retention of Mel Greene. He recommended identification of the unreinforced masonry buildings, however, urged the City to also study areas where seismic retrofit programs were not required. He felt that, as the expert in seismic retrofit, Mr. Greene would not present alternatives to the program. Chamber of Commerce Executive Director Larry Osborne explained his feeling that the downtown guidelines had been adopted after several workshops and with the commitment that seismic retrofit would be eliminated. Based on the presentation that other communities do not require seismic retrofits, he urged the Board to research their programs. His comments also included the allegation that City staff had deliberately attempted to gain governmental implementation of a program which would not have been gained through negotiation. He supported inventorying the buildings and retention of Mr. Greene. Once the inventory is completed, a careful analysis of the options may provide a method to address both the citizen's safety and health issues and allow for economic development of the downtown district

as well as the entire community.

Discussion among the Board and Ms. Walker noted the liability concerns if a building should fall during a seismic event and the need for the building inventory. Mr. Lipparelli then outlined the City's options when adopting the UBC, Conservation Code, etc. Amendments could be made to these Codes. Redevelopment's powers to make exceptions to the Building Codes were also outlined. These exceptions could be granted without having to amend the Code. Granting of exceptions, however, would make different rules for different areas of the community. He supported retention of Mr. Greene as his report may analyze these issues. Member Smith supported Ms. Walker's recommendations one and two but felt that a careful analysis should be undertaken before three is funded. If a project is going to be delayed or "killed" by the Conservation Code, it should be brought to the Authority for consideration of Mr. Lipparelli's comments. Ms. Walker felt the issues would be back to the Authority by December.

(2-1075) John Copoulos outlined his personal experience with Mr. Greene including a seminar he had conducted at the Brewery. He encouraged the Board to bring Mr. Greene back for another seminar which could address some of the "misconceptions" presented during this hearing. As Mr. Greene had written the UBC on seismic retrofits, he did not feel that he would support total elimination of those requirements. He then elaborated on his support for the retrofits based on the liability concerns. Phasing the improvements could be considered. He, too, was concerned about Ms. Walker's recommendation No. 3 as it merely spent money on more studies and not for bricks and mortar. He then outlined the study Mr. Greene had done at the Brewery and his costs. He was concerned that Redevelopment was "frittering away little bits of money and not getting an end result from it".

Ms. Walker explained that the preliminary study would define the building problems. The inventory would establish which buildings were unreinforced masonry. Projects are being halted when the Building Department requires an engineering study. If Redevelopment assists in this study, the projects would continue. Clarification indicated that only the Pony Express building may be coming forward for consideration under the incentive program. The seismic issues should be resolved by December. Member Smith then outlined his support for Ms. Walker's recommendations one and two. Member Smith then moved that the Board direct staff to proceed with the implementation of the Redevelopment Seismic Retrofit plan and incentives program as amended, the plan to include Item No. 1 for a total cost of \$2500, Item No. 2, for a total cost of \$1500, and Item No. 4 for a total cost of \$4,000; funding source to be Redevelopment Funds. Clarification indicated the augmentation would be considered at a future meeting. Member Teixeira seconded the motion. Ms. Walker requested the funding for Item No. 1 be amended due to the need to hold workshops. Member Smith amended his motion to reflect that funding for Item No. 1 was \$3500, Item No. 2 remained at \$1500 for a total cost of \$5000. An augmentation would be returned to the Authority for consideration at a future meeting. Member Teixeira continued his second. He then elaborated on his concern about the Authority/Board acting on items in which the ramifications are not fully detailed. He felt it was staff's duty to inform the Board of all the ramifications. The motion to approve Items No. 1, 2, and 4 of Ms. Walker's program at a total funding cost of \$5000 carried 5-0.

BREAK: A five minute recess was declared at 11:15 a.m. When the meeting reconvened at 11:20 a.m. The entire Authority was present constituting a quorum.

There being no other matters for consideration by the Authority, Member Teixeira moved adjourn. Member Smith seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

The Minutes of the October 21, 1993, Carson City Redevelopment Authority meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON ____December_2____, 1993.

/s/ _____
Tom Tatro, Chairperson

ATTEST

/s/ _____
Kiyoshi Nishikawa, Clerk-Recorder