

**CITY OF ELKO
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
4:00 PM, THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 2022
ELKO CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
1751 COLLEGE AVENUE, ELKO, NV 89801**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Jon Karr, Chairman of the City of Elko Redevelopment Advisory Council (RAC), at 4:00 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present:

**Jon Karr, DBA
Catherine Wines, ACAB
Lina Blohm, RAC Member
Giovanni Puccinelli, Councilman
Jeff Dalling, RAC Member**

Absent:

**Ex-Officio - Non Voting Member Corey Rice, Elko County
Ex-Officio - Non Voting Member Katie Nedderiep, ECVA
Ex-Officio - Non Voting Member Sonja Sibert, GBC
Ex-Officio - Non Voting Member Steve Bowers, Elko County School
District**

City Staff Present:

**Cathy Laughlin, City Planner
Shelby Knopp, Administrative Assistant
Scott Wilkinson, Assistant City Manager**

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

*Catherine Wines asked for some photos to be shown on the projector (**Included as Exhibit A**). She said when she received the agenda for this meeting it must have caught her in a bad mood, because she was livid that the downtown looked like the pictures shown and all they do is elect officers and talk about Storefront Grants. Storefront Grants are not going to fix any of this. She said it was similar to the Federal Government sending money to El Salvador thinking that it would fix the problem on the southern border. Our downtown is filthy. She explained that the first picture, the upper left corner, was blood and vomit in front of the door to her office a couple months ago. She explained that the picture of the trashcan was right outside of her office. There is broken glass around it, and it has been there since before Christmas. She explained that the picture of the dumpsters was located in alley behind her building, One of the dumpsters caught on*

fire a year ago, it melted half of the fence and hasn't been repaired. In the photo it is clean compared to what it usually looks like. Years ago, they agreed to move their trash from behind their buildings to this area. They were promised that it would be kept clean and that their trash bin would go down. Their bins went up and this is what it looks like. In front of the Punch Bowl, there is an ashtray that is always completely full, and there are to go cups all over the sidewalk. She thought there was also vomit that could be seen in the photo that was taken a couple months ago, which has still not been cleaned up. The photo at the bottom in the middle was human waste in front of the Post office. The last photo is one of the streetlights in the middle of the corridor that got shot out. It took weeks for the glass to get cleaned up, but now there is no light there. Ms. Wines felt like Ms. Blohm and herself had been talking about safety and cleanliness of the Downtown on this Board for five years. She stated that she was so mad when she got this agenda that she called John Ellison and asked him whom she could talk to at State Public Health, because this is a health hazard. She lives and walks around in this every single day. A Board that is supposed to be advising the City Council on what to do downtown is talking about Storefront Grants and electing officers. She said if something wasn't done immediately, she was going to turn the City of Elko in to the State Public Health Board, or do whatever she could to get someone's attention.

Lina Blohm agreed with Ms. Wines. She said they all knew it was a problem, but wanted to talk about a solution.

Ms. Wines said she saw a street sweeper go by every three or four months. She said she had never seen the sidewalks cleaned. There are layers of vomit, blood, and human waste that have never been cleaned off.

Ms. Blohm stated that it was the responsibility of the property owners to keep their sidewalks clean. She said she was out this morning sweeping her own sidewalk.

Ms. Wines said she had swept, but that they needed to be powerwashed. Every sidewalk in the downtown needed to be powerwashed once every six months.

Ms. Blohm said they couldn't take action, but she asked if they could create an agenda item. She didn't want to wait another quarter to take action on this.

Jon Karr said as a member of the Board with ideas on how to fix it; they could present it to the City Council.

Ms. Wines stated that she had requested multiple times for this Board to discuss safety and cleanliness, and it never makes an agenda.

Mr. Karr assumed that the lights would come up on an agenda, because NV Energy was talking about giving them to the City.

Ms. Laughlin explained that there had been several conversations at City Council regarding the lights downtown. It was tabled and it would be brought back to City Council again.

Scott Wilkinson said there was a report at the last Council Meeting. There are ten lights out, out of 40. NV Energy is aware of it. NV Energy has a responsibility as a corporate citizen to maintain not only the corridor lights, but also lighting throughout the City.

Mr. Karr said he didnt mind putting it on the agenda, but he wasnt quite sure how to present it.

Giovanni Puccinelli said if he owned one of those businesses, he would take the responsibility and clean up in front of his business.

Ms. Wines said there were three bars in that area that didnt care.

Jeff Dalling said when the bars get their CUP they are required to clean in front of their business.

Ms. Wines said there was no enforcement and nobody cared.

Ms. Laughlin explained that the three bars on that street did not have CUPs, because they havent lost their legal non-conforming status. Any new bars that come to the downtown are required by their CUP to clean in front of their buildings. It is also in the Code that it is the property owner's responsibility to clean in front of their property.

Ms. Blohm said this wasnt the first time this issue had come up. She remembered letters being sent out that said the issues had to be corrected within a certain amount of time, but there was not any follow-up.

Ms. Laughlin said she would email the complaint form to Ms. Wines, which will go to the Code Enforcement Officer and she will have to follow up on it.

Ms. Wines asked about the trash dumpsters, and who was responsible for those. She said the poop was in the middle of the Corridor and it has been there for five days. At some point, the City has to say they are going to clean the place up. Someone has to take the lead on it, and Ms. Wines wanted this Board to take the lead, but it never seemed to make an agenda.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 28, 2021 - Regular Meeting FOR POSSIBLE ACTION

*****Motion: Approve the October 2021 Meeting Minutes.**

Moved by Jeff Dalling, Seconded by Lina Blohm

****Motion Pass. (4-0)***

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Review, consideration, and possible recommendation to the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) regarding outstanding and non-compliant storefront improvement grants, and matters related thereto. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION**

As progress is made with the Storefront Grant Program, the RAC suggested a progress report on those who are outstanding and non-compliant.

Ms. Laughlin wanted to go through the memo that was included in the agenda packet. She added that there had been some changes since the memo was written and the agenda was posted. She thought it would be necessary to take action on each grant individually. Ms. Laughlin started with the 2018 Grants on OC Restaurants. She went over the information that was included in the memo and added that she received the reimbursement packet this morning, but it had a lot of errors and omissions. We have received the reimbursement request; it is just insufficient at this time. Ms. Laughlin said she would put together a list of things that the applicant would need to submit. She continued with the 2020 Grants. Ms. Laughlin went over the information in the memo regarding the Braemar Construction Grant. Staff recommended that the RDA terminate the financial obligation on the part of the RDA and waive the provision in the Participation Agreement stating that Braemar Construction is disqualified from applying for future grants.

Ms. Blohm asked if Braemar would have the opportunity to reapply. (Yes)

Chairman Karr asked if that money would become available to someone else, or if it would sit in limbo until Braemar reapplied.

Ms. Laughlin explained that the Storefront Program was initially approved for five years at \$50,000 per year. The RDA went through the \$250,000 in four years with grant approvals. Staff went back to the RDA and asked for an extension, and they granted a five year extension for another \$50,000 per year. At times, the RDA has approved more than \$50,000 each year, so the money has gone out quicker than it comes in. If this grant money gets de-obligated, it will go back into the Storefront Grant opportunity fund to extend it to the full five years.

Mr. Wilkinson thought the provision of one grant per property was under the assumption that the applicant would utilize the funding. In this case, if it is deobligated and they haven't utilized the funding, he thought it warranted them to be eligible at a future date.

Ms. Blohm asked if it would require a motion to bring the money back into the fund for future use. She asked if any of this required a specific motion.

Ms. Laughlin requested that they make a recommendation to the RDA on each of the grants. The money will just go back into the RDA budget.

Mr. Wilkinson mentioned that it might be easier to have a motion as they go through each one.

It was decided to go back to the 2018 OC Restaurants Grant.

Ms. Wines asked if they applied for reimbursement.

Ms Laughlin said that they submitted their reimbursement application today, but the application is insufficient. It is lacking some information.

Ms. Wines said they didnt do the Old Chicago.

Ms. Laughlin explained that they amended their project in September of 2018 to do the bear and some painting. They did do the work; they just need to revise their reimbursement application. Ms. Laughlin added that she changed her recommended motion from the one listed in the memo.

