

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**Special Meeting**  
**Carson City Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee (RACC)**  
**Monday, September 4, 2018 • 5:30 PM**  
**Community Center Sierra Room**  
**851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada**

**Board Members**

<b>Chair – Court Cardinal</b>	<b>Vice Chair – Jason Justice</b>
<b>Member – John Barrette</b>	<b>Member – Ronni Hannaman</b>
<b>Member – Lee Kennedy</b>	<b>Member – Sherri Powell</b>
<b>Member – Michael Smith</b>	

**Staff**

Lee Plemel, Community Development Director  
Dan Yu, Chief, Deputy District Attorney  
Tamar Warren, Deputy Clerk

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

An audio recording of this meeting is available on [www.carson.org/minutes](http://www.carson.org/minutes).

**1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

(5:31:19) – Chairperson Cardinal called the meeting to order at 5:31 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present.

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Chairperson Court Cardinal	Present	
Vice Chairperson Jason Justice	Present	
Member John Barrette	Present	
Member Ronni Hannaman	Present	
Member Lee Kennedy	Present	
Member Sherri Powell	Absent	
Member Michael Smith	Present	

**2. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

(5:31:40) – Chairperson Cardinal entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

**3. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES – August 6, 2018.**

(5:32:02) – Chairperson Cardinal introduced the item and entertained corrections, changes, or a motion.

**(5:34:35) – MOTION: I move to approve the minutes of the August 6, 2018 RACC meeting as presented.**

(5:34:51) – Chairperson Cardinal requested an official roll call to count the votes.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (5-0-1)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Hannaman
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Barrette
<b>AYES:</b>	Justice, Barrette, Hannaman, Kennedy, Smith
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	Cardinal
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Powell

#### 4. MEETING ITEMS

**4-A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY REGARDING THE EXPENDITURE OF \$9,000 FROM THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 REDEVELOPMENT REVOLVING FUND, SPECIAL EVENT ACCOUNT, FOR A SPECIAL EVENT FUNDING REQUEST FROM THE CARSON CITY DOWNTOWN BUSINESS ASSOCIATION FOR THE PASSPORT TO DOWNTOWN EVENT ON OCTOBER 26, 2018.**

(5:32:30) – Chairperson Cardinal introduced the item. Member Smith disclosed that he was a Downtown business owner and a member of the Downtown Business Association. Therefore, due to this conflict of interest, he would abstain from voting on the item.

(5:33:46) – Mr. Plemel presented the Staff Report and the accompanying special event funding application, both of which are incorporated into the record, and noted that applicant representative Jennifer Smith was present in the audience. He also reminded the Committee that the current balance of the Special Events Fund was \$11,000.

(5:35:49) – Downtown Business Association (DBA) representative Jennifer Smith introduced herself and described the Passport to Downtown event. Vice Chair Justice was informed that this year's event budget was larger than last year's due to an \$8,000 marketing grant from the Nevada Commission on Tourism. Discussion ensued regarding what DBA projects were funded last year. Member Barrette was informed that 48 businesses had participated in 2017. Chairperson Cardinal inquired about the \$67,000 the DBA had on hand and wished to understand why they were requesting funds and Ms. Smith offered to return with an explanation. A.J. Matule introduced herself as the DBA Vice President and noted that the Wine Walk is their major event, and that a healthy [account] balance was needed for liability issues. Member Hannaman suggested charging businesses a fee to participate in the program. Ms. Smith distributed examples of the Passports from the previous year. Discussion ensued regarding attendee counts versus redeemed Passports and the RACC's donation to Nevada Day and Ms. Smith noted that the event will be advertised to 56,000 households in Carson City and other rural areas. She also clarified for Chairperson Cardinal that they did not see a conflict with other Nevada Day activities. Member Hannaman noted that the information received from the DBA was not complete.

(5:52:52) – DBA Board Member Cynthia Bundt cited large crowds at the McFadden Plaza the previous year to get their Passports stamped. She noted that “families were having a good time...this is what it's about, it's about bringing people downtown that aren't usually there.” Member Hannaman suggested adding all the information above to the application in the future. Vice Chair Justice called the funding

“out of scale compared to how we fund other things” especially because this was an existing event. Member Kennedy also believed that the \$9,000 request was too high considering the DBA’s account balance. Member Hannaman proposed to fund half the requested amount. There were no public comments.

**(5:58:58) – MOTION: I move to recommend to the Redevelopment Authority approval of \$4,500 for this year’s Passport to Downtown event.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (5-0-1)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Hannaman
<b>SECONDER</b>	Justice
<b>AYES:</b>	Cardinal, Justice, Barrette, Hannaman, Kennedy
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	Smith
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Powell

(6:00:20) – Mr. Plemel stated that he planned to agendize this item for the Redevelopment Authority’s September 20, 2018 meeting.

**4-B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO APPROVE THE EXPENDITURE OF UP TO \$25,000 FOR FAÇADE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE OFFICE BUILDING LOCATED AT 302 N. MINNESOTA STREET, WITHIN REDEVELOPMENT AREA NO. 1.**

(6:01:08) – Chairperson Cardinal introduced the item. Mr. Plemel reviewed the Staff report and the accompanying photographs of the property and recommended approval of 50 percent of the painting cost as part of the façade improvement, adding that the re-roofing portion of the project would not be reimbursable. Mr. Plemel also responded to clarifying questions and noted that the applicant was present.

(6:07:03) – Vice Chair Justice inquired about the tax incentives and Mr. Plemel explained that “properties already receiving tax incentives or other financial incentives from the City” were considered ineligible, clarifying that they were specifically meant for those properties receiving tax abatements, and cited Sportsman’s Warehouse or the auto dealers as examples. Member Hannaman inquired about the definition of “façade” and Mr. Plemel noted that for this purpose the term was defined as including “all portions of the building excluding the roof decking, visible from the public right-of-way or on-site public parking lot.” Chairperson Cardinal received clarification from Mr. Yu that “if you’ve already received a tax incentive from the City then you would be a quote unquote ineligible”. Discussion ensued regarding the tax incentives in the Historic District and Mr. Plemel noted that the subject property “is definitely a commercial property within the Redevelopment District; therefore, it’s eligible.” Chairperson Cardinal invited the applicant to answer the members’ questions.

(6:15:15) – Joe Cowee introduced himself as a Manager/Member of Cowee Investments and gave background on the property, noting that it was part of downtown and “the Blue Line tour”, and needed “lead abatement”. He also noted that the back parking lot was for “ADA-compliant accessibility” and believed that the wood decking qualified as part of the façade. Chairperson Cardinal commended Mr. Cowee for obtaining three quotes and was informed by the applicant that the front of the property was less weathered because of the large trees that shade it from the sun. Discussion ensued on whether the sides

not seen from the street would qualify for the funds, and regarding commercial properties that were not on Carson or Curry Streets. Mr. Plemel referenced the attached resolution and clarified that “unequivocally, the action was that all commercial properties, any commercial property in the entire Redevelopment District, would be eligible for this program.” Member Hannaman noted that the final decision will be made by RACC and not the Redevelopment Authority in this case and likened the approval to “opening Pandora’s box” since there were many businesses in the Historic District that may also request Façade improvements. Chairperson Cardinal indicated that the Committee was presented “with a changing of the rules part way through the game that we are now being made aware of.”

(6:30:18) – Mr. Yu clarified that on Page two, paragraph six of the resolution about application review process gave this Committee the final decision authority; however, it was “appealable to the Redevelopment Authority”. He indicated that “the guidance language is pretty broad” adding that it was limited to Commercial properties and not specific to properties located on Carson Street only. Mr. Yu also noted that the applicant had the right to appeal the Committee’s decision to the Redevelopment Authority. He also addressed “roof decking”, noting that his interpretation would encompass the shingles as well, and suggested taking the unclear sections back to the Redevelopment Authority for clarification. Further discussion ensued regarding the interpretation of the resolution and Member Smith believed that the language in the resolution needed recrafting. Mr. Yu recommended that the members “do the best that you can, based on the language that you have in front of you today, and come to a good faith determination...and then let that go the way it will”, indicating that the applicant had the choice to appeal to the Redevelopment Authority. Mr. Plemel clarified for Chairperson Cardinal that this was the first application of the current fiscal year, with the entire \$50,000 yet unspent, adding that Staff had recommended funding just the façade painting at \$9,292.50. Chairperson Cardinal stated that with Mr. Yu’s explanation, he understood that the project would qualify as a façade improvement; however, he was uncertain about the tax deferment of the property.

(6:43:07) – Chairperson Cardinal proposed reimbursing 74 percent of the \$9,292.50 which would deduct the deferred tax amount from the requested funds for painting. Vice Chair Justice noted that he was “not comfortable” with the project; therefore, he would not vote in favor of it. Member Barrette believed that the project was eligible for the funds. Mr. Plemel gave background on the original resolution and its amendment. Member Hannaman reminded the Committee that the historic tax deferment was voluntary and suggested postponing a vote on the item. Member Kennedy noted that his key concern was the historic property tax deferment. Mr. Yu was in favor of a decision instead of a continuance, and not to wait for the Redevelopment Authority’s decision without a recommendation. Further discussion ensued regarding the eligibility of the property and Mr. Plemel read the requirements outlined in the attached resolution. Member Smith suggested a motion and Chairperson Cardinal entertained one.

No public was present for comment.

**(7:02:21) – MOTION: I move to not approve the expenditure of up to \$9,292.50 for façade improvement to the building located on 302 N. Minnesota Street within Redevelopment Area Number One, subject to the recommended conditions of approval.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>FAILED (3-3-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Justice
<b>SECONDER</b>	Hannaman
<b>AYES:</b>	Justice, Hannaman, Smith
<b>NAYS:</b>	Cardinal, Barrette, Kennedy
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Powell

(7:03:52) – Mr. Yu announced that due to the tie vote of three ayes and three nays, the motion had failed and the application was denied. Chairperson Cardinal noted that the applicant had the ability to appeal to the Redevelopment Authority.

## 5. DISCUSSION ONLY

### a. STAFF REPORTS AND UPDATES ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE RACC.

(7:05:20) – Mr. Plemel announced that because this was a special meeting, the upcoming regularly-scheduled meeting would take place on Monday, November 5, 2018.

### b. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT RACC MEETING.

(7:05:30) – Mr. Plemel indicated that the Fiscal Year 2020 allocation plan and the sign improvement project will be discussed in the next meeting.

### c. RACC MEMBER REPORTS AND COMMENTS

(7:06:00) – Member Hannaman received clarification that the carryover funds will also be discussed in the next meeting.

## 6. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(7:07:04) – There were no additional public comments.

## 7. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT.

**(7:07:12) – Member Kennedy moved to adjourn. Chairperson Cardinal adjourned the meeting at 7:07 p.m.**

The Minutes of the September 4, 2018 Carson City Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee meeting are so approved on this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of November, 2018.

---

COURT CARDINAL, Chair