

Clark County Redevelopment Agency

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

TICK SEGERBLOM
Chair
JUSTIN JONES
Vice Chair
JAMES B. GIBSON
MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK
WILLIAM MCCURDY II
ROSS MILLER
MICHAEL NAFT

COMMISSION CHAMBERS, GOVERNMENT CENTER
500 SOUTH GRAND CENTRAL PARKWAY
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2021

The Redevelopment Agency of Clark County, Nevada met in the first session in full conformity with law and bylaws of said Board, meeting in the Commission Chambers, Government Center, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada on Tuesday, the 21st day of September 2021 at the hour of 9:00 a.m. The meeting was called to order at the hour of 10:30 a.m. by Commissioner Kirkpatrick and, on roll call, the following members were present, constituting all of the members thereof:

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS:

Marilyn Kirkpatrick
Jim Gibson
Justin Jones
William McCurdy II
Ross Miller
Michael Naft
Tick Segerblom

Also Present:

Yolanda T. King, County Manager
Mary-Anne Miller, Deputy District Attorney
Lynn Marie Goya, County Clerk
Jewel Gooden, Assistant Clerk, BCC
Keri Miller, Deputy Clerk

Commissioner Miller was present via teleconference.

INVOCATION

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEM NO. 1. Public Comment

At this time, Commissioner Kirkpatrick asked if there were any persons present in the audience wishing to be heard on any items on the agenda as posted.

SPEAKER(S): Present

Margaret Ann Coleman spoke regarding areas of concern including Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA); arsenic and lead poisoning in the water; housing; discrimination; and homelessness.

Magaliene Enyard spoke regarding topics including equal and civil rights; and the redevelopment of the building where the first black casino was located.

Lorena Cardenas spoke regarding free speech.

There being no other persons present in the audience wishing to be heard on any items on the agenda as posted, Commissioner Kirkpatrick closed the public comments.

ITEM NO. 2. Approval of Agenda with the Inclusion of Any Emergency Items and Deletion of Any Items. (For possible action)

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Jim Gibson that the agenda be approved as recommended.

On roll call, motion carried by the following vote:

Voting Aye:	Marilyn Kirkpatrick Jim Gibson Justin Jones William McCurdy II Ross Miller Michael Naft Tick Segerblom
Voting Nay:	None
Absent:	None
Abstain:	None

ITEM NO. 3. Designate a Chair and a Vice-Chair for the Clark County Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors. (For possible action)

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Jim Gibson that the recommendation (including the appointment of Tick Segerblom being named Chair and Justin Jones being named Vice-Chair) be approved.

On roll call, motion carried by the following vote:

Voting Aye:	Marilyn Kirkpatrick Jim Gibson Justin Jones William McCurdy II Ross Miller Michael Naft Tick Segerblom
Voting Nay:	None
Absent:	None
Abstain:	None

ITEM NO. 4. Appoint the Clark County Manager/Chief Executive Officer as the Executive Director/Chief Executive Officer for the Clark County Redevelopment Agency and authorize them or their designee to conduct any and all necessary business for the day-to-day operation of the agency. (For possible action)

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Jim Gibson that the recommendation (including the appointment of the Clark County Manager/Chief Executive Officer as the Executive Director/Chief Executive Officer) be approved.

On roll call, motion carried by the following vote:

Voting Aye:	Marilyn Kirkpatrick Jim Gibson Justin Jones William McCurdy II Ross Miller Michael Naft Tick Segerblom
Voting Nay:	None
Absent:	None
Abstain:	None

ITEM NO. 5. Receive a report on the Clark County Redevelopment Agency's three existing redevelopment areas. (For possible action)

DOCUMENT(S) SUBMITTED:

1. Evaluation of Redevelopment Areas (4 pages) submitted by staff
2. RDA Overview and Profiles (21 pages) submitted by staff

