

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 28, 2005 Meeting

Page 1

A meeting of the Carson City Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 28, 2005 in the City Hall Capitol Conference Room, 201 North Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Robin Williamson
Vice Chairperson Sally Zola
Jed Block
Stan Jones
Janice Shafer
Gigi Valenti
Jim Wallace

STAFF: Joe McCarthy, Economic Development / Redevelopment Manager

NOTE: A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and is available for review during regular business hours.

A. CALL TO ORDER, DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (1-0012) - Chairperson Williamson called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Vice Chairperson Zola arrived at 5:40 p.m. Members Bruce and Cowan were absent.

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDIZED ITEMS (1-0017) - None.

C. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - November 10, 2004 (1-0022) - Motion was made, seconded, and carried unanimously to approve the minutes.

D. REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE:

D-1. DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ON A SPENDING PLAN FOR THE UNSPENT BOND PROCEEDS, CRITERIA TO EVALUATE REDEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE APPLICATIONS, AND OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS PERTAINING TO THE REDEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAM FOR REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA NUMBER ONE (1-0034) - Mr. McCarthy distributed to the Committee members information regarding the Truckee Meadows Livable Communities Lecture Series, and provided an overview of the same.

Mr. McCarthy distributed the incentive program criteria, and provided an overview of the same. Member Jones related details of a conversation with Supervisor Pete Livermore regarding the unspent bond proceeds. In response to a question, Chairperson Williamson suggested that this Committee make recommendations to the Redevelopment Authority based on knowledge of the downtown and the projects being presented. The Redevelopment Authority has the prerogative to change the recommendations. In response to a further question, Chairperson Williamson provided background information regarding the figure set aside for the parking garage. Discussion took place with regard to direction provided by the Board of Supervisors. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy explained there was no requirement to construct a parking garage when the bonds were issued. The understanding was to use the bond proceeds for a variety of capital improvement programs, including a proposal to partner with the State to construct

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 28, 2005 Meeting

Page 2

a parking garage on the site behind Citibank. The State rejected the proposal, so there is no partner. The Board of Supervisors has provided direction for this Committee to present a spending plan “because things have changed.” Member Valenti expressed the opinion that a parking garage doesn’t belong on the west side of town, nor should funding for any parking garage be allocated from redevelopment. She recommended removing the parking garage from consideration “because it’s not feasible.” Member Wallace concurred.

Member Shafer suggested investing in a revolving loan program. Mr. McCarthy cautioned that income cannot be earned on bond proceeds, but offered to research the possibility. Discussion took place with regard to the same and with regard to the Legislature’s recent action to cap property taxes. Member Valenti expressed concern over awarding incentive funding without having any input into the appearance of a project. Chairperson Williamson advised the Committee would have to become involved in the Downtown Design Review process. Discussion took place with regard to personal property taxes.

Mr. McCarthy suggested making a recommendation to divide the remaining bond proceeds between downtown improvements, new construction projects, and ongoing rehabilitation of existing properties. Developing criteria by which applications will be evaluated and awarded may provide the opportunity to accomplish more projects. Member Jones suggested reducing the maximum award amount to 15% of the total project costs, and discussion took place with regard to the same. Mr. McCarthy advised that the redevelopment incentive program resolution was rewritten in 2001 to allow for larger incentives. He provided an example. Discussion took place with regard to maintenance, and consensus of the Committee was that the City, and not redevelopment, should fund maintenance.

In response to a question, Member Wallace discussed the importance of assessing the direction of the incentive program. He suggested reviewing the existing incentive program guidelines, and noted there are guidelines which are simply not followed. He suggested tying the existing guidelines to a framework in consideration of how the downtown should look once the freeway bypass is complete, and presenting the Board of Supervisors with a spending plan which reflects “something based on reality.” In response to a further question, Member Wallace commented that the freeway bypass represents an historic opportunity. He expressed support for framing the approach around the available funding. He expressed opposition to denying applications based on the amount of funding an applicant may have available. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy and Chairperson Williamson reviewed potential redevelopment projects. Discussion took place with regard to the same. Mr. McCarthy noted that redevelopment has only invested in approximately one-third of the 90-100 downtown projects. Of the approximately \$2 million in redevelopment funding invested, \$30 million has been generated.

