Mesquite City Council

Regular Meeting

Mesquite City Hall
10 E. Mesquite Blvd.
Tuesday, July 26, 2016 - 5:00 PM

Below is an agenda of all items scheduled to be considered. Unless otherwise stated, items may be taken out of the order presented on the agenda at the discretion of the Mayor and Council. Additionally, the Mayor and Council may combine two or more agenda items for consideration, and may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time. Public comment is limited to three minutes per person.

Ceremonial Matters

- INVOCATION
- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Public Comments

During the Public Comment portion of the agenda comments must be limited to matters within the authority and jurisdiction of the City Council. Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak to the City Council at this time, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name. Comments are limited to 3 minutes in length.

1. Public Comment

Consent Agenda

Items on the Consent Agenda may not require discussion. These items may be a single motion unless removed at the request of the Mayor, City Council, or City Manager.

2. Consideration of Approval of the July 26, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting agenda; the June 22, 2016 Special Primary Canvass Meeting minutes; the June 28, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting minutes and the July 5, 2016 Technical Review Meeting minutes.

- Public Comment
- Discussion and Possible Action

3. Consideration of approval of:
   a) Notification of Budget Transfers
   b) Notification of Budget Amendments
   c) Notification of Bills Paid
   d) Purchase Orders

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

Resolutions & Proclamations

4. Consideration of Approval of Resolution No. 902, adopting Amendment No. 2 to Interlocal Agreement (NM068-15-015) between the City of Mesquite (COM) and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) for the Construction of Exit 118 located on I-15 within the City of Mesquite, Nevada.

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

Department Reports

5. Mayor's Comments

6. City Council and Staff Reports

Zoning Items

7. Consideration of the introduction of Bill No. 502 (Medical Marijuana Separation Requirements) to amend Mesquite Municipal Code Section 9-15-8 Location Restrictions and Section 9-8-8 Separation Requirements by inserting language to exempt schools, community facilities, and residential

zones, from the separation requirements if they knowingly choose to locate closer to existing medical marijuana establishments.

- Discussion and Possible Action

Administrative Items

8. Consideration of the Introduction of Bill 504 (as Ordinance 504) amending Title 1 of the Mesquite Municipal Code "Administration"; amending Chapter 8 "Elections and Districts"; amending Section 19 "Primary and General Elections"; and other matters properly related thereto and to set a date for Public Hearing.

   - Discussion and Possible Action

Public Comments

During the Public Comment portion of the agenda comments must be limited to matters within the authority and jurisdiction of the City Council. Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak to the City Council at this time, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name. Comments are limited to 3 minutes in length.

9. Public Comment

Adjournment

10. Adjournment

Note: Please be advised that the Standing Rules of the City Council are attached for your information. The Standing Rules govern the conduct of City Council Meetings. These Standing Rules may be acted upon and utilized by the Mayor and City Council at any City Council Meeting.

To obtain any or all supporting materials for this Agenda, please contact the Clerk's Office at 702-346-5295.

Members of the public who are disabled and require special assistance or accommodation at the meeting are requested to notify the City Clerk's Office -City Hall in writing at 10 E. Mesquite Blvd., Mesquite, NV, 89027 or by calling 346-5295 twenty-four hours in advance of the meeting.

THIS NOTICE AND AGENDA HAS BEEN POSTED ON OR BEFORE 9:00 AM ON THE THIRD WORKING DAY BEFORE THE MEETING AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:

1. *Mesquite City Hall, 10 E. Mesquite Blvd., Mesquite, Nevada*
2. *Mesquite Community & Senior Center, 102 W. Old Mill Road, Mesquite, Nevada*
3. *Mesquite Post Office, 510 W. Mesquite Blvd., Mesquite, Nevada*
4. *Mesquite Library, 121 W. First North, Mesquite, Nevada*

The agenda is also available on the Internet at http://www.mesquitenv.gov and http://nv.gov

In accordance with Federal law and U.S. Department of Agriculture policy, the City of Mesquite is prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability. To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice), or (202) 720-6382 (TDD).

RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. Authority

1.1 NRS 266.240 provides that the Council may determine its own rules of procedure for meetings. The following set of rules shall be in effect upon their adoption by the Council and until such time as they are amended or new rules are adopted in the manner provided by these rules.

2. General Rules

2.1. *Public Meetings*: All meetings of the Council shall be open to the public, expect those provided in NRS 241 and 288. The agenda and backup material shall be open to public inspection in the City Clerk's Office.

2.2 *Quorum*: A majority of the members of the Council shall constitute a quorum and be necessary for the transaction of business. If a quorum is not present, those in attendance will be named and they shall adjourn to a later time.

2.3 *Compelling Attendance*: The Council may adjourn from day to day to compel attendance of absent members.

2.4 *Minutes*: A written account of all proceedings of the Council shall be kept by the City Clerk and shall be entered into the official records of the Council.

2.5 *Right to Floor*: Any member desiring to speak shall be recognized by the chair, and shall confine his remarks to the item under consideration.

2.6 *City Manager*: The City Manager or his designee shall attend all meetings of the Council. The City Manager may make recommendations to the Council and shall have the right to take part in all discussions of the Council, but shall have no vote.

2.7. *City Attorney*: The City Attorney or Deputy City Attorney shall attend all meetings of the Council and shall, upon request, given an opinion, either written or verbal, on questions of the law.

2.8 *City Clerk*: The City Clerk or Deputy City Clerk shall attend all meetings of the Council and shall keep the official minutes and perform such other duties as required by the Council.

2.9 *Officers and Staff*: Department heads of the City, when there is pertinent business from their departments on the Council agenda, shall attend such Council meetings upon request of the City Manager.

2.10 *Rules of Order*: "Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised" 10th Edition shall govern the proceedings of the Council in all cases, provided they are not in conflict with these rules.

3. Types of Meetings

3.1 Regular Meeting: The Council shall meet in the Council Chambers for all regular meetings. Regular Council meetings will be held on the second and fourth Tuesday of each month. If the second or fourth Tuesday falls on or near a holiday or falls on any day wherein it is determined a quorum may not be available, the Council may provide for another meeting time.

3.2 Special Meetings: Special meetings may be called by the Mayor or by a majority of the City Council. The call for a special meeting shall be filed with the City Clerk in written form, expect that an announcement of a special meeting during any regular meeting at which all members are present shall be sufficient notice of such special meeting. The call for a special meeting shall specify the day, the hour, and the location of the special meeting and shall list the subject or subjects to be considered.

3.3 *Adjourned Meeting*: Any meeting of the Council may be adjourned to a later date and time, provided that no adjournment shall be for a longer period than until the next regular meeting.

3.4 *Workshop and Study Sessions*: The Council may meet in workshops or study sessions to review upcoming projects, receive progress reports on current projects, or receive other similar information from the City Manager, provided that all discussions thereon shall be informal and open to the public.

3.5 *Executive Sessions*: Closed meetings may be held in accordance with NRS 241 and 288.

4. Duties of Presiding Officer

4.1 *Presiding Officer*: The Mayor, if present, shall preside at all meetings of the Council. In the Mayor's absence, the Mayor Pro Tem shall preside. In the absence of both the Mayor and Mayor Pro Tem, the Council members present shall elect a Presiding Officer.

4.2 *Preservation of Order*: The Presiding Officer shall preserve order and decorum; prevent attacks of a personal nature or the impugning of members' motives, and confine members in debate to the question under discussion.

4.3 *Points of Order*: The Presiding Officer shall determine all points of order, subject to the right of any member to appeal to the Council. If any appeal is taken, the question shall be: "Shall the decision of the Presiding Officer be sustained?"

5. Order of Business and Agenda

5.1 *Agenda*: The order of business of each meeting shall be as contained in the agenda in accordance with NRS 241 prepared by the City Clerk and approved by the City Manager. The agenda shall be delivered to members of the Council at least three (3) working days preceding the meeting to which it pertains.

5.2 *Special Interest/Presentation Items*: Unless otherwise approved by the City Manager, and in order to provide for the effective administration of City Council business, a maximum of four (4) items of special interest or presentation shall be scheduled on one agenda. Special Interest/Presentation items must appear on the agenda and it is not appropriate for presentations to be made during the public comment portion of the meeting.

6. Creation of Committees, Boards and Commissions

6.1 *Resolution*: The Council may by resolution create committees, boards, and commission to assist in the operation of the City government with such duties as the Council may specify, which shall not be inconsistent with law.

6.2 *Membership and Selection:* Membership and selection of members shall be as provided by the Council if not specified by law. Any committee, board, or commission so created shall cease to exist upon the accomplishment of the special purpose for which it was created, as provided in the initial resolution, or when abolished by a majority vote of the Council. No committee, board or commission shall have powers other than advisory to the Council or to the City Manager, except as otherwise provided by law.

6.3 *Removal:* The Council may remove any member which they have appointed to any board, committee or commission by a vote of at least a majority of the Council. Such appointed members will be removed automatically if they fail consistently (three or more unexcused absences) to attend meetings.

7. Voting

7.1 All voting procedures shall be in accordance with Parliamentary Authority.

7.2 *Point of Order*: Any Council member may raise a Point of Order if s/he perceives a breach of the Council's procedural rules and insists on the enforcement of the rule by the Presiding Officer. A Point of Order take precedence over any main motion, is not debatable, is not amendable, but may be superseded by a motion to table the item over which the Point of Order was raised, and is ruled on immediately by the Presiding Officer.

7.3 *Point of Information:* This is a request by a Council member, directed to the Presiding Officer or appropriate individual for information relevant to the pending item. A Point of Information takes precedence over a main motion, is not debatable, is not amendable, is not superseded by other motions, and is ruled on for appropriateness by the Presiding Officer.

7.4 *Abstentions*: A member may abstain from voting for any reason s/he deems appropriate.

7.5 *Failure of Affirmative Motion*: The failure of a motion calling for affirmative action is not the equivalent of the passage of a motion calling for the opposite negative action. The failure of such affirmative motion constitutes no action.

7.6 *Failure of Negative Motion*: The failure of a motion calling for a negative action is not the equivalent of the passage of a motion calling for the opposite affirmative action. The failure of such a negative motion constitutes no action.

7.7 Lack of Passage of a Motion: In some instances (maps in particular, per NRS) lack of passage of a motion may result in the item being "deemed approved." In other instances no action may result in confusion and complication for the applicant. In all cases the City Council will strive to achieve a decision or action.

8. Citizens' Rights

8.1 *Addressing the City Council*: Any person desiring to address the Council by oral communication shall first secure the permission of the Presiding Officer.

8.2 *Time Limit*: Each person addressing the Council shall step to the microphone, shall give his/her name and residence address in an audible tone of voice for the record and, unless further time is granted by the Presiding Officer, shall limit the time of his/her comments to three (3) minutes.

8.3 *Disruptive Conduct*: Any person who willfully disrupts a meeting to the extent that its orderly conduct is made impractical may be removed from the meeting by order of the Presiding Officer or majority of the City Council. A person willfully disrupts a meeting when s/he (1) uses physical violence, threatens the use of physical violence or provokes the use of physical violence, or (2) continues to use loud, boisterous, unruly, or provocative behavior after being asked to stop, which behavior is determined by the Presiding Officer or a majority of the City Council present to be disruptive to the orderly conduct of the meeting, or (3) fails to comply with any lawful decision or order of the Presiding Officer or of a majority of the City Council relating to the orderly conduct of the meeting.

8.4 *Written Communications*:
a. In General: Interested parties or their authorized representatives may address the Council by written communication in regard to any matter concerning the City's business or over which the Council has control at any time by direct mail to Council members, email, or by addressing it to the City Clerk and copies will be distributed to the Council members.
b. At City Council Meetings: Except as provided in subsection c, written communications will not be read at City Council meetings, but will be attached to the item as part of the record, tallied, and reported by the City Clerk as generally in favor of or against the proposition.
c. Exceptions: A written communication to the City Council may be read by City staff at a City Council meeting when (1) the person making the written communication has asked it be read aloud, (2) the person is unavailable to be at the meeting due to emergency or illness, (3) the written communication can be read in an ordinary cadence within three minutes, and (4) the person's name appears on the written communication and will be read into the record.

9. Suspension and Amendment of These Rules

9.1 *Suspension of these Rules*: Any provision of these rules not governed by law may be temporarily suspended by a majority vote of the City Council.

9.2 Amendment of these Rules: These rules may be amended, or new rules adopted, by a majority vote of all members of the City Council, provided that the proposed amendments or new rules have been introduced into the records at a prior City Council meeting.

July 26, 2016

City Council Regular

Agenda Item 1.

Subject:

Public Comment

Petitioner:

Andy Barton, City Manager

Staff Recommendation:

None

Fiscal Impact:

None

Budgeted Item:

No

Background:

None

Attachments:

None

City Council Regular

Agenda Item 2.

Subject:

Consideration of Approval of the July 26, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting agenda; the June 22, 2016 Special Primary Canvass Meeting minutes; the June 28, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting minutes and the July 5, 2016 Technical Review Meeting minutes.

- Public Comment
- Discussion and Possible Action

Petitioner:

Tracy Beck, City Clerk

Staff Recommendation:

Approve the July 26, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting agenda; the June 22, 2016 Special Primary Canvass Meeting minutes; the June 28, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting minutes and the July 5, 2016 Technical Review Meeting minutes.

Fiscal Impact:

None

Budgeted Item:

No

Background:

None

Attachments:

June 22, 2016 Special primary Canvass Meeting minutes;
June 28. 2016 Regular City Council Meeting minutes
July 5, 2016 Technical Review Meeting minutes.

Mesquite City Council

Special Meeting - Primary Canvass

Mesquite City Hall
10 E. Mesquite Blvd.
Wednesday, June 22, 2016 - 5:00 PM

Minutes of a scheduled Special meeting of the City Council for the June 14, 2016 Primary Election Canvass was held on Wednesday, June 22, 2016, at 5:00 P.M. at City Hall. In attendance were Mayor Allan S. Litman, Council members W. Geno Withelder, Rich Green and Kraig Hafen. City Manager Andy Barton, City Attorney Robert Sweetin, City Clerk Tracy Beck, other city staff and approximately 18 citizens.

Mayor Litman called the meeting to order at 5:00 P.M. and Council members Cindi Delaney and George Rapson recused themselves from this meeting. (NOTE: This meeting has been tape-recorded and will remain on file in the office of the City Clerk for four years for public examination.)

Below is an agenda of all items scheduled to be considered. Unless otherwise stated, items may be taken out of the order presented on the agenda at the discretion of the Mayor and Council.
Public comment is limited to three minutes per person and may only address items that are not on the meeting's agenda.

Public Comments

During the Public Comment portion of the agenda comments must be limited to matters within the authority and jurisdiction of the City Council. Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak to the City Council at this time, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name. Comments are limited to 3 minutes in length.

1. Public Comments

[5:00 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman opened up the meeting with Public Comment.

[5:01 PM] Minutes:
Dave West: I am one of the candidates for City Council in the most recent election. I commend you all on addressing the issue that's coming forth on how we apply an ordinance. In our Mesquite Municipal Code, it's referred to as the 50 plus 1 rule. The way it is written in our code right now, it appears to be copied from another municipality that only has single seat elections, and how we apply it tonight, I will trust your judgment in how you vote and apply that in the past election, but obviously there is a deficiency there as it applies to how we handle our City Council elections. So I would encourage this board and whoever is elected to take the time to correct the language in that ordinance for future elections. Thank you.

Administrative Items

2. Consideration of approval of the Canvass of the June 14, 2016 Mesquite Primary Elections returns and declaration of the result.

   - - Discussion and Possible Action

[5:02 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Mr. Robert Sweetin.

[5:02 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Sweetin: I will provide for the Council a brief update on the situation where we are at and why this is a little different than just a normal Canvass Meeting. So where we are at essentially is there is Mesquite Municipal Code 1-8-19. That was changed in 2011. What that said prior to 2011 was we looked to the number of voters who vote in the election, and then we looked at candidates and how many votes they received, and if they received a majority of the votes cast by voters, then they would move forward.

In 2011, the ordinance was changed. The critical language is if in a primary City election one candidate receives votes equal to a majority of votes cast in that election for the office for which he or she is a candidate. So what happened is it changed the language of voters, that critical analysis, that number of voters to votes cast for the office.

So what you have before you tonight are essentially two options. The first would be to apply Mesquite Municipal Code 1-8-19 to apply to multi-seat elections, which we haven't necessarily done in Mesquite before. I think it has been assumed, but the Council's never actually made that direct determination, but that 1-8-19 would apply to multiple seat elections, and if that's the case, then the result would be you would count the number of votes that were cast in that election. Because there are three offices that are up, the only reasonable way that we have been able to figure out what the critical numbers are is you would

take the number of votes cast for that City Council at large seat. You would divide it by 3 and then you take that number, 50% plus 1, and I think that number ends up at 1,106 votes. So any candidate that would receive more than 1,106 votes would be seated and not have to fight it out in the general election.

The other option is consistent with the way – now, I would note MMC 1-8-19 is almost identical to the State statute. It is not from another city code; it is NRS 293(c).1754. They are almost identical. The way that the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, and the County have applied that statute in their elections is to apply to only single off selections. So if the Council tonight were inclined to interpret Mesquite Municipal Code 1-8-19 because of how close that language is as applying to only single seat elections, that is, there is only one open seat, not three seats like in this election, then what would happen is 1-8-19 would essentially not be relevant to our analysis, nor would 293(c).1754, and the default provision is 293(c).180, which would allow you to take in our case the top six vote getters. You just take each seat. You take the top two vote getters.

So those are your options. I'll submit to the Council on which way you want to interpret it. That's in your discretion to make that decision, but I'll submit on that, and I am available for any questions.

[5:05 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman: Thank you. I might add, by the way, that this evening Council member Rapson is recused along with Council woman Delaney, so these would be the Council people tonight making the decision.

[5:06 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Sweetin: If I can on that, I actually told them and I spaced it -- on behalf of Council member Rapson and Council woman Delaney, I will disclose on their behalf as the City Attorney that they do have a conflict in this or a perceived conflict, because this would essentially determine their fate in this election to some extent, and because of that both of them have chosen to abstain.

[5:08 PM] Minutes:
Council member Hafen: Well, I just wonder if there are any more comments from the public.

Mayor Litman: No, there are not.

Council member Hafen: First of all, I thank the attorney for the analysis and his legal opinions. I believe, though, that as stated that Municipal Code 1-8-19 and NRS 293(c).1754, that is talking about single seat elections, I think we have blown this thing way out of proportion. I sit on the Council, and I had to go back and I went and pulled the tapes, I pulled the minutes, and I still do not know how I voted on something like this ordinance, because it is bad. It is terrible. It is un-American, and I can tell you that when I listen to the tape of the meeting, the

intent of what we passed that night was because there was a ballot question that I think it was like 55/45 of changing the election cycle, which at that time myself, Council member Rapson, and Mayor Litman, we were elected as Council people and Mark Witter won it outright in the primary, but that changed the number of years we sat on this seat. It added like a year and 6 months. I voted against that. That was the reason this item was put on the agenda back in September of 2011. The whole discussion of that item lasted probably less than 2 minutes, maybe one minute and a half. There was absolutely nothing that talked about this problem that we got into, so I am still – I don't know why it was ever changed. I'll take the blame, because somewhere I was asleep at the switch, because I did not look at this, and if this was in there, which apparently it was, that was totally something that was terribly done. So if nothing else, too, I want to hear what the other Council members say. If not, I will make a motion, but I would ask that as soon as we can get it back on the City Council agenda that we correct this thing. Just because we have a bad ordinance doesn't mean we continue to do things the wrong way. So I want this corrected so that it gives everybody that walks through the door to vote or mails in a vote, that they get that vote counted. It is done the fair way and the right way. So I am asking our City Manager and City Attorney to get that on the agenda. You can say that I am the sponsor. I don't care. I want that done because this ordinance is terrible. It needs to be changed. I will make a motion after I hear from everyone else.

[5:09 PM] Minutes:
Council member Green: I believe in substance over form here, so I believe that MMC 1-8-19 is not applicable in our situation. I am looking to how we serve the best interest of the voters of Mesquite, and I think having six candidates on the ballot for three seats at a November election when the turnout will be high because of the national election versus having two of those seats filled with the mid-June election with the voter turnout ratio of about 30% does not reflect the best interest of the voters of the City of Mesquite.

[5:10 PM] Minutes:
Council member Withelder: I must concur with the other two Council members and their comments. I especially agree with Mr. Hafen, and I was part of that process, and I apologize, because I think I cast the motion to approve that measure, and looking back on it, it was probably the wrong thing to do. I think we have to absolutely write a new ordinance to correct those shortcomings, and again I am going to agree with Craig and have the City Attorney and the City Manager draft a new ordinance. I do believe that to serve the best interests of the people of Mesquite and to carry forward in the general election, I think we have to change the outcome of what has recently transpired. Thank you.

[5:11 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Sweetin: One thing I want to note for Council that I omitted from my prior remarks is that I have spent the better part of my week on this and last week making sure we get the right answer, because there is no more critical issue

than elections in a democracy, and we want to make sure we have the right answer in our City. I went back and looked at every minute that I could find, every note that I could find from those prior meetings and it was never raised that this ordinance change was part of that package. I think Council member Hafen referenced that and so did Council member Withelder. When this was presented, it was presented as a change of date for elections to be held, not a change of calculating the elections, and that was never raised by any staff member, which to me was very surprising. I also note that I agree 100% this needs to be changed, and I will get to work on that. I have actually already been working on it, so it will be on the next agenda.

[5:12 PM] Minutes:
Council member Hafen: This is not part of the canvass motion, but just as a point, there has never been any candidate, whether it was a Mayor or Council person, that has gone forward out of the primary that did not have 50 plus 1% of the actual people, that means mail in ballots, early voting and the day of the election. Never happened, okay. So the intent of this whole thing is to respect the right of the voter, and this is just my opinion, the only fair way to do it, is the six people go forward because nobody got 50 plus 1% of the actual people that went through the door to cast a vote. Now that is just for me, but as we discussed with Municipal Code 1-8-19 and NRS 293(c).1754, the intent of those it's a one seat election. It's not three different seats and one person can cast three votes. That's why -- and I appreciate our attorney. He gives us good advice. He gives us both the arguments, both sides of it, and lets us decide, and that is what he has done today. As he said, he is already working on an ordinance that is legally right, because I mean anybody can take this one that we have and spin it upside down inside out, but the intent of it is 50 plus 1.

Council member Hafen moved the Council canvass the June 14, 2016 Mesquite Primary Elections based on the submittals from the City Clerk and that the six (