Mr. Wilkinson asked Ms. Laughlin if the contract required them to submit sufficient documentation for the reimburseement within a certain period of time.

Ms. Laughlin said at the time their application was approved, no, but as of now, there is a timeline for them to submit for the reimbursement.

Mr. Wilkinson said if the Board wanted to have a recommendation, so this doesnt go on for a year or two, for the RDA to consider a deadline. Ms. Laughlin would have to consult legal. He thought there was an opportunity for the RDA to take some type of action that resolves the issue, based on Ms. Laughlin's conversations with legal counsel, sooner rather than later.

Ms. Laughlin added that the insufficiencies in the reimbursement request was the W-9 had the wrong name on it; the same thing with the application, there was no proof of payment, and some issues with receipts. When staff reviews these reimbursement requests, they have to look at them as the auditors would look at them.

Chairman Karr said they could either table this, or make the recommendation as listed in the memo but give them a timeline to get the proper infomation turned in.

Ms. Laughlin agreed with Mr. Karr.

Chairman Karr asked what the Board thought for this grant.

Ms. Blohm said this project was initiated in 2018. We are in 2022. She asked if there was something lacking within the Storefront Agreement that says the applicants must submit for reimburseement with a certain period of time after the project is complete, and the completion of the project must be done within a certain amount of days.

Ms. Laughlin explained that that has been added into the new agreements, but it was not included in the agreement at the time this project was approved.

Mr. Wilkinson added that Ms. Laughlin consulted with the City Attorney and there is an opportunity that the RDA could consider action that addresses that issue. He thought Ms. Laughlin's recommendation was appropriate.

Ms. Wines stated that the purpose of the grant was to improve downtown. She didnt think that it should go for four years, but the purpose of the money was to spend it. She didnt think they should make it harder. She thought they needed to keep their eye on the big picture. She said she would do whatever the other Board members wanted to do on this one, because it had gone on for a long time. She added that she thought they would get more participation if they loosened up the requirements.

Ms. Blohm didnt think participation had been an issue. She thought they needed to tend toward lenient, as opposed to hard-nosed hammer.

Ms. Laughlin believed that since the applicant submitted the reimbursement today, it was just a matter of them correcting a couple things.

Chairman Karr reiterated that they could table this grant, or give them 60 days to get the propret paperwork in.

Mr. Puccinelli thought the motion should be to approve it, but also to give him a certain amount of time to get the things Ms. Laughlin needed.

Ms. Wines agreed.

Chairman Karr asked if 60 days was enough time. (Yes) He stated that the motion would be to approve it with 60 to get the proper paper work in.

Mr. Wilkinson clarified that it would need to be a recommendation to the RDA, rather than an approval of the reimbursment.

*****Motion: Forward a recommendation to the RDA to provide the applicant a written request to file the necessary paperwork for reimbursement, stating that if the City of Elko Redevelopment Agency doesn't receive the reimbursement request within 60 days, the RDA will accept that as the applicant's statement of intent not to proceed and terminate the financial obligation on the part of the RDA.**

Moved by Lina Blohm, Seconded by Lina Blohm

** Motion passed unanimously. (5-0)*

Chairman Karr wanted to move on to 717 W. Idaho Street.

Ms. Laughlin went over the information included in the memo. Her recommendation was that the RDA terminate the financial obligation, but waive the provision of the Participation Agreement and that they can reapply for a grant when they are ready to do the project.

Ms. Blohm asked if this would come in the form of a letter from the City, which would state that we were thankful that they applied, but because of the conditions involved, we respectfully request that you submit again.

Mr. Wilkinson added that they could have that be a part of the motion.

Ms. Wines asked if someone could reach out to them first.

Ms. Laughlin explained that she had reached out to the applicant several times. They aren't operating their full business out of that building any more, so she wasn't sure what their plans were with the building going forward.

*****Motion: Forward a recommendation to the RDA to terminate the financial obligation on the part of the RDA and waive the provision in the Participation Agreement stating that Braemar Construction is disqualified from applying for future grant funds.**

Moved by Giovanni Puccinelli, Seconded by Catherine Wines

** Motion passed unanimously. (5-0)*

Chairman Karr stated that they would move on to 442 Idaho Street.

Ms. Laughlin went over the information for 442 Idaho Street that was included in the memo. She added that she received a reimbursement request from Rubies Bar. There were some problems with the reimbursement request form, but Ms. Laughlin has reached out to the applicant requesting that the changes be made. As of today, Ms. Laughlin hadn't received the information she requested, but she thought she would see it.

Mr. Dalling thought if they gave the applicant 60 days it would be fair.

*****Motion: Forward a recommendation to the RDA to provide the applicant written notification that it must promptly file the necessary request for reimbursement; if the City of Elko Redevelopment Agency doesn't receive the reimbursement request within 60 days, the RDA will accept that as the applicant's statement of intent not to proceed and terminate the financial obligation on the part of the RDA.**

Moved by Jeff Dalling, Seconded by Lina Blohm

** Motion passed unanimously. (5-0)*

Chairman Karr moved on to 506 Silver Street.

Ms. Laughlin explained that she reached out to all of the applicants in the memo. She also reached out to the Building Department and had them provide a memo to her on the status of each project. She then went over the information provided in the memo. Ms. Laughlin said that when she reached out to Garret, he stated that they are currently doing the work on the building, and that he would still like to be considered for the storefront grant. She reached back out to the Building Department, and it had not been permitted as of 5 minutes before the meeting. They are doing the work. What was approved by the RDA was a brick exterior of the building. The three bids that

were in the application are different contractors than the one that is doing the work. They are doing a metal siding now, which looks great, but it is not what was approved in the grant application. Ms. Laughlin recommended that the RAC do the same thing as the others, allow them to continue and not deobligate the funds. It will have to go to the RDA for approval of the substitution of materials and the contractor that wasn't part of their grant. With the RDA's approval, they can also give them a certain timeline to get the work permitted and completed.

Ms. Wines asked if it had to be permitted.

Ms. Laughlin explained that because of the installation method on the building, the Building Official was requiring that it be permitted.

Chairman Karr asked if the recommended motion was different from what was listed in the memo. (Yes) He asked if they even needed to make a recommendation on this one.

Ms. Laughlin stated that they needed to make a recommendation.

*****Motion: Forward a recommendation to the RDA to continue working with Living Stones Church as long as they get the required permits, let them continue with the project and apply for reimbursement when it is complete.**

Moved by Catherine Wines, Seconded by Giovanni Puccinelli

Mr. Dalling asked Garret Kamps to explain the project with the changes.

Garret Kamps, 676 A street, explained that they did not intend to be the problem child. You have all heard all of the excuses of the difficulty of construction, and working with these projects over the last two years, they have gotten to experience all of them, including having to move to a different siding. There was an earthquake in Wells and it was decided that the type of exterior that they were looking at was no longer acceptable or safe. They had to make the changes as they moved along. He also wanted the Board to know that he found out yesterday that the project was not permitted. He apologized for that. Mr. Kamps explained that he relied on some information that was not clear. They intend to finish the project. The longevity of the exterior should be amazing, there would be awnings, and it would be lit. They have spent about \$105,000 on materials. They would love to still be considered for the grant. He said he appreciated that the RDA made a concession for them to be a part of the Storefront Improvement Grant from the beginning. They understood that they did not qualify. He said he knew it was asking a lot to move past the issues that there are now, but he would appreciate if they did. He thought this would be a beautiful addition to downtown Elko. He stated that their hope and intention was that it becomes a nice, shining example of what the Storefront Improvement Grant can accomplish in association with responsible business owners.

Ms. Blohm pointed out that Mr. Kamps' comment brought a thought to mind. There have been several applicants in the downtown area who have made really responsive use of this Storefront money. She asked if it would be nice to have some sort of canopy, or something to advertise the Storefront money in action in front of the business.

Mr. Kamps said they would be happy to be a part of something like that.

Ms. Blohm asked if that would require an agenda item.

Chairman Karr thought they could put that on the next meeting's agenda.

** Motion passed unanimously. (5-0)*

Chairman Karr moved on to 246 Silver Street.

Ms. Laughlin went over the information included in the memo. This application is in conformance and they have 12 months from the date the Building Permit is issued to complete the project. She added that there was not a motion to be made on this application. She then moved on to 240 7th Street for the Tedesco Foundation. Ms. Laughlin went over the information included in the memo. This application is in conformance and they have until April 27, 2022 to complete the project. No motion was necessary on this application.

Ms. Wines stated that she had an update on the project. She said they would possibly need to apply for an extension. The property was purchased from NV Energy and they still have some really large transformers that they have five years to remove. They have discovered that they can't just remove them; they will need to get an easement. There has been some wheeling and dealing going on with Mr. Tedesco and NV Energy. The project is ready to be built, but there is some negotiation going on with NV Energy right now.

Ms. Laughlin pointed out that the Participation Agreement allows for one extension. They would need to submit the request for an extension before the expiration date, with enough time to get it on an RDA Agenda.

Ms. Blohm asked Ms. Wines to enlighten her on the entire project.

Ms Wines gave a brief explanation on the property owner and the project.

Chairman Karr moved on to 618 Idaho St.

Ms. Laughlin went over the information that was included in the memo. She recommended that the RDA grant an extension of 9 months to obtain the proper permit from the City of Elko Building Department, which gives the applicant until June 26, 2022 to obtain the permit and June 26, 2023 for completion of the project.

Ms. Blohm asked if the construction was complete.

Ms. Laughlin said no, and clarified that the grant was for the 6th Street side of the building.

*****Motion: Forward a recommendation to the RDA to grant an extension of 9 months to obtain the proper permit from the City of Elko Building Department, which gives the applicant until June 26, 2022 to obtain the permit and June 26, 2023 for completion of the project.**

Moved by Lina Blohm, Seconded by Catherine Wines

** Motion passed unanimously. (5-0)*

B. Review, consideration and possible action to elect officers, FOR POSSIBLE ACTION

RAC Bylaws Article III, Section 1 states: The RAC shall elect a chairperson, a vice-chairperson, and a secretary from its members in January of each year. There is no minimum or maximum on the number of times a member may serve in one of the elected offices.

***Jeff Dalling nominated Jon Karr for the Chairman position; a vote was taken and passed unanimously.**

***Lina Blohm nominated Catherine Wines for the Vice-Chairman position; a vote was taken and passed unanimously.**

***Catherine Wines nominated Lina Blohm for the Secretary position; a vote was taken and passed unanimously.**

VII. REPORTS

A. Budget

Budget Report

Ms. Laughlin went over the budget report that was included in the packet.

Ms. Blohm asked if the Block End Project was complete.

Ms. Laughlin explained that everything was complete except for the art pedestals.

Ms. Blohm asked what the anticipated completion date was for the art pedestals.

Ms. Laughlin stated that Ms. Wines could give an update on that.

Ms. Wines explained that she had been hired to do that project, because the cost was low enough that it didnt need to go out to bid. She stated that her structural engineer was slammed at the moment. She talked to him yesterday and said he would hopefully have the drawings done by February 10th. That will leave plenty of time in this calendar year to go out to bid.

Ms. Blohm asked what the intent was.

Ms. Wined explained that the half circles would be built up. They will be pedestals that are 18" tall, and an art piece can go in the center.

Mr. Wilkinson mentioned that at the next Arts & Culture meeting they would be talking about some pieces that we might be able to consider. Ms. Laughlin, as the RDA Manager, will attend that meeting. She has some authorities given to her by the RDA to move forward with contracts up to a certain amount. .

Ms. Blohm asked how many pedestals there would be.

Ms. Wines said there would be four.

B. Storefront Improvement Program

C. UP Property Acquisition

D. Downtown Idea Exchange

Downtown Idea Exchange

VIII. COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

There were no public comments made at this time.

NOTE: The Chairman or Vice Chairman reserves the right to change the order of the agenda and if the agenda is not completed, to recess the meeting and continue on another specified date and time. Additionally, the Redevelopment Advisory Council reserves the right to combine two or more agenda items, and/or remove an item from the agenda, or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Jon Karr, Chairman

Lina Blohm, Secretary