Member Wallace suggested that Carson Street should become a priority once the freeway bypass is completed. He further suggested that planning for what Carson Street will look like will generate a “ripple effect” for some of the surrounding undeveloped properties. Mr. McCarthy described the visioning process being conducted by Jeff Winston & Associates as part of the citywide master plan update. He anticipates the process will begin in the fall after the project is approved through the Capital Improvement Projects process. He responded to questions regarding the visioning process. Member Wallace suggested that the Redevelopment Authority should pay for the visioning process in order to fast track it. Discussion took place with regard to the same, and Member Valenti suggested that the visioning process will assist in developing the criteria for the incentive program.

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 28, 2005 Meeting

Page 3

Mr. McCarthy responded to questions and provided historic information on development of the existing incentive program criteria. Member Valenti discussed the potential of the area surrounding the existing Carson-Tahoe Hospital. Member Jones expressed appreciation for Member Wallace's comments with regard to Main Street. He anticipates that Main Street will change once Fairview Drive is expanded to four lanes. He expressed the opinion that the focus should be on improving downtown infrastructure, including the V&T. Vice Chairperson Zola expressed a concern with regard to reducing the maximum incentive program award in consideration of the need for some developers to obtain bank loans. Member Block suggested granting incentive funding incrementally based on the total amount requested. Mr. McCarthy expressed concern with regard to appearing arbitrary. Member Wallace noted that better decisions result from more time spent considering projects. He requested that applications and their accompanying materials be submitted to the Committee members at least thirty days in advance. Member Jones expressed support for applicants making presentations at one meeting and the Committee taking action at the next meeting. Discussion took place with regard to the same, and consensus of the Committee was to require the application materials at least four weeks in advance and to take appropriate action at the first public hearing unless special circumstances warrant prolonging the decision. Mr. McCarthy agreed to add appropriate language to the application materials.

Discussion took place with regard to this Committee being involved in the Downtown Design Review process, and consensus of the Committee was to leave this to the Planning and Community Development Division. In response to a comment, consensus of the Committee was to recommend that the Board of Supervisors not save money for a parking garage. The Committee members agreed on the need to continue to be involved in parking issues and decisions. Mr. McCarthy responded to questions regarding the Stewart Street extension project. Chairperson Williamson related details of her conversation with Parking Officer Technician Frank Rahm for the benefit of Vice Chairperson Zola and Member Block. Discussion took place with regard to way-finding signage.

Member Valenti suggested recommending that the Board of Supervisors earmark approximately \$300,000 of the \$1 million for infrastructure, signs, sidewalks, more lighting, etc. She further suggested recommending allocation of sufficient funding, \$100,000 to \$300,000 for "one block a year" thereafter. The Committee members concurred. Mr. McCarthy advised of a meeting, earlier in the day, with Senior Projects Manager Robb Fellows, who suggested replacing the gas lamps with the new white light technology. Member Valenti further suggested allocating \$400,000 toward small projects, and allocating the remaining funding to large projects. She discussed the importance of communicating to the Board of Supervisors the need to require maintenance of downtown infrastructure from the City's general fund, not redevelopment. The Committee members concurred, and Mr. McCarthy advised he would develop a presentation for the April Committee meeting. He acknowledged that \$100,000 in Capital Improvement Projects funding had been requested for the coming fiscal year.

In response to a question, consensus of the Committee was to support the incentive program relative criteria and to do away with the proposed rankings. Member Shafer suggested that the Committee members evaluate the relative criteria of each application individually. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy advised that applications which do not meet the mandatory criteria are never submitted to the Committee. Discussion took place to revise the relative criteria questions. Member Shafer suggested utilizing the same criteria to address parking waiver applications. [Chairperson Williamson recessed the meeting in order to allow Mr. McCarthy time to revise the relative criteria.] Mr. McCarthy distributed, to the Committee members, the revised relative criteria.

