

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 1

DRAFT

A meeting of the Carson City Redevelopment Authority was held during the regularly scheduled Board of Supervisors meeting, on Thursday, October 21, 2010 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Robin Williamson
Vice Chairperson Shelly Aldean
Member Robert Crowell
Member Pete Livermore
Member Molly Walt

STAFF: Larry Werner, City Manager
Alan Glover, Clerk - Recorder
Randal Munn, Chief Deputy District Attorney
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the Redevelopment Authority's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the Clerk during the meeting are part of the public record. These materials are available for review, in the Clerk's Office, during regular business hours.

14. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL (9:29:56) - Chairperson Williamson called the meeting to order at 9:29 a.m., noting the presence of a quorum.

15. ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - May 17, 2010; July 1, 2010; and July 15, 2010 (9:30:04) - Vice Chairperson Aldean moved to adopt the minutes, as presented. Member Livermore seconded the motion. Chairperson Williamson entertained public comment and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote on the pending motion. Motion carried 5-0.

16. OFFICE OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

16(A) ACTION TO APPROVE AND RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE EXPENDITURE OF \$22,500 FROM THE REVOLVING FUND FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY TO SUPPORT THIS YEAR'S CARSON CITY CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU PROMOTION AND PRODUCTION OF THE MANY GHOST WALK EVENTS, INCLUDING A NEW EVENT, "FRIENDS IN LOW PLACES," THE LONE MOUNTAIN CEMETERY TOUR SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 2010; THESE EXPENSES ARE INCIDENTAL TO CARRYING OUT THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN (9:30:49) - Business Development Manager Joe McCarthy introduced this item, and reviewed the agenda materials. (9:33:12) Carson City Convention and Visitors Bureau Executive Director Candace Duncan distributed event information to the Board members and staff, provided background information on the Ghost Walk event, and reviewed this year's scheduled events. She reviewed changes to accommodate a Saturday evening Ghost Walk event "through the summer," and discussed the involvement of the Bruka Theatre Company. She expressed appreciation for the opportunity to be involved in the Ghost Walk events that have "had such a long history here in Carson City," and the hope that "we can continue to do that." She acknowledged that the requested \$22,500 would cover the October 2010 event as well as those planned for the spring / summer of 2011. She responded to questions of clarification relative to the budget information included in the agenda materials.

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 2

DRAFT

In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy advised that Lone Mountain Cemetery is not within the redevelopment district boundaries. In response to a further question, he discussed the purpose of the Ghost Walk events, including the Lone Mountain Cemetery tour, to “bring tourists to town and people ... to our redevelopment district to add value to the district.” He expressed the opinion that “the spill from the activity is the whole point of the activity; to generate activity within the redevelopment district to support our businesses.” Ms. Duncan explained the purpose of scheduling the “Friends in Low Places” event on the Friday Night preceding the Ghost Walk event to draw visitors to Carson City to spend the night. She advised that one of the lodging properties offered “a great rate to go along with that.” She acknowledged out-of-area patrons of the Ghost Walk events. Discussion followed, and Vice Chairperson Aldean acknowledged that, although the cemetery is not in the redevelopment district, “the cemetery tour is a precursor to the Ghost Walk ... and there is a nexus there.” She advised that redevelopment law provides for the lawful use of redevelopment funds to benefit areas adjacent to, but not specifically within, the redevelopment district. In response to a question, Mr. Munn referenced NRS 279 which “talks about the immediate neighborhood and ... this would qualify.”

Chairperson Williamson entertained additional Redevelopment Authority member and public comments. When none were forthcoming, she entertained a motion. **Vice Chairperson Aldean moved to approve and recommend to the Board of Supervisors the approval of the expenditure of \$22,500 from the revolving fund for the Redevelopment Agency to support this year’s Carson City Convention and Visitors Bureau promotion and production of the many Ghost Walk events, including a new event, “Friends in Low Places,” the Lone Mountain Cemetery tour, scheduled for October 2010; these expenses are incidental to carrying out the redevelopment plan. Member Walt seconded the motion.** Member Crowell disclosed that his law office is part of the Ghost Walk, but advised of no financial benefit. Chairperson Williamson called again for public comment; however, none was forthcoming. Ms. Duncan acknowledged that the Ghost Walk event is nearly 20 years old. Chairperson Williamson noted the success of the event, but advised it has never “broken even. ... There’s always been a subsidy from the Redevelopment Authority ... because ... it had a value to our community and our downtown and redevelopment district.” Chairperson Williamson called for a vote on the pending motion; **motion carried 5-0.** Ms. Duncan thanked the Redevelopment Authority and invited everyone’s participation.