DISCUSSION: Following introduction of the item, the Board received a report

from Shani Coleman, Director of Community and Economic Development, regarding the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS 279.519) which dictates how redevelopment agencies are created; redevelopment area evaluation requirements included at least 75 percent of the land in the proposed area must be improved, can include both private and publicly owned land and improvements, not required to be contiguous to another redevelopment area, must be a regular shape with easily visible ground features, can be redeveloped in conformity with the redevelopment goals and in the interest of peace, health, safety, and welfare, and the proposed area was determined to be blighted; blight was a legal term defined by NRS 279.388; and advised that a blight study was conducted to determine if an area met at least four of the eleven characteristics to satisfy the criteria to be labeled as blighted.

The Board was addressed by Brian Gordon, with Applied Analysis, who presented a report on an overview and profile of the County's three existing redevelopment areas (RDA).

Brian Gordon discussed the locations for the three areas as: RDA 1 was in Winchester Township between Las Vegas Boulevard and Maryland Parkway, and held the most taxable value at approximately \$3 billion; RDA 2 was located on the southwest corner of Maryland Parkway and Desert Inn Road, across the street from the Boulevard Mall; and RDA 3 was located in Sunrise Manor east of Boulder Highway, at the intersection of Boulder Highway and Sahara Avenue.

Brian Gordon described the areas as: RDA 1 encompassed approximately 255 acres including the Las Vegas Festival Grounds, Sahara Hotel and Casino Las Vegas, timeshares, high-rise condos, multifamily residential properties, and two potential development projects; RDA 2 encompassed approximately 18.5 acres with multiple owners of commercial establishments with disjointed development; a commercial corridor with retail shops and strip malls, financial institutions, the former Maryland Square, and the JobConnect office for the Department of Employment, Training, and Rehabilitation; and RDA 3 encompassed approximately 33 acres including an apartment complex, convenience store and gas station, boat and recreational vehicle storage business, and a large vacant commercial building.

Brian Gordon discussed the demographic profiles of the areas as: RDA 1 consisted of approximately 3,000 people residing within approximately 1,600 households, the average household size was smaller at approximately 1.8, the median age was higher than the overall average, and the median income was slightly lower than the County as a whole; RDA 2 was defined as exclusively commercial without residents; and RDA 3 consisted of a single multifamily residential rental property with a population of 477 residents within approximately 250 households, had a younger demographic when compared to RDA 1, with lower incomes than the broader average with approximately one out of five people living below the poverty level.

The Board was then advised of the comparison of owners versus renters: RDA 1

contained a mix of renter-occupied and owner-occupied units, with approximately 60 percent being renter-occupied, which was slightly higher than the overall average in Southern Nevada; RDA 3 consisted of a single apartment community, with 100 percent being renter-occupied.

Brian Gordon compared the educational attainment of the areas: RDA 1 consisted of a higher education with approximately 40 percent of people earning a Bachelor's degree or higher; and RDA 3 consisted of a slightly lower educational attainment level when compared to the broader average.

The Board was advised of the race and ethnicity metrics within each area: RDA 1 was similar to the broader Southern Nevada market in terms of the demographic breakout; and RDA 3 was more Hispanic and Latino.

In response to Commissioner Segerblom, Shani Coleman advised that the three RDAs were established in 2003.

ACTION: No action was taken by the Board.

[Attachment] [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment] [Meeting Handout 092121 RDA Item No. 5 \(1\).pdf](#)

[Attachment] [Meeting Handout 092121 RDA Item No. 5 \(2\).pdf](#)

ITEM NO. 6. Receive a report on the Clark County Redevelopment Agency's FY22 Budget. (For possible action)

DOCUMENT(S) SUBMITTED:

1. Clark County Redevelopment Agency FY2022 Budget (11 pages) submitted by staff

DISCUSSION: Following introduction of the item, the Board was addressed by Jeff Share, Director of Budget and Financial Planning, who advised that the finance department submitted a budget on behalf of the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) per Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 354; the "Base Year Valuation," or the assessed values of parcels within the redevelopment areas, were established as of July 1, 2003; an "increment" is the change in the current assessed values within the RDA compared to the Base Year Valuation; a positive change in increment would generate revenue credited to the RDA; a negative change in increment would reduce the year's revenue, the RDA receives no revenue in a fiscal year in which the current assessed values fall below the Base Year Valuation (which occurred in Paradise Town in FY2012, FY2014, and FY2015; the Base Year Assessed Valuation for Paradise Town was set at \$5.2 million; the Base Year Assessed Valuation for Sunrise Manor Town was set at approximately \$7.8 million; and the Base Year Assessed Valuation for Winchester Town was set at \$264.6 million; the total Base Year Assessed Valuation for the three towns was \$277.7 million, the FY2022 Assessed Values total was \$921.8 million, resulting in a total increment of \$644.1 million; the property tax bill created from the \$644.1 million resulted in approximately \$26 thousand tax dollars which will be generated from Paradise Town and Sunrise Manor Town combined, and \$7.6

million tax dollars generated from Winchester Town; the FY2022 Budget had a property tax revenue of \$7.63 million plus interest earnings for a total of \$7.88 million in revenue to be spent throughout the year; the FY2022 projected cash flow was \$7.63 million; and interest earnings would be based on the amount of cash collected by the Treasurer during each tax installment.

In response to Commissioner Segerblom, Jeff Share advised that the taxes were collected in four installments, some people pay taxes in full at the beginning of the year which accounts for the varying amounts collected during each installment throughout the year, and some people do not pay their taxes resulting in a delinquency and less interest than anticipated; and further advised that staff was exploring bonds for future redevelopment.

Discussion was held by Commissioner Kirkpatrick, Shani Coleman, Director of Community and Economic Development, and Jeff Share regarding that funds were based on real property tax, gaming properties may be included as determined by a policy decision by the Board, and redevelopment bonds will be brought before the Debt Management Commission per NRS 350.

ACTION: No action was taken by the Board.

[Attachment] [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment] [Meeting Handout 092121 RDA Item No. 6.pdf](#)

ITEM NO. 7.

Receive a report on changes made to community redevelopment law NRS 279 during the 2021 Legislative session that impact the Clark County Redevelopment Agency. (For possible action)

DISCUSSION: Following introduction of the item, Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, advised of changes to NRS 279 to provide the Board with the same powers and duties as local cities including permitting the Redevelopment Agency to operate for 45 years; and to adopt a procedural ordinance to govern how the Board does work as the Redevelopment Agency.

ACTION: No action was taken by the Board.

[Attachment] [Staff Report](#)

ITEM NO. 8.

Discuss potential projects for the reactivated Clark County Redevelopment Agency and direct staff on next steps to be taken. (For possible action)

DISCUSSION: Following introduction of the item, discussion was held regarding potential and additional redevelopment areas, blight study, public outreach, tools for change, and an ordinance to increase the life of the agency.

Staff was directed to draft an ordinance to extend the life of the Redevelopment Agency to forty-five years.

ACTION: No action was taken by the Board.

[Attachment] [Staff Report](#)

[Attachment] [Meeting Handout 092121 RDA Item No. 8.pdf](#)

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Comments by the General Public

At this time, Chair Segerblom asked if there were any persons present in the audience wishing to be heard on any items not listed on the agenda as posted.

SPEAKER(S): Present

Margaret Ann Coleman expressed concerns regarding topics including respect.

James Butler Junior spoke regarding redevelopment areas, improvements, and funding.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, at the hour of 11:19 a.m., Chair Segerblom recessed the meeting for the Board of County Commissioners agenda.

APPROVED:

/s/ Tick Segerblom

TICK SEGERBLOM, CHAIR

ATTEST:

/s/ Lynn Marie Goya

LYNN MARIE GOYA, COUNTY CLERK