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 28, 2005 Meeting

Page 4

D-2. ACTION REGARDING REDEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE FUNDING REQUEST BY JOYCE HARRINGTON, OWNER / PROPRIETOR, FOR THE BLISS BUNGALOW, 408 WEST ROBINSON STREET (1-2332) - Mr. McCarthy provided background information on this item. Ms. Harrington responded to questions regarding cost overruns for the porch. She acknowledged that the project is proceeding, and anticipates it will be complete by the summer of 2005. Mr. McCarthy reviewed the incentive funding request. Ms. Harrington advised of an upcoming meeting with the Historic Resources Commission to discuss demolition of the garage structure. She described exterior work to be completed, including sidewalks, brick work, landscape, and installation of the handicap lift. Mr. McCarthy explained, to Ms. Harrington, the process by which the Committee members would evaluate the application.

Member Valenti expressed the opinion that the project meets all the relative criteria with the exceptions that the property is not along Carson Street and the project is not new construction. She assigned a high ranking to all the other relative criteria. Chairperson Williamson agreed. Member Shafer expressed the opinion that the project did not fully meet all the relative criteria and, therefore, deducted \$12,000 from the requested \$48,000. At Ms. Harrington's request, she reviewed the criteria which were not fully met. Discussion took place with regard to whether the project will generate pedestrian traffic. Member Wallace agreed the project does not meet all the criteria, but "comes close to everything." He indicated no problem with awarding the requested incentive amount because, when Ms. Harrington applied, "those were her expectations." He expressed reservation with regard to penalizing Ms. Harrington based on the fact that the Committee revised the relative criteria at this meeting. Vice Chairperson Zola agreed. Mr. McCarthy advised that this Committee has not consistently always awarded 20% of project costs. Members Valenti and Jones responded to questions regarding the reasons for requesting Ms. Harrington to return to the Committee following her presentation at the March 9th meeting. The Committee members discussed their project rankings.

Ms. Harrington acknowledged that the Bliss Bungalow will be marketed via the Internet. Member Jones expressed agreement with Member Wallace's comments. **Member Jones moved to award the \$48,000. Vice Chairperson Zola seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.** Mr. McCarthy advised that the Committee's recommendation would be presented to the Redevelopment Authority, that funding awards are allocated on a reimbursement basis, and that the property owner is required to sign a declining lien.

Mr. McCarthy clarified the wording of the relative criteria item associated with new construction projects. Vice Chairperson Zola offered formatting and language suggestions.

D-3. ACTION REGARDING REDEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE FUNDING REQUEST BY BRET ANDREAS, STATE FARM INSURANCE, FOR THE OFFICE EXPANSION/ RENOVATION AND IMPROVEMENT UPGRADES TO THE PROPERTY AT 810 NORTH NEVADA STREET (1-2802) - Don Smit provided background information on the project, and reviewed the incentive program application. Discussion took place with regard to the incentive funding request. Mr. McCarthy discussed the efforts of the property owners to locate in the downtown area. Member Jones noted the project improved two corners. The Committee members commended Mr. Smit on the project. Mr. Smit acknowledged that the sidewalks on Nevada Street were completely redone, and that 60% of the sidewalks fronting the property on Washington Street were redone.

The Committee members ranked the project. Member Valenti expressed the opinion that the project did not meet all the relative criteria, but expressed support for approving the request based on the fact that the

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY CITIZENS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the March 28, 2005 Meeting

Page 5

applicants requested less than the 20% maximum. **Member Valenti moved to fund the \$38,058.36. Member Block seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.** Mr. McCarthy advised that the Committee's recommendation would be forwarded to the Redevelopment Authority. He requested Mr. Smit's attendance at the Board of Supervisors meeting, and advised he would be notified of the date.

E. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (1-3122) - Vice Chairperson Zola moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Valenti seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

The Minutes of the March 28, 2005 meeting of the Carson City Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee are so approved this 25th day of October, 2005.

ROBIN L. WILLIAMSON, Chair