



**togetherforbetter**

## ***Board of County Commissioners***

**Clark County, Nevada**

Tick Segerblom, Chair  
Justin Jones, Vice Chair  
Jim Gibson  
Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick  
William McCurdy II  
Ross Miller  
Michael Naft

---

The Clark County Redevelopment Agency in full conformity with law and bylaws of said Boards, at the regular place of meeting in Clark County, Nevada, on Wednesday, October 16, 2024:

CLARK COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER  
COMMISSION CHAMBERS  
500 S GRAND CENTRAL PKWY  
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SEC. 1. OPENING .....	3
CALL TO ORDER.....	3
SEC. 2. PUBLIC FORUM.....	3
SEC. 3. AGENDA .....	3
SEC. 4. BUSINESS ITEMS.....	4
PUBLIC COMMENTS.....	12

## SEC. 1. OPENING

### CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:28 a.m. by Chair Segerblom with the following members present:

**Commissioners Present:**

Tick Segerblom, Chair  
Justin Jones, Vice Chair  
Jim Gibson  
William McCurdy II  
Ross Miller  
Michael Naft

**Absent:**

Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick

**Also Present:**

Kevin Schiller, County Manager  
Robert Warhola, Deputy District Attorney  
Lynn Marie Goya, County Clerk  
Michelle Hinkson, Deputy Clerk  
Robin Delaney, Deputy Clerk

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

All right, County Manager, you ready? All right. This is the welcome to the Redevelopment Agency hearing on October the 16, 2024. Mr. Miller, are you on?

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

All right. We'll, go ahead.

## SEC. 2. PUBLIC FORUM

1. Public Comment

**KEVIN SCHILLER**

Chairman, we can move, first section set aside for public comment.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

This is the first time for public comment. Anyone wishing to speak on the Redevelopment agenda, please come forward. Seeing no one, we'll close the public hearing and turn over to the County Manager.

## SEC. 3. AGENDA

2. Approval of Agenda with the Inclusion of Any Emergency Items and Deletion of Any Items.  
(For possible action)

**KEVIN SCHILLER**

Item 2 is approval of the agenda with the inclusion of any emergency items and deletion of any items.

**ACTION: APPROVED.**

**MOTION**

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Move approval.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

There's a motion to approve. Cast your vote. Mine won't work but cast count me as a yes.

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Push your name.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

Oh, okay. That makes sense. All right, there I go.

**VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** Tick Segerblom, William McCurdy II, Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Michael Naft

**VOTING NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller

**ABSTAIN:** None

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

And that motion passes.

## **SEC. 4. BUSINESS ITEMS**

3. Review current Clark County Redevelopment Agency fund balance and proposed expenditures, authorize funding for redevelopment projects; or take other action deemed appropriate. (For possible action)

**ACTION: ACTION: ACCEPTED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDING ALLOCATIONS EXCLUDING THE REQUESTED EXPENDITURES FOR 900 LIBERACE AVENUE, ALLOWING THE FUNDS TO REMAIN ACCESSIBLE.**

*Attachment(s) submitted and filed with the County Clerk's Office.*

**KEVIN SCHILLER**

Item 3 is to review current Clark County Redevelopment Agency Fund balance and proposed expenditures, authorized funding for Redevelopment Projects, or take other action as deemed appropriate. And I'll turn it over to Ms. Coleman for a brief presentation.

**SHANI COLEMAN**

Good morning, Commissioners. We have a presentation on the Fiscal Year '25, budget overview and proposed expenditures. Next slide. So currently, in the bank, in the Redevelopment Fund, we have \$22.9 million. The additional \$10.1 million are funds that are due to be received by the Redevelopment Agency between now and the end of the year. We are likely to see a lump sum of receivables in January and another for the last cash drop, but we don't have exact timing of when that \$10 million come in. But

roughly for Fiscal Year '25, there is 33 million to spend. This presentation will only deal with cash on hand right now, though. Next slide.

So, current allocations and items already approved by the Board, and so we have the Commercial Center Planning, which was approved at \$516,000. We have the Commercial Center Grease Trap Program, which was approved at \$500,000. We have the Commercial Center Security Program that was approved at \$1.2 million; a Project Management Agreement which was approved at \$99,000. We have a pending item on the next agenda item for \$325,000, an Interlocal Agreement between UNLV and the Redevelopment Agency. And we have demolition. We did purchase this building, 925 East Sahara Avenue, and included in that Purchase Agreement was an amount for demolition was an initial estimate. And then, we've had various small vendor payments such as utility payments and other things that have come through. So, roughly since July, we have approved approximately \$3.9 million, which brings your cash balance down to \$18.9 million. Next slide.

So, 925 Sahara, this is a building that we closed escrow on in May of 2024. We purchased the building for \$5 million. It's roughly 84,000 square feet, sitting on a little over an acre. There was a fire in this building in June of '24 of this year. Because of that, we had to turn off the power, and we removed all the tenants from the building. The building is currently boarded up. The building is slated to be demolished. During that time, we have learned that the building does have asbestos and a basement, and that has pushed the estimated cost of demolition up. So, the total cost for demolition is \$2.7 million, so we need to allocate an additional \$1.4 million for 925 East Sahara Avenue. If the Board wanted to move forward with this demolition, that would bring the cash balance down to roughly \$17.5 million dollars.

**JUSTIN JONES**

Ms. Coleman, can I just ask a question with regards to the discovery asbestos and the basement, I guess I'm trying to understand in terms of due diligence, what do we do and looking forward to future purchases, what can we do better, so we don't have surprises like this?

**SHANI COLEMAN**

Absolutely, Commissioner. This building was purchased a little bit quicker than we do most of our due diligence. At the time when this building was brought before us as an opportunity, it was going up for auction. And so, we did a quick 30-day due diligence period on it, so we didn't do our normal due diligence. And so, moving forward, obviously, we would hope to have more time, and do our regular due diligence process so we could get better estimates on things like proposed demolition, but that was a specific circumstance that happened with this particular building.

**JUSTIN JONES**

Okay, thanks.

**SHANI COLEMAN**

Next slide. 900 Liberace is a building that we closed escrow on in January of 2024. We paid roughly \$6.5 million for the building. The building is approximately 72,000 square feet, sits on a little more than one acre. This building is currently occupied. It's 39% occupied. There are a number of suggestions. One of them is keeping the building and rehabbing the building, which is the most expensive. As I mentioned earlier, we are currently in the midst of a master planning process or revisiting process for Commercial Center with a contractor.

And so, pending that report, we will come back to recommendations. But what we'd like to do is set aside the most expensive of the options in case the Board decides to move forward with the rehabilitation of

this particular building. If that is the case, then at most, we're looking at, right now, the estimate is about \$10.3 million, which would bring the current cash balance down to \$7.2 million. Next slide.

There has been a request to develop an additional grant program for Commercial Center that focuses on the interior and exterior improvement of existing buildings in Commercial Center. The budget for that grant program would be \$500,000. Obviously, we need to build out the program, and we would bring that before the Board, but we're just looking to allocate a potential budget and if the Board is so interested, then that would bring the cash balance down to \$6.7 million. Next slide, please.

At our last Redevelopment Agency meeting, this Board approved to move forward with a consolidated fund distribution model in which all Redevelopment Agency money is utilized equally amongst all Redevelopment areas. Currently, right now, we are in the final stages of adding four new areas to the Redevelopment Agency that was approved by this Board at the last RDA meeting. It was approved by Planning Commission on October 1. And so, with that, we'd like to develop some strategic priorities. So, in Fiscal Year '26, when these other four areas are part of the Redevelopment Agency and part of the model, the Board has some strategic priorities to work with, and for which to make decisions on how to spend the balance of the Redevelopment Agency fund. And we are setting aside \$300,000 for that. We will do an RFP to identify the appropriate consultants to work with to develop those priorities and that strategy. And if the Board so chooses to move forward with that, that would bring our fund balance down to \$6.4 million. Next slide, please.

And then, that would leave the remaining, the \$6.4 million plus the \$10 million, so roughly \$16 million. Again, we don't know when the \$10 million is going to come in, but that would leave roughly \$6 million cash on hand for the strategic acquisition of real estate and/or any other recommended activities that could come out of the Gensler Report or any other reports or activities that the Board would like to move forward with. So, you would have roughly \$6 million, and then whatever funds become available through receipt of taxes between now and the end of June. Next slide. And with that, I'm happy to take any questions that the Board may have.

#### **TICK SEGERBLOM**

Commissioner Jones.

#### **JUSTIN JONES**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Coleman, going back to the \$10 plus million, not the additional that's coming in, but the one for the building at Commercial Center. When you say the most expensive option, what is that? And I guess I'm trying to understand whether we're putting a cart before a horse. If we haven't identified what our priorities for Commercial Center, then I don't know that I'm quite comfortable with allocating that large of a dollar amount for something where we haven't decided what our priorities are yet.

#### **SHANI COLEMAN**

So initially, there was the question whether or not the building should be demolished or whether or not we should rehab the building through the master planning process. We are having conversations right now with stakeholders to determine what the new vision is or what the new opportunities are for Commercial Center. Based on that guidance or the information that we receive from that report, then there could be a different opportunities that avail themselves that the report recommends. And so, the most expensive of those options was the \$10 million or the \$10.3. There was an initial assessment that it would cost roughly approximately \$3 million if the building were demolished. But again, we're waiting for the Gensler Master Planning Report to be done for us to bring that back to you so the Board can provide staff with direction.

**JUSTIN JONES**

Okay. But is the \$10 plus million, is that a placeholder or are there actual options that have been identified, and that's the most expensive of the options? If so, then what is it? I'm not understanding.

**SHANI COLEMAN**

The \$10 million is just a placeholder.

**JUSTIN JONES**

Okay. That was my question.

**ROSS MILLER**

So, kind of a follow-up question. I have similar concerns that Commissioner Jones - doesn't appear to me that we've got recommendations coming or a specific plan in the short term in order to try to rehabilitate that building towards any specific vision. If we use this even as a placeholder, you say, would that preclude us from making additional acquisitions in around that area or any others? I know there are other potential acquisitions that have been identified in the RTC report. Do we need to take any formal action if we were going to try to move forward on any of those acquisitions, and would this placeholder preclude us for moving forward because we wouldn't have enough funds?

**SHANI COLEMAN**

Commissioner Miller, no, it would not. As you can see, if you go back to the next slide, even with that placeholder in place, there's still \$6,400,000 cash on hand and an additional \$10 million that's expected to be received by the Redevelopment Agency between now in the end of the fiscal year. So, there's roughly \$16 million at play here. The only question is we don't have an exact time of when that additional \$10.1 million will come in. So, money usually flows in when taxes, when you have individuals that pay their taxes quarterly. So, we're likely to see a large lump sum of cash inflow at the beginning of the year and then also around March and April when the last tax settlement is due. So, you roughly have \$16 million for other acquisitions and/or activities.

**ROSS MILLER**

Right, but if this was in fact a placeholder, and we chose not to approve this as the placeholder, we actually have the money that's sitting there for New Orleans Square that could be used instead for acquisitions, right? I mean, we're not intending under any timeline before the fiscal year to spend any money that quickly on the redevelopment of New Orleans Square?

**SHANI COLEMAN**

That is correct.

**ROSS MILLER**

Okay. So, we actually have much more than \$6 million because we're going to have that \$10 million because there's no chance that we're going to spend that \$10 million before the fiscal year.

**SHANI COLEMAN**

That is correct.

**ROSS MILLER**

Okay.

**JUSTIN JONES**

Do we need a motion on this?

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

Yes, it's an action item.

**MOTION**

**JUSTIN JONES**

Okay. I'll go ahead and make a motion to accept the recommendations. However, with regards to the requested expenditures of \$10.3 million, pending Gensler final report, I would say, say we don't make that allocation at this time, and just leave it unallocated. But to Commissioner Miller's point, we can still have access to those funds in the event that an opportunistic purchase comes along.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

Or if the Gensler Report came back and recommended it, we could have a vote of this committee.

**JUSTIN JONES**

Absolutely. No, that's my point, is when the Gensler Report comes back, I think that's when we make the allocation because we'll have better sense for what we're allocating it to.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

Great. All right. There's a motion. Cast your vote.

**ROSS MILLER**

Yes.

**VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** Tick Segerblom, William McCurdy II, Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Ross Miller, Michael Naft

**VOTING NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick

**ABSTAIN:** None

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

That motion passes.

4. Approve and authorize the Chair to sign an Interlocal Agreement between Clark County Redevelopment Agency and UNLV College of Fine Arts for the sponsorship of arts and culture activities to assist in the revitalization of current redevelopment areas. (For possible action)

**ACTION: ACTION: APPROVED (STAFF DIRECTED TO PROVIDE A REPORT IN NOVEMBER 2024 OUTLINING PRIOR AND FUTURE PROGRAM EXPENDITURES).**

**KEVIN SCHILLER**

Item 4 is to approve and authorize the Chair to sign an Interlocal Agreement between Clark County Redevelopment Agency and UNLV College of Fine Arts for the sponsorship of arts and cultural activities to assist in the revitalization of the current redevelopment areas.



**SHANI COLEMAN**

Commissioners. We do have an amendment to read into the record quickly on the proposed Interlocal Agreement before you, Article 1, under UNLV Obligation, Section 2, the date should read June 30, 2025, instead of June 30, 2024. There are no other changes to the Interlocal Agreement.

**JIM GIBSON**

I'm wondering, Mr. Chair, if I might ask a question? So, we've been under an agreement. We've had UNLV do some things for us at Commercial Center. Have you made a formal report to us on those activities?

**SHANI COLEMAN**

There has not been a formal report, but if the Board would like a formal report, we can request UNLV College of Fine Arts provide that info.

**JIM GIBSON**

I think because of the way that the language reads, it's not a specific deliverable. We're not getting a widget for this much money. In this instance, it's services that they're performing for us. I'd feel most comfortable acting on this if we knew what we'd already gotten, so that if there needs to be a reshaping of expectations on either side, we make sure that we address that before we enter into a new agreement. So anyway, that's just a thought I have. I'm not moving to hold this item or anything. I think that there's wisdom in it, but if somebody has a better idea, that's fine with me. I'm willing to listen.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

That's fine. There is kind of a timeframe here, so if we could have a meeting in the next month to go through that, but ask them to come make a presentation, and vote on because they are playing for this year's to perform all the stuff for this year already.

**JIM GIBSON**

Well, if that doesn't mess everything up, I do think that in order for us to have the confidence that we need to have, and to be able to talk about what we're getting in exchange for the dollars that we're paying, it's fairest to both UNLV and to us that they report on what they've been paid to do and what they've done.

**SHANI COLEMAN**

Absolutely-

**ROSS MILLER**

I think that makes a lot of sense and is probably overdue. And just as a reminder, I think we presented the first time we put this in front of the Commission, but all seven schools of UNLV College of Fine Arts are engaged in performances or in some way connected towards the assistance of the redevelopment of Commercial Center.

For example, the Film School did a documentary last semester about the history of Commercial Center. We've had the School of Performing Arts do an immersive theater project in Commercial Center. The School of Architecture's engaged. They put together some very solid programming for us last semester, and the intent is to really try to link higher education and create an incubator of ideas that can be then transitioned into commercial projects similar to what all the Economic Development Reports suggest we should try to do. I think UNLV is doing a solid job of that. So, this is really a renewal of that same contract that was performed last semester. This semester, I think they have a new schedule of programming, but

absolutely agree that it'd be appropriate to have them come in and present the progress that they've made and the development that we're continuing to push.

**JIM GIBSON**

Either that or submit a written report to us. If we need to do this within a month, then maybe a written report makes sense so that we can study it and ask questions. I'm sure then –

**SHANI COLEMAN**

We will reach out to them and see if we can get both a written report, and if they can come to the next agency meeting and actually present on that as well.

**JIM GIBSON**

Thank you.

**SHANI COLEMAN**

Okay.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

All right. We'll defer on that item then. Do I have to –

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

Mr. Chairman.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

Do I have to vote?

**ROSS MILLER**

Hold on. Are we deferring on that item? I believe they have programming, and if they don't have the funding on it, it would, I think, probably halt the progress on that. I'm not sure UNLV is going to continue this semester with the program that they already had planned and underway.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

So, are you saying we should vote to approve the money, and then ask for a report?

**ROSS MILLER**

Yeah, maybe I misunderstood Commissioner Gibson's suggestion, but I think there is a time limits issue here. If we didn't vote to approve it today, I think it would most likely halt the fall program that's already underway.

**JIM GIBSON**

Well, yeah, I was suggesting that we not take a vote until we'd seen what had been done. That just seemed to be more consistent with the way we typically operate. I guess, the other thing then –

**KEVIN SCHILLER**

I was going to suggest, I know in the previous contract and in the existing contract, we had a 30-day termination that we always have built into those contracts. So, I think one thing we could do, we could follow up immediately to both your questions related to kind of the follow-up on the detail. I mean, we do have that out if we need to do that, if the Board so wishes, and we can bring that forward. But we could get the details to you related to the scope, and then if there's something you want to address in it, we can also do an amendment. Whatever you guys feel like.

**JIM GIBSON**

So, are you suggesting that we - which? That we postpone a vote on this or that we take it?

**KEVIN SCHILLER**

I was suggesting that if you vote on it and approve it, there's a 30-day termination anyway, if for some reason we determined that that wasn't sufficient.

**JIM GIBSON**

Then there's one other ask, and it would be that we get a look forward similar to the look backward that we're doing. So, look forward, that suggests to us what each of these departments proposes to do. I think that way, we answer one of the questions that was asked earlier.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

So, there's a motion to go ahead and pass with the proposition that we're going to have a report soon, both about what happened before and what's going to happen in the future, and we'll have the 30-day option to cut it off.

**JIM GIBSON**

Well - okay. Okay, fine. I mean, I'm just one, but if my colleagues think that we should just go ahead and extend this contract, then okay, fine. But I do think it's critical to us that we, for accountability purposes, that we have a report on what was done, what the monies were spent for, and that we have a look forward so that we understand what we're committing ourselves to pay for.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

In November, so we don't want to wait this quarterly thing. We want to do it right away.

**SHANI COLEMAN**

Understood.

**LYNN MARIE GOYA**

Could you repeat the motion exactly so that we make sure we know what the motion is, please?

**MOTION**

**WILLIAM MCCURDY II**

It sounds to me like the motion was to move forward with approval of the item, and have UNLV come and give us a presentation as to the work that's been done, it sounds like from department, is that correct? Her department that has been involved. And it sounds like also the Chair would like to have that meeting in November. That capture everything?

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

And also, a perspective of what they are going to do with the new contract.

**ROSS MILLER**

I believe we do already have a written report, and we do have deliverables from UNLV from last semester. I believe that UNLV has been pushing and encouraging us to try to get this approved earlier so they can plan accordingly. So, I fully support this motion and I think it's the appropriate thing also. And we'll forward those materials to the rest of the Commission for review.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

All right. There's a motion. Cast your vote.

**ROSS MILLER**

Yes.

**VOTE**

**VOTING AYE:** Tick Segerblom, William McCurdy II, Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Ross Miller, Michael Naft

**VOTING NAY:** None

**ABSENT:** Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick

**ABSTAIN:** None

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

That motion passes.

5. Go into closed session, pursuant to NRS 241.015(3)(b)(2), to receive information from the District Attorney regarding potential or existing litigation involving a matter over which the Board has supervision, control, jurisdiction or advisory power, and to deliberate toward a decision on the matter, and pursuant to NRS Chapter 288.220, to receive a report on the status of ongoing labor negotiations; and direct staff accordingly. (For possible action)

**ACTION: ACTION: NO CLOSED SESSION WAS HELD. NO ACTION WAS TAKEN BY THE BOARD.**

*Attachment(s) submitted and filed with the County Clerk's Office.*

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**KEVIN SCHILLER**

Chairman, that concludes your agenda. I think that moves us to the second section set aside for public comment.

**TICK SEGERBLOM**

All right, this is a second section set aside for public comment. Anyone here wishing to speak? Seeing no one, we'll close the period of public comment and adjourn.

**END PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, at the hour of 10:56 a.m., Chair Tick Segerblom adjourned the meeting.

**PLEASE NOTE:** THE COUNTY CLERK KEEPS THE OFFICIAL RECORD OF ALL PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNTY COMMISSION, THE CCWRD BOARD OF TRUSTEES, THE UMC HOSPITAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, THE CLARK COUNTY LIQUOR AND GAMING LICENSING BOARD, AND THE CLARK COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY. TO OBTAIN A COMPLETE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF ALL PROCEEDINGS, ANY PHOTOGRAPH, MAP, CHART, OR ANY OTHER DOCUMENT USED IN ANY PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD/TRUSTEES, REQUESTS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO THE COUNTY CLERK.

TO REFERENCE AGENDA ITEM ATTACHMENTS ONLINE: REFER TO THE MEETING LINK BELOW, SELECT THE ITEM (FILE # COLUMN), AND CLICK THE LINK FOR THE DESIRED ATTACHMENT.

[ONLINE MEETING LINK](#)

**APPROVED:** /s/ Tick Segerblom  
TICK SEGERBLOM, CHAIR

**ATTEST:** /s/ Lynn Marie Goya  
LYNN MARIE GOYA, CLARK COUNTY CLERK