Chairperson Williamson advised that the subject request was previously presented to the Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee (“RACC”) and approved. In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy explained the delay between the subject item being heard by the RACC in August and agendizing this item before the Redevelopment Authority was to “work through the budget to make sure that we had the funds for the particular agenda items that are in front of you today.”

16(B) ACTION TO APPROVE AND RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE EXPENDITURE OF \$5,000 FROM THE REVOLVING FUND FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY TO SUPPORT THE CAPITAL CITY ARTS INITIATIVE, AS AN EXPENSE INCIDENTAL TO CARRYING OUT THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN (9:43:55) - Mr. McCarthy provided background information on the Capital City Arts Initiative, introduced Arts Administrator Sharon Ross, and provided an overview of the agenda report. Ms. Ross narrated a SlideShow presentation on the Capital City Arts Initiative. Discussion took place regarding the significance of arts in the community. Mr. McCarthy acknowledged that the subject request was presented to the RACC in August and approved.

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 3

DRAFT

Chairperson Williamson entertained public comment and, when none was forthcoming, encouraged the citizens to visit the Business Resource Information Center and the Carson City Courthouse gallery. She entertained a motion. **Member Walt moved to approve and recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the expenditure of \$5,000 from the revolving fund for the Redevelopment Agency to support the Capital City Arts Initiative, as an expense incidental to carrying out the Redevelopment Plan. Member Crowell seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.** Ms. Ross thanked the Redevelopment Authority.

16(C) ACTION TO APPROVE AND RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE EXPENDITURE OF \$2,500 FROM THE REVOLVING FUND FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY TO SUPPORT SIERRA NEVADA BALLET 2010 PEANUTCRAKER, AS AN EXPENSE INCIDENTAL TO CARRYING OUT THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN (10:03:57) - Chairperson Williamson introduced this item, and Mr. McCarthy advised that this item had been presented to and approved by the RACC at their August meeting. He introduced Sierra Nevada Ballet Artistic Director Rosine Bena, who reviewed the application included in the agenda materials. (10:05:10) Ms. Bena provided background information on Sierra Nevada Ballet and development of the Peanutcracker.

Chairperson Williamson entertained Redevelopment Authority member and public comments and, when none were forthcoming, a motion. **Member Walt moved to approve and recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the expenditure of \$2,500 from the revolving fund for the Redevelopment Agency to support Sierra Nevada Ballet 2010 Peanutcracker, as an expense incidental to carrying out the redevelopment plan. Vice Chairperson Aldean seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

16(D) ACTION TO APPROVE AND RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF AN AMENDED AND RESTATED OPERATING COVENANT AND AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND THE CITY OF CARSON CITY AND CARSON SOUTHGATE, LLC (10:09:44) - Vice Chairperson Aldean advised of a financial interest in Carson Southgate, LLC, stepped from the dais and left the meeting room. A quorum of the Redevelopment Authority was still present. Mr. McCarthy introduced this item, and narrated a PowerPoint presentation, copies of which were provided for the record. In response to a question, he recommended that the Redevelopment Authority participate “at a 50 percent level in the building which would yield ... a 70 / 30 split participation going forward.” He advised that Robert Rothe would explain “the constraints ... relative to his renewed bank financing and our ability to do this deal.”

