

**CARSON CITY CONSOLIDATED MUNICIPALITY
NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE
CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Day: Tuesday
Date: May 17, 2022
Time: Beginning at 1:30 pm
Location: Community Center, Robert ‘Bob’ Crowell Board Room
851 East William Street
Carson City, Nevada

AGENDA

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC:

Members of the public who wish to view the meeting may watch the livestream of the Charter Review Committee meeting at www.carson.org/granicus and by clicking on “In progress” next to the meeting date, or by tuning in to cable channel 191. Livestream of the meeting is provided solely as a courtesy and convenience to the public. Carson City does not give any assurance or guarantee that the livestream or cable channel access will be reliable. Although all reasonable efforts will be made to provide livestream, unanticipated technical difficulties beyond the control of City staff may delay, interrupt, or render unavailable continuous livestream capability.

The public may provide public comment in advance of a meeting by written submission to the following email address: publiccomment@carson.org. For inclusion or reference in the minutes of the meeting, your public comment must include your full name and be submitted via email by not later than 3:00 p.m. the day before the meeting. Public comment during a meeting is limited to three minutes for each speaker.

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Public Comment:

The public is invited at this time to comment on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda as an action item. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda.

4. For Possible Action: Approval of Minutes -

4.A April 12, 2022

[04-12-2022 Minutes \(CRC\).pdf](#)

5. Agenda Items:

5.A For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to amend subsection 2.110(3) of the Carson City Charter to require that emergency ordinances expire after a defined number of days. (Jason Woodbury, jwoodbury@carson.org)

Staff Summary: Pursuant to subsection 2.110(3) of the Carson City Charter, in a case of emergency, the Board of Supervisors may, by unanimous consent, take final action on an ordinance immediately or at a special meeting. Staff seeks direction from the Committee as to whether it wants to offer a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that the Charter be amended to establish a maximum effective period for emergency ordinances and, if so, the duration of that maximum effective period.

5.B For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that section 2.110 of the Carson City Charter be amended: (1) to require the Board to adopt or reject a proposed ordinance or amendment thereto within 60 days after the publication required by subsection 2.110(1); (2) to require the Carson City Clerk to complete publication required by subsection 2.110(4) not later than 14 days after adoption of the ordinance; and (3) to remove the requirement of Section 2.110(4) requiring publication of an approved ordinance prior to its effective date. (Jason Woodbury, jwoodbury@carson.org)

Staff Summary: Under certain circumstances, the publication timing requirements established by the Carson City Charter create impracticalities which are disruptive to the ordinance review process. The proposed amendments would allow greater flexibility in the timing requirements for the Board to complete its review and ultimate adoption or rejection of a proposed ordinance, and allow the Board to establish an effective date in advance of publication of the ordinance by title if circumstances necessitate.

[Section 2.110 Proposed Amendment \(FINAL\) as revised 20220510.pdf](#)

5.C For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to amend subsection 3.010(1)(c) of the Carson City Charter to limit the time during which the Mayor may exercise emergency powers. (Jason Woodbury, jwoodbury@carson.org)

Staff Summary: Pursuant to subsection 3.010(1)(c) of the Carson City Charter, the Mayor may perform emergency duties to ensure the general health, welfare, and safety of Carson City. Staff seeks direction from the Committee as to whether it wants to offer a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that the Charter be amended to establish a maximum period for the exercise of emergency powers by the Mayor and, if so, the duration of that maximum period.

5.D For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding future agenda items and meeting dates and possible direction to staff on the same. (Stephanie Hicks, shicks@carson.org)

Staff Summary: Discussion on potential future agenda items and the need for future meetings. Any proposed changes to the City Charter will need to be provided in a Legislative Bill Draft Request which will be due in September.

6. Public Comment:

The public is invited at this time to comment on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda as an action item. No action may be taken on a matter raised under this item of the agenda.

7. For Possible Action: To Adjourn

Agenda Management Notice - Items on the agenda may be taken out of order; the public body may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; and the public body may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

Titles of agenda items are intended to identify specific matters. If you desire detailed information concerning any subject matter itemized within this agenda, you are encouraged to call the responsible agency or the City Manager's Office. You are encouraged to attend this meeting and participate by commenting on any agenda item.

Notice to persons with disabilities: Members of the public who are disabled and require special assistance or accommodations at the meeting are requested to notify the City Manager's Office in writing at 201 North Carson Street, Carson City, NV, 89701, or by calling (775) 887-2100 at least 24 hours in advance.

To request a copy of the supporting materials for this meeting contact Rachael Evanson at revanson@carson.org or call (775) 887-2100.

This agenda and backup information are available on the City's website at www.carson.org/agendas and at the City Manager's Office - 201 N. Carson Street, Ste 2, Carson City, Nevada (775) 887-2100.

This notice has been posted at the following locations:

City Hall 201 North Carson Street

carson.org/agendas

<https://notice.nv.gov/>

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Carson City Charter Review Committee
Wednesday, April 12, 2022 ● 1:30 PM
Community Center Sierra Room
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Board Members:

Chair – Richard Staub	Vice Chair – Susan Hoffman
Member – Kimberly Fiegehen	Member – Ronni Hannaman
Member – Joe Hart	Member – Robert “Bob” Weise
Member – Stacie Wilke-McCulloch	

Staff:

Jason Woodbury, District Attorney
Stephanie Hicks, Deputy City Manager
Stephen Wood, Government Affairs Liaison
Tamar Warren, Senior 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.

The minutes of the Carson City Charter Review Committee meetings are available on www.carson.org/minutes.

1. CALL TO ORDER

(1:34:12) – Chairperson Staub called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

(1:34:46) – Ms. Warren called roll and noted the presence of a quorum.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Richard Staub	Present	
Vice Chairperson Susan Hoffman	Present	
Member Kimberly Fiegehen	Absent	
Member Ronni Hannaman	Present (via telephone)	
Member Joe Hart	Present	
Member Robert “Bob” Weise	Present	
Member Stacie Wilke-McCulloch	Present	

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

(1:35:08) – Chairperson Staub entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF MINUTES - FEBRUARY 24, 2022

(1:35:30) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item and entertained comments, corrections, or a motion.

(1:36:08) – Member Wilke-McCulloch moved to accept the minutes of the February 24, 2022 Charter Review Committee meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by member Weise and carried 6-0-0.

5. AGENDA ITEMS

5.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AMEND SUBSECTION 1.060(3) OF THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO REMOVE THE DEADLINE FOR REALIGNMENT OF WARD BOUNDARIES.

(1:36:38) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item. Ms. Hicks outlined the items that would be heard by the Committee and clarified that the first four items were recommended by Staff and the next five were submitted by members of the public. She offered to return with proposed language should there be a need. She also provided background on this item, outlined in the Staff Report, and requested amending Subsection 1.060(3) of the Carson City Charter to remove the January 1 deadline for the realignment of ward boundaries preceding the next general election, after a significant change in the population of a ward has taken place or after the receipt of decennial US Census Bureau data, to allow for more flexibility in the ward realignment process. Chairperson Staub entertained Committee and public comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(1:38:48) – Member Weise moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to the Carson City Charter to remove the January 1 redistricting deadline in subsection 1.060(3). The motion was seconded by Member Hannaman.

(11:39:30) – Mr. Woodbury clarified that the filing dates, both for the judicial (January) and non-judicial candidates (March) were set by Statute, and the proposed language required that “the ward realignment be completed not later than 30 days before the non-judicial candidate period.” Hel also explained that the judicial candidates were not affected by the ward realignments. Chairperson Staub called for the vote. **The motion carried 6-0-0.**

5.B FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AMEND SUBSECTION 2.010 OF THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO CLARIFY WHEN THE TERM OF OFFICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND MAYOR BEGIN AND END.

(1:38:48) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item. Ms. Hicks presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, and recommended a proposed amendment to include more detailed language to eliminate confusion about the start and end times for the terms of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. She clarified that the amendment would define the end of a term as being 11:59 p.m. on the day before the first Monday in January following a general election, and the beginning of a term as starting on the first Monday in January succeeding their election. Mr. Woodbury clarified for Member Wiese that the District Attorney’s Office was comfortable with the amendment which was consistent with the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS). Chairperson Staub noted he was “comfortable” with the amendment language. He also entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming. The Chair entertained a motion.

(1:46:51) – Vice Chair Hoffman moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to the Carson City Charter to include language in Subsection 2.010 that defines the term of office as beginning on the first Monday in January succeeding their election and ending at 11:59 p.m. on the day preceding the first Monday in January following a general election. The motion was seconded by Member Wilke-McCulloch and carried 6-0-0.

5.C FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT SUBSECTION 2.100(1) OF THE CARSON CITY CHARTER AMEND THE REQUIRED STYLE OF ORDINANCES FROM “THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF CARSON CITY DO ORDAIN” TO “THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF CARSON CITY DOES ORDAIN.”

(1:47:50) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item. Ms. Hicks noted that the correction was for “a small grammatical error.” The Chair entertained Committee and public comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(1:48:41) – Member Weise moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to subsection 2.100(1) to change the word “do” to “does.” The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Hoffman and carried 6-0-0.

5.D FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AMEND SUBSECTION 3.015 OF THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO HAVE THE MAYOR PRO TEMPORE ASSUME THE OFFICE OF MAYOR AND ESTABLISH THE PROCESS OF FILLING THE VACANCY LEFT BY THE MAYOR PRO TEMPORE IN THE EVENT OF A VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF MAYOR.

(1:49:15) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item. Ms. Hicks explained that the City’s current charter defines the Mayor Pro Tempore as one who performs the duties of Mayor during the absence or disability of the Mayor; however, he or she does not assume the Office of Mayor, adding that no mechanism exists for the filling of the vacancy left by the Mayor Pro Tempore should he or she act as Mayor. Ms. Hicks referenced two options, highlighted in the Staff Report, and cited examples from neighboring cities. The

first option recommended that the Mayor Pro Tempore assume the office of Mayor, which would result in a vacancy in the Mayor Pro Tempore’s former office which the Board of Supervisors would fill. The second option would authorize the Board of Supervisors to fill the vacancy in the office of the Mayor without waiting for the next general election. The Mayor Pro Tempore would be authorized to act as Mayor until the vacancy is filled by the Board of Supervisors. Discussion ensued and the Committee preferred the first option as the members believed that the Mayor Pro Tempore would be selected by the entire Board anyway. Chairperson Staub entertained public comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(1:54:45) – Member Wilke-McCulloch moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to subsection 3.015 of the Carson City Charter to establish the process for filling the vacancy on the Board of Supervisors left by the Mayor Pro Tempore in the event of a vacancy in the Office of Mayor. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Hoffman and carried 6-0-0.

(1:55:40) – Ms. Hicks clarified for Vice Chair Hoffman that Staff would present the redlined document included in the Staff Report which is consistent with the Committee’s discussion to the Board of Supervisors for approval at the upcoming joint meeting.

5.E FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AMEND SUBSECTION 1.060 OF THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO CREATE TWO NEW WARDS WITHIN CARSON CITY AND AN AMENDMENT TO SUBSECTION 2.010 OF THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO CHANGE THE ELECTION OF SUPERVISORS FROM AT LARGE TO BEING ELECTED BY REGISTERED VOTERS WITHIN THE WARD THAT THEY REPRESENT.

(1:55:59) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item. Ms. Hicks stated that the item was submitted by Richard Arguile. She also presented the Staff Report and referenced the request which is incorporated into the record as late material. Chairperson Staub noted that the City’s population had not increased significantly in the past 10-15 years and wished to see additional data to be convinced that “our supervisors simply cannot represent their wards because they’re too large,” calling it a huge step. He also received confirmation that Carson City voters had rejected a ballot measure to conduct ward-based elections. Member Hart recommended separating the two requests during action on the item. Member Wilke-McCulloch did not believe that “the City has the population base to add two more [supervisors]” and noted that a board of seven members would add “more problems sometimes”. She also reiterated the fact that the voters had already rejected ward-based voting. Ms. Hicks clarified that public requests pertaining to the City’s Charter would be presented to the Committee and explained that appropriate language would be drafted for consideration as future action based on the discussion. Vice Chair Hoffman also wished to see that the two requests presented as one agenda item should be acted upon separately. Mr. Woodbury explained that the Chair could request two different motions at his discretion. Chairperson Staub entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming. He also recommended two separate motions.

(2:07:16) – Vice Chair Hoffman moved not to recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to Subsection 1.060 of the Carson City Charter to create two new wards within Carson City. The motion was seconded by Member Hart and carried 6-0-0.

(2:07:58) – Chairperson Staub entertained another motion to address ward-based voting.

(2:08:04) – Member Wilke-McCulloch moved not to recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to Subsection 2.010 of the Carson City Charter that would require members of the Board of Supervisors to be elected by the registered voters within the boundaries of the ward they represent. The motion was seconded by Member Hart and carried 6-0-0.

5F. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AMEND SUBSECTION 2.090(1) OF THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO REPLACE "NOT REPUGNANT TO THE CONSTITUTION" WITH "NOT IN CONFLICT WITH THE CONSTITUTION."

(2:09:00) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item. Ms. Hicks explained that the request was submitted by Adele Basham who believed the use of the word repugnant in Subsection 2.090(1) of the Carson City Charter was "vague and subjective." Ms. Basham, whose request is incorporated into the record as late material, had suggested that the amendment read "not in conflict with the Constitution" or similar language. Mr. Woodbury did not find the suggestion "legally unsound;" however, he advised that "the word repugnant in this context is a legal term of art. Mr. Woodbury believed that the term "repugnant" captured more than the phrase "in conflict with." Vice Chair Hoffman cited the definition of "repugnant" from Merriam-Webster's Dictionary and did not believe the change was necessary. Chairperson Staub was also not in favor of the proposed amendment noting that "repugnant" had historical significance. He also entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming. Chairperson Staub entertained a motion.

(2:15:06) – Member Weise moved not to recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to subsection 2.090(1) of the Carson City Charter to change "not repugnant to the Constitution" to "not in conflict with the Constitution." The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Hoffman and carried 6-0-0.

(2:16:07) – Member Weise inquired about the communication back to the requesters. Ms. Hicks explained that all those who had submitted a request had been invited to the meeting, adding that her office would communicate with the individuals who had submitted a request.

5.G FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AMEND THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO REQUIRE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO ADOPT AN ORDINANCE TO ASSESS AN ANNUAL VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE.

(2:17:07) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item. Ms. Hicks indicated that the item had been submitted by Edward Choklek in order to provide the City with a new revenue stream for road and street capital projects and for ongoing maintenance and repair. She also noted that the City had been looking at additional revenue streams to increase local funding for road maintenance; however, NRS 482.480 did not permit “enabling legislation that would allow a local government to impose fees” without further legislative changes. She also responded to clarifying questions.

(2:19:10) – Chairperson Staub was in favor of handling the request through the legislature. Member Weise believed that the request did not belong with the Committee as the Board of Supervisors would draft its own ordinances. He also believed that Staff should be able to reject such items; however, Ms. Hicks cited historic data, noting that all requests from the public have been brought to the Committee but offered to look into Member Weise’s request as a way of streamlining the process. Chairperson Staub entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

(2:22:30) – Chairperson Staub requested tabling the item as he believed the Committee was not prepared to make a tax recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Vice Chair Hoffman believed the Committee could take action not to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Member Weise was in agreement with the Vice Chair’s suggestion. Mr. Woodbury confirmed that a motion not to recommend would also be submitted to the Board as part of the Committee’s actions. Chairperson Staub entertained a motion. Discussion ensued regarding the motion.

(2:28:36) – Vice Chair Hoffman moved “not to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for or against the item due to the fact that it is not within the purview of this Committee.” The motion was seconded by Member Wilke-McCulloch and carried 6-0-0.

5.H FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AMEND SUBSECTION 2.110(3) OF THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO REQUIRE THAT EMERGENCY ORDINANCES EXPIRE 30 DAYS AFTER ADOPTION.

(2:29:09) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item and thanked Adele Basham for submitting the item. Ms. Hicks reiterated the request which stated that an emergency ordinance should be applicable for a limited time, such as 30 days, before it is required to go through the regular process of ordinance adoption, including an opportunity for public input. Member Weise inquired about extensions and Mr. Woodbury explained that Staff would craft the recommendation based on the Committee’s action. Member Hart noted that expiration dates should be based on the ordinance, adding that some may require 60 or 90-day expiration dates and recommended not-to-exceed expiration dates. Chairperson Staub cited the example of the COVID-19 pandemic and explained that the emergency ordinances related to the pandemic had remained in effect as long as the emergency existed. He recommended expiring the emergency ordinance a number of days after the emergency ends. Member Weise was in favor of “the spirit” of the request and wondered whether the Board could review emergency ordinances at least every 90-days. Mr. Woodbury confirmed that the District Attorney’s Office could draft language based on the Committee’s decision.

Mr. Woodbury clarified for Vice Chair Hoffman that the language for this item could be finalized during the joint meeting between the Committee and the Board of Supervisors. Chairperson Staub entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming. He also suggested that Staff redraft the language for recommended options, based on comments received, and return it to the Committee for action at the next meeting. The Board had no objections to the recommendation; therefore, the item was continued until the next meeting.

5.I FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS TO AMEND SUBSECTION 3.010(1)(C) OF THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO LIMIT THE TIME DURING WHICH THE MAYOR MAY EXERCISE EMERGENCY POWERS.

(2:38:43) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item and thanked Ms. Basham once again for submitting the item. Ms. Hicks presented the request which indicated that the emergency duties of the Mayor should be for a limited time before the Mayor is required to obtain approval of the Board of Supervisors, including an opportunity for public input. Vice Chair Hoffman believed that this item was similar to item 5.H and required clearer language by Staff. She recommended postponing action on the item until the next meeting. In response to a question by Member Weise, Mr. Woodbury explained that items 5.H and 5.I could not be combined and must be agendized separately; however, they could be discussed concurrently. Chairperson Staub requested receiving language on the duration of the emergency powers. There were no public comments. This item was continued until the next meeting.

5.J FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND MEETING DATES AND POSSIBLE DIRECTION TO STAFF ON THE SAME.

(2:41:59) – Chairperson Staub introduced the item and noted a code enforcement letter he had received regarding the Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC) 4.04.010 and 4.04.013 which state:

4.04.010 - Business license required.

- 1. It is unlawful for any person to engage in or carry on any trade, profession, calling or business in whole or in part within Carson City, or to advertise that person is conducting or carrying on any business specified herein, without first applying for, obtaining and maintaining a license as set forth in this chapter.*
- 2. Violation of this section shall be punishable as prescribed in Section 1.08.010 of this code.*

4.04.013 - License fee—Liens on property where located—Enforcement.

- A. Any license fee shall constitute a lien upon the real and personal property of the business for which the fee was levied and upon the real property upon which the business is conducted until the fee is paid. For the purposes of this section, any general or subcontractor performing work in Carson City for which a license is required shall be deemed to be conducting his business at the premises where he is performing such work.*

- B. *The lien shall be enforced in the following manner:*
 - 1. *By recording in the office of the city recorder, within 90 days following the date on which such fee became delinquent, a notice of the lien containing the following:*
 - a. *The amount due;*
 - b. *The name of the record owner of the property;*
 - c. *A description of the property sufficient for identification;*
 - d. *A verification by the oath of the chief license officer of Carson City;*
 - and*
 - 2. *By an action for foreclosure against such property in the same manner as an action for foreclosure of any other lien, commenced within 2 years after the date of recording of the notice of the lien, and accompanied by appropriate notice to other lienholders.*

(2:43:18) – Chairperson Staub stated that the notices were being sent to the owners of the property instead of tenants; however, he believed that it would not be the appropriate process and wished to see the notices sent to the tenant. Member Wilke-McCulloch questioned whether the item fell under the City’s Charter or whether it was a code enforcement issue. Mr. Woodbury offered to look into the matter and believed it could be within the Committee’s purview to consider the item.

(2:46:44) – Chairperson Staub wished to reconsider the next two meeting dates. Ms. Hicks noted that the Boardroom may be available on May 17, 2022, and June 21, 2022, at 1:30 p.m. Mr. Woodbury suggested approving the meeting dates via a motion. Chairperson Staub entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

(2:51:12) – Vice Chair Hoffman moved to reschedule the May 20, 2022 Charter Review Meeting to May 17, 2022 at 1:30 p.m. The motion was seconded by Member Hart and carried 6-0-0.

(2:52:40) – Vice Chair Hoffman moved to reschedule the June 17, 2022 Charter Review Meeting to June 21, 2022 at 1:30 p.m. The motion was seconded by Member Hart and carried 6-0-0.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

(2:53:17) – Chairperson Staub entertained final public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

7. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO ADJOURN

(2:53:40) – Chairperson Staub adjourned the meeting at 2:53 p.m.

The April 12, 2022 Charter Review Committee meeting minutes are so approved on this 17th day of May 2022.



STAFF REPORT

Report To:

Meeting Date: May 17, 2022

Staff Contact: Jason Woodbury, District Attorney

Agenda Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to amend subsection 2.110(3) of the Carson City Charter to require that emergency ordinances expire after a defined number of days. (Jason Woodbury, jwoodbury@carson.org)

Staff Summary: Pursuant to subsection 2.110(3) of the Carson City Charter, in a case of emergency, the Board of Supervisors may, by unanimous consent, take final action on an ordinance immediately or at a special meeting. Staff seeks direction from the Committee as to whether it wants to offer a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that the Charter be amended to establish a maximum effective period for emergency ordinances and, if so, the duration of that maximum effective period.

Agenda Action: Formal Action / Motion

Time Requested: 15 min

Proposed Motion

I move (to recommend) (to not recommend) to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to subsection 2.110(3) of the Carson City Charter to require that emergency ordinances expire ___ days after adoption.

Board's Strategic Goal

Efficient Government

Previous Action

The Committee heard this item at the April 12, 2022 meeting, and referred the item back to staff for additional review.

Background/Issues & Analysis

This item was submitted by Adele Basham. Ms. Basham stated that an emergency ordinance should be applicable for a limited time, perhaps 30 days, before it is required to go through the regular process of ordinance adoption including an opportunity for public input. The District Attorney will provide background and discussion on the emergency ordinance process.

Applicable Statute, Code, Policy, Rule or Regulation

Carson City Charter §2.110(3)

Financial Information

Is there a fiscal impact? No

If yes, account name/number:

Is it currently budgeted?

Explanation of Fiscal Impact:

Alternatives

Attachments:

Board Action Taken:

Motion: _____

1) _____

2) _____

Aye/Nay

(Vote Recorded By)



STAFF REPORT

Report To:

Meeting Date: May 17, 2022

Staff Contact: Jason Woodbury, District Attorney

Agenda Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that section 2.110 of the Carson City Charter be amended: (1) to require the Board to adopt or reject a proposed ordinance or amendment thereto within 60 days after the publication required by subsection 2.110(1); (2) to require the Carson City Clerk to complete publication required by subsection 2.110(4) not later than 14 days after adoption of the ordinance; and (3) to remove the requirement of Section 2.110(4) requiring publication of an approved ordinance prior to its effective date. (Jason Woodbury, jwoodbury@carson.org)

Staff Summary: Under certain circumstances, the publication timing requirements established by the Carson City Charter create impracticalities which are disruptive to the ordinance review process. The proposed amendments would allow greater flexibility in the timing requirements for the Board to complete its review and ultimate adoption or rejection of a proposed ordinance, and allow the Board to establish an effective date in advance of publication of the ordinance by title if circumstances necessitate.

Agenda Action: Formal Action / Motion

Time Requested: 5 min

Proposed Motion

I move to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that section 2.110 of the Carson City Charter be amended to change the number "45" in subsection (1) to "60" and to replace the phrase, "before the ordinance becomes effective" in subsection (4) with the phrase "not later than 14 days after adoption."

Board's Strategic Goal

Efficient Government

Previous Action

N/A

Background/Issues & Analysis

The Carson City Charter requires publication of a notice in the Nevada Appeal after an ordinance has been proposed and filed with the Carson City Clerk indicating that the proposed ordinance has been filed. Section 2.110(1) of the Charter requires adoption or rejection of the ordinance within 45 days of the publication. The Nevada Appeal's publication schedule and submission deadlines periodically misalign with the Board's regular meeting schedule in a way as to make the 45 day deadline impractical. Staff recommends extending the current 45 day deadline to 60 days.

Similarly, Section 2.110(4) of the Carson City Charter requires publication of an ordinance by title in the Nevada Appeal following passage. The current provision prohibits the ordinance from becoming effective until after such publication. On occasion, this can delay the effective date for a time sensitive ordinance or create

confusion about when the ordinance actually becomes effective. Staff recommends removing this prohibition from Section 2.110(4) which would allow the Board discretion over an ordinance's effective date. The Charter's requirement for publication of an adopted ordinance by title would be undisturbed by this amendment. Additionally, the amendment would expressly require publication of an ordinance not later than 14 days after its adoption.

Applicable Statute, Code, Policy, Rule or Regulation

Carson City Charter §2.110

Financial Information

Is there a fiscal impact? No

If yes, account name/number:

Is it currently budgeted?

Explanation of Fiscal Impact:

Alternatives

Do not recommend the proposed amendment to the Board of Supervisors.

Attachments:

[Section 2.110 Proposed Amendment \(FINAL\) as revised 20220510.pdf](#)

Board Action Taken:

Motion: _____	1) _____	Aye/Nay
	2) _____	_____

(Vote Recorded By)

Sec. 2.110 Ordinances: Enactment procedure; emergency ordinances.

1. All proposed ordinances when first proposed must be read to the Board by title, after which an adequate number of copies of the proposed ordinance must be filed with the Clerk for public distribution. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3, notice of the filing must be published once in a newspaper qualified pursuant to the provisions of chapter 238 of NRS and published in Carson City at least 10 days before the adoption of the ordinance. The Board shall adopt or reject the ordinance or an amendment thereto, within [45] **60** days after the date of publication.
2. At a regular meeting or adjourned meeting of the Board following the proposal of an ordinance it must be read as first introduced, or as amended, and thereupon the proposed ordinance must be finally voted upon or action thereon postponed.
3. In cases of emergency or where the ordinance is of a kind specified in section 7.030, by unanimous consent of the Board, final action may be taken immediately or at a special meeting called for that purpose, and no notice of the filing of copies of the proposed ordinance with the Clerk need be published.
4. All ordinances must be signed by the Mayor, attested by the Clerk and published by title, together with the names of the Supervisors voting for or against passage, in a newspaper qualified pursuant to the provisions of chapter 238 of NRS and published in Carson City for at least one publication[~~-, before the ordinance becomes effective~~] **not later than 14 days after adoption**. The Board may, by majority vote, order the publication of the ordinance in full in lieu of publication by title only.
5. The Clerk shall record all ordinances in a book kept for that purpose together with the affidavits of publication by the publisher.



STAFF REPORT

Report To: Meeting Date: May 17, 2022

Staff Contact: Jason Woodbury, District Attorney

Agenda Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to amend subsection 3.010(1)(c) of the Carson City Charter to limit the time during which the Mayor may exercise emergency powers. (Jason Woodbury, jwoodbury@carson.org)

Staff Summary: Pursuant to subsection 3.010(1)(c) of the Carson City Charter, the Mayor may perform emergency duties to ensure the general health, welfare, and safety of Carson City. Staff seeks direction from the Committee as to whether it wants to offer a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that the Charter be amended to establish a maximum period for the exercise of emergency powers by the Mayor and, if so, the duration of that maximum period.

Agenda Action: Formal Action / Motion **Time Requested:** 15 min

Proposed Motion

I move (to recommend) (to not recommend) to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to subsection 3.010(1)(c) of the Carson City Charter to limit the time during which the Mayor may exercise emergency powers to ___ days before such emergency powers must be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Board's Strategic Goal

Efficient Government

Previous Action

The Committee heard this item at the April 12, 2022 meeting, and referred the item back to staff for additional review.

Background/Issues & Analysis

This item was submitted by Adele Basham. Ms. Basham stated that emergency duties of the Mayor should be for a limited time, before the Mayor is required to obtain approval of the Board of Supervisors including an opportunity for public input. The District Attorney will provide background and discussion on the emergency powers of the Mayor.

Applicable Statute, Code, Policy, Rule or Regulation

Carson City Charter §3.010(1)(c)

Financial Information

Is there a fiscal impact? No

If yes, account name/number:

Is it currently budgeted?

Explanation of Fiscal Impact:

Alternatives

Attachments:

Board Action Taken:

Motion: _____

1) _____

2) _____

Aye/Nay

(Vote Recorded By)



STAFF REPORT

Report To: **Meeting Date:** May 17, 2022

Staff Contact: Stephanie Hicks, Deputy City Manager

Agenda Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding future agenda items and meeting dates and possible direction to staff on the same. (Stephanie Hicks, shicks@carson.org)

Staff Summary: Discussion on potential future agenda items and the need for future meetings. Any proposed changes to the City Charter will need to be provided in a Legislative Bill Draft Request which will be due in September.

Agenda Action: Formal Action / Motion **Time Requested:** 15 min

Proposed Motion

Provide direction to staff regarding future agenda items and/or meeting dates based on the discussion at the meeting.

Board's Strategic Goal

Efficient Government

Previous Action

At the April 12, 2022 meeting, the committee selected the following meeting dates for possible future meetings: May 17, 2022 and June 21, 2022.

Background/Issues & Analysis

If there are no further items for discussion, the committee may decide no additional Charter Review Committee meetings are necessary. A joint meeting will be held with the Board of Supervisors on July 21, 2022.

Applicable Statute, Code, Policy, Rule or Regulation

N/A

Financial Information

Is there a fiscal impact? No

If yes, account name/number:

Is it currently budgeted?

Explanation of Fiscal Impact:

Alternatives

Attachments:

Board Action Taken:

Motion: _____

1) _____

2) _____

Aye/Nay

(Vote Recorded By)