(10:27:40) Mr. Rothe provided background information on the proposed participation agreement. He advised that the recommended 50 percent participation “just on the revenues generated on that building with a 70 / 30 split is ... very close to identical to what we had with the participation agreement for Sportsmen’s Warehouse. That is consistent with ... the way we had structured it prior.” Mr. Rothe commended Mr. McCarthy’s presentation, noting “obviously, this is Plan B. We had Plan A which was Sportsmen’s Warehouse but, with the bankruptcy, that brought that to a conclusion. So then we were back to the drawing board to recreate this in a very difficult financial market.” Mr. Rothe commented on his practice to “see it through to the end,” once involved in a project. He advised of having lost “significant dollars” over the first four years of the project, and doesn’t anticipate any “significant change” over the next two to three years. He further advised that the City’s participation is critical in consideration of project financing. “We just renewed that project financing. ... In order to do that, the participation agreement that

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 4

DRAFT

we had with Sportsmen's Warehouse was shown as the basis by which we would be more than likely going forward with the City and coming to a solution to this problem." Mr. Rothe advised that financing was renewed, as of last July, which will allow the project to be completed "provided that we can get all of this put together."

With regard to the Sportsmen's Warehouse transaction, Mr. Rothe advised of restrictions for development of the "out parcel," and "so we were relying on the revenue stream being generated by Sportsmen's. And that worked fine, based on our projections of what they would do. We set this up originally with ... 57 point-something percent participation by our company, the shopping center development, and 40 percent with the City. But we ... clearly expected that to be dramatically higher than that so it would end up getting closer to 70 ... for the City and 30 for us with the projected sales that we really felt that Sportsmen's would do. We put a minimum on it, but we did project those sales that would be probably close to \$23 million. And we had information that showed that they were certainly doing that in their market in Reno, anticipated that this would be a very key market for them as well." Mr. Rothe explained that the "engine driving this deal today is really the pad site, the Olive Garden. So, now we find ourselves in a situation where it's kind of a reverse order. Before, the pad site really didn't amount to any significant potential dollars to the City. The actual in-line building was the future. And, now, I think we'll see just ... a reversal of that. So, as we structure this deal, it's interesting. It still works ... similar in that if we do it on a participation of 50 percent of the in-line building over a period of time to get to the dollar amount total that we were looking to, that comes in very close to what was projected originally for doing the Sportsmen's deal with our restriction and our cap. Now, with the Olive Garden out there, that will be almost a guarantee of those increased sales and the dollars to the City end up coming in just as we had structured it with Sportsmen's Warehouse."

Chairperson Williamson inquired as to an estimated number of jobs to be created by the project, both short-term and long-term. Mr. Rothe was uncertain as to the number of people who will be employed by the Olive Garden or the Big Lots store. He advised of Big 5 Sporting Goods intention to expand in Carson City, noting that their employment base "will stay here and probably expand as well." Mr. McCarthy advised that the Reno and Sparks Olive Garden Restaurants "generate between 45 and 50 ... full-time jobs and another 25 ... part-time jobs." He anticipates a number of management jobs at the Big Lots and Big 5 Sporting Goods stores.

Mr. McCarthy responded to questions of clarification relative to the figures presented in the agenda materials. Member Livermore commended Mr. Rothe on "staying the course." In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy reviewed details of the Burlington Coat Factory project, and Mr. Rothe provided additional clarification. Member Crowell thanked Mr. Rothe and his company for their investment in the community. In response to a question, Mr. Rothe advised that the lease between his company and Big Lots has been executed. The Big 5 lease is "at this point, standing by to be approved. We've created the fascia out in front there in anticipation that hopefully this will all come together. But, at this point, they are not signed. ... And the Olive Garden lease has been signed with the caveat and condition that it is conditioned upon completion of our Big 5 and their comfort that we have fulfilled our obligations on that building." Member Crowell inquired as to whether any of the leases are conditioned upon assistance from the City. Mr. Rothe stated, "We have not spelled that out in the leases. Obviously, it's our decision if we go forward or not. We have not conditioned those leases on that ... we didn't do it with the Sportsmen's transaction either. We were providing the opportunity for Sportsmen's to come here. That whole deal was predicated upon the participation agreement. But that was our relationship with Joe and myself and with the City so we did not condition our transaction on that because, in order for us to make the proposal, that's what we were

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 5

DRAFT

relying on was that participation agreement.” Mr. Rothe acknowledged that the existing leases are conditioned upon bank financing. “And that is probably the biggest factor in the equation. ... Our lender’s gone forward predicated upon the participation agreement as it was ... in the first original term of the lease. So ... really our financing is relying on the participation agreement. That is a key component of us being able to keep our lender in this project.” Member Crowell inquired as to whether the Olive Garden receives a benefit from the reduction of water and sewer connection fees. Mr. Rothe stated, “We don’t receive that benefit. There’s no participation on our side with that. They will be going into this so their investment costs to ... build their restaurant facility, though we’re providing a contribution to that, they will be doing it. So the benefit that they might get from that would be something that would be part of their decision-making processes as the costs to build the facility and to do this warranting their investment to go to this location. ... We won’t be participating or involved in that.” Member Crowell inquired as to whether the Olive Garden “figured that into their negotiation side of when they executed or entered into the lease ...” Mr. Rothe stated, “I have a feeling that they probably did because when they were negotiating the deal, they asked us specifically what those costs would be prior to signing the lease. In other words, what would it be for water and sewer connections and whatnot for them to go forward. After we had given them that answer, ... obviously, they moved forward from that point and eventually signed the lease which has our conditions in it.” Member Crowell inquired as to the figure provided for the water and sewer connection fee reduction. Mr. Rothe advised that Project Construction Manager Ed Shaw researched the water and sewer connection fees. “He got that information directly back to them as to what the costs would be. I don’t think Ed presented it in a form, ‘Gee, if you would have done this two years ago, it would have been this, but now you’re doing it this year so it’ll only be that.’ I think he just gave them the number.” Mr. McCarthy estimated a \$200,000 savings to the Olive Garden, and acknowledged this represents an incentive and stimulus to choose Carson City over other sites.

In response to a question, Mr. Rothe advised that the lender “has a dollar amount that they can qualify the property for based on a revenue stream and based on the value of the property. So, the participation agreement provides the revenue stream increment that is necessary for that to qualify for the financing that we have. So if that was removed, we would be below the level of the financing ... The lender, in this case, they’ve used the numbers, including the participation agreement with the 50 percent split on the main building which we showed there and then qualify to get to the value they needed to show for the project to be able to then say, ‘Okay, we can commit to providing the funds that are necessary.’”

Member Walt inquired as to the reason the Redevelopment Authority was presented with options. Mr. McCarthy clarified his previous recommendation. “I don’t want to put the Board in a spot of choosing one over another because of my recommendation.” Mr. McCarthy expressed appreciation for Mr. Rothe’s “forthrightness in providing us the information and his constraints,” in that it “allowed me to at least say that I think a 50 percent split should be the way to go as we looked at the numbers. But the Board has a difficult decision as to what they think that split should be and it should be in relationship with what Rob’s needs are.” Mr. McCarthy advised that the 20 percent indicated in the Operating Covenant and Agreement “was a working document ... and it was part of what we thought we could accomplish. On hindsight, I probably should have fought harder to keep that a little more open-ended in the draft agreement in your packet.” Member Walt reiterated that the Redevelopment Authority doesn’t “have much of a choice because if your lender’s agreement is saying ... this is based on the 50 percent participation split, ... if we go 40, it doesn’t sound like you’re going to get that lending.” Mr. Rothe advised of having asked Mr. McCarthy the reasons for providing the other options. “And he felt it was good to show the other numbers, but I agree ... The project that we had put together with Sportsmen’s reflects what is the 50 percent

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 6

DRAFT

participation which eventually should get to a 70 / 30 right off the bat for the City. But that's the one, really, we need to consider because the others don't have any bearing to the project for us." Mr. McCarthy advised of "some evolution," and provided background information on development of the draft Operating Covenant and Agreement. "When I first drafted up the proposed participation agreement for you to consider, I had included Olive Garden in that calculation which made it a little bit more palatable. But, on reflection, we pulled Olive Garden out and just focused on the building which changed the way the numbers ran." Mr. Rothe acknowledged the point "because if we looked at it as an overall project, we're at 70 / 30; 70 to the City, 30 for us with the revenue projections we feel pretty comfortable will be sustainable. But we were also, Joe informed me that because that's a new building, evidently, ... your advice from the District Attorney ... that maybe that didn't exactly come under the realm of the renovation of the old. So it put us back into dealing with just the old building which, ironically, kind of does the same thing as what we were doing before with the Sportsmen's Warehouse where we had a base minimum, but really the sales would be higher. So even though the participation agreement started off with a minimum of our participation getting 'x' dollars which was close to ... 60 percent of the original, we expected Sportsmen's Warehouse sales to be much higher than that which would have been more along the lines of 70 / 30 or maybe even 80 / 20 if sales were going really well. Today, what we have now is back to the same concept but that's really the 50 percent participation column that is there." Member Walt inquired as to the minimum participation necessary. Mr. Rothe stated, "50 percent and that's really what I'm asking for approval today. That's the one that we have to work with."

Mr. Werner advised that the 80 / 20 split was the Board policy for participation on any of these agreements. "The original agreement, which was somewhat innovative ..., is that if you looked at the sales tax generation over the 15-year period versus the cost that was being proposed, that ultimately ended up with an 80 / 20 split but then was backed up so that there was more on the front end than there was on the back end. But, again, the Board policy was 80 / 20. That's still in existence today. ... That's why the recommendation that you formally have is an 80 / 20 split. The issue also was, in the original agreement, that it was to fill the existing building. And we're looking at an amended agreement to the existing document. So, again, we went back to the existing building and the 80 / 20 split. ... the Board has the ability to change that and ..., as you've heard from Mr. Rothe today, you may want to do so, but that's why you have the 80 / 20, why it's limited to the building because ultimately that's what the policy of the Board initially was."

In reference to an earlier question, Member Livermore inquired as to whether sewer and water connection fees were paid at the time the Sportsmen's Warehouse was under construction, "or are you coming back at a second time of re-renovating and get the benefits of the policy we enacted here of exempting sewer and water connection fees." Mr. Rothe expressed the belief that "because we were already pre-existing, we were already there. I think we already had those connections. They were never terminated. So, I believe we are operating under the original. When we bought the property, ... those connections were in place." Member Livermore noted that the building was "divided ... in two." In response to a question, Mr. Werner explained the procedure to consider, for existing buildings, what was previously purchased for water and sewer connection, based on usage at the time. The proposed use is then considered to determine whether it's greater than or equal to and less than the usage that was there before "no matter how it's split up." Mr. Werner reviewed a corresponding example, and expressed the belief that the existing building had sufficient connections to serve both the Burlington Coat Factory and any retail store. He surmised there were no charges for the initial permits and probably no charges on the tenant improvements on the existing building. Water and sewer connection fees would, therefore, only relate to the "out parcel." In response

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 7

DRAFT

to a comment, Mr. Rothe advised of not having to “pay any extra costs in that regard,” noting no change in the utilization or the size of the existing building.

In response to a question, Mr. McCarthy advised that the lending institution is Bank of America. In response to a further question, he advised of not having spoken with any Bank of America representative relative to the subject project. Chairperson Williamson entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming. Chairperson Williamson thanked Mr. Rothe for “sticking with us,” noting the drastic difference in the economy between now and four years ago. She suggested the possibility of revisiting a policy established “during particularly better times, ... because at least we have options.” She noted that the Olive Garden restaurant will be paying increased property taxes which will be allocated to the Redevelopment Authority. She suggested that “100 percent of nothing doesn’t get you as much as 50 percent of something.” She expressed support for the opportunity “to have a sales tax generator and a property tax generator and a job creation generator.” She reiterated her appreciation to Mr. Rothe and Mr. McCarthy “for bringing this choice to us.”

Member Livermore expressed appreciation for Chairperson Williamson’s comments, noting that 3,000 people had submitted applications to Kohl’s. Member Livermore thanked Mr. Rothe for his investment in Carson City. Chairperson Williamson entertained additional comments and, when none were forthcoming, a motion. Member Walt expressed appreciation for Big Lots opening before Christmas. At Member Walt’s request, Mr. Munn provided direction with regard to the motion. **Member Walt moved to approve and recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of an amended and restated Operating Covenant and Agreement, by and between Carson City Redevelopment Authority and the City of Carson City and Carson Southgate, LLC, with the adoption of the 50 percent participation which would be the overall split; Southgate LLC 70 / 30, citing Section 3.1 of the draft contract and as expressed in the recitals of that contract. Member Livermore seconded the motion.** Member Crowell advised that he would not support the motion, expressing difficulty over “mov[ing] off an historic use of redevelopment percentage split on 80 / 20 ... given what’s been presented to us today.” Member Crowell expressed understanding for Mr. Rothe’s representations over the original agreement with Sportsmen’s Warehouse, and hesitation over “going around an 80 / 20 split that we’ve done for people subsequent to that time ...” He expressed uncertainty over whether the water and sewer connection fees for the Olive Garden restaurant were not part of the financing for “both the Olive Garden side and your side ...” Member Crowell expressed appreciation for Mr. Rothe’s investment in the community. Chairperson Williamson entertained additional comments and, when none were forthcoming, a vote on the pending motion. **Motion carried 3-1-1.** Chairperson Williamson recessed the meeting at 11:01 a.m. and reconvened at 11:10 a.m. Vice Chairperson Aldean had returned to the meeting dais during the recess.

17. PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT AND OFFICE OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

17(A) ACTION TO ADOPT A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND APPROVING AN INTERLOCAL CONTRACT BETWEEN CARSON CITY, A CONSOLIDATED MUNICIPALITY AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, AND THE CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, A REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 279 OF THE NEVADA REVISED STATUTES AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, TO PROVIDE FOR THE ARLINGTON SQUARE ICE RINK FOR THE WINTER / HOLIDAY PERIOD OF 2010 - 2011, AND OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO (11:10:04) - Chairperson Williamson introduced this item, and Parks and

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 8

DRAFT

Recreation Department Director Roger Moellendorf reviewed the agenda materials. Based on direction from Mr. Werner, he advised of having researched options including outright purchase of an ice skating rink and associated equipment, as well as leasing with an option to purchase. He advised of having received proposals from two vendors, the most interesting of which is leasing with an option to purchase at the termination of the season. He noted the Redevelopment Authority's direction, at the last meeting, to avoid a delay in the start of the ice skating season. At Chairperson Williamson's request, he advised of having been informed by a City of Reno Parks and Recreation Department representative that much of their ice skating rink equipment is permanently affixed. "They're not interested, at this time, in selling, loaning, or renting their equipment" to Carson City. In reference to the possibility of purchasing equipment, Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged that the \$106,255 is "part of the scope ... we're working within." He reviewed costs associated with leasing equipment for the current season and purchasing it at the end of the season, noting the requirement to purchase ice skates as part of this option. Mr. Werner suggested considering a 5 to 10 percent contingency for the project. In response to a question, Mr. Munn advised that adding a contingency would not materially change the agenda item. Mr. Moellendorf expressed concern over the time frames associated with delivery of the ice skating rink and the beginning of ice skating season.

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf speculated that the Redevelopment Authority would own the ice skating rink and associated equipment. He clarified that the Parks and Recreation Department is providing operations. In reference to comments from the October 7th meeting, Member Livermore inquired as to whether the ice skating rink represents a special event or a recreation program. Vice Chairperson Aldean suggested that if the ice skating rink becomes a seasonal event under the Parks and Recreation Department, "there can be some sort of repayment arrangement over time if we want to reimburse the Redevelopment Authority for the use of equipment acquired over the last two years." Mr. Werner acknowledged the possibility of various arrangements, and advised that the ice skating rink and associated equipment would be an asset under the Redevelopment Authority. He suggested that the chances of the ice skating rink being located outside the redevelopment district are "fairly slim."

In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the marketing component was included in the budget. Member Livermore expressed the opinion that project contingencies are typically absorbed. Mr. Werner advised that marketing was approximately \$8,500 last year. "If we do marketing and we actually end up selling more seasonal tickets, it'll reduce the subsidy ... So, actually, it'll pay to benefit us ..." Discussion followed, and Mr. Werner advised of no anticipation that more funding will be requested. "If the marketing goes as good as it did last year, then it's about \$8,000 we don't have to ask for ..." Member Livermore expressed concern over the possibility of a lack of interest in the ice skating rink. In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that operational costs will be adjusted according to use of the facility. In response to a comment, he advised that costs were lower last year than estimated. In reference to discussion from the October 7th meeting, Member Crowell inquired as to whether the funding includes a discount for active military personnel. Mr. Moellendorf advised that a discount will be included for active military personnel.

Chairperson Williamson entertained public comment. (11:24:13) Carson City Navy League Council President Robert Prater inquired as to a discount for the dependents of active military personnel. Following a brief discussion, consensus of the Redevelopment Authority was to extend the discount to dependents of active military personnel. Mr. Moellendorf expressed support. He acknowledged that the Redevelopment Authority will market the ice skating rink. Vice Chairperson Aldean noted necessary corrections to the proposed resolution and the interlocal agreement included in the agenda materials. In response to a

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 9

DRAFT

question, Mr. Moellendorf provided the cost for dasherboard advertising space, and advised anyone interested to contact Recreation Division Operations Manager Joel Dunn.

Chairperson Williamson entertained additional public comments and, when none were forthcoming, a motion. **Vice Chairperson Aldean moved to adopt Resolution No. 2010-RA-R-4, a resolution adopting and approving an interlocal contract between Carson City, a consolidated municipality and political subdivision of the State of Nevada, and the Carson City Redevelopment Authority, a redevelopment agency authorized pursuant to Chapter 279 of the Nevada Revised Statutes, and political subdivision of the State of Nevada, to provide for the Arlington Square Ice Rink for the winter / holiday period 2010 / 2011, and other matters properly related thereto; subject to the clerical corrections noted on the record. Member Walt seconded the motion.** Member Livermore advised he would not support the motion “because ... it’s too open-ended right now.” He expressed the belief that the requested amount will not be the final cost, and opposition to appropriating public money without the final total cost. Vice Chairperson Aldean noted that the interlocal agreement does not specify the amount of money being allocated by the Redevelopment Authority to support the operation of the ice skating rink. Member Livermore acknowledged his understanding. Vice Chairperson Aldean further noted that no decision had yet been made on the proposed contingency. Chairperson Williamson called for additional comments and, when none were forthcoming, a vote on the pending motion. **Motion carried 4-1.**

17(B) ACTION TO APPROVE, AS A REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, AND RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE EXPENDITURE OF \$106,255 FROM THE REVOLVING FUND FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY TO SUPPORT THE ARLINGTON SQUARE ICE RINK (11:29:40) - Chairperson Williamson introduced this item. Mr. Moellendorf reviewed the agenda materials, and reiterated the suggestion to include an appropriate contingency. In reference to Regional Transportation Commission projects, Vice Chairperson Aldean noted that “even projects with change orders ... come in under the amount of the contingency.” She expressed optimism over the possibility that none of the contingency will be spent unless the City leases / purchases the ice skating rink. “If we do not enter into a lease / purchase arrangement and purchase the required ice skates, then we will adhere to the \$106,255 that’s contained in this recommended board action.” Mr. Moellendorf acknowledged his understanding.

Member Walt noted that there had been no discussion over the Ghost Walk allocation, and that said event represents “18 or 19 percent of what this budget is.” In response to a question, Mr. Moellendorf advised that the ice skating rink will be open for ten weeks. Member Walt expressed dismay over the amount of discussion and opposition generated by the ice skating rink. She commended Mr. Moellendorf for the work done on the ice skating rink project.

Chairperson Williamson entertained public comment and, when none were forthcoming, a motion. **Vice Chairperson Aldean moved to approve, as a redevelopment project, and recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the expenditure of \$106,255 from the revolving fund for the redevelopment agency to support the Arlington Square ice skating rink, plus a five percent contingency to cover any costs associated with a lease / purchase agreement, which would include the acquisition of an ice skating rink and ice skates to support the event. Member Crowell seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-1.**

CARSON CITY REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Meeting

Page 10

DRAFT

18. ACTION TO ADJOURN (11:32:47) - Chairperson Williamson adjourned the meeting at 11:32 a.m.

The Minutes of the October 21, 2010 Carson City Redevelopment Authority meeting are so approved this _____ day of November, 2010.

ROBIN WILLIAMSON, Chair

ATTEST:

ALAN GLOVER, Clerk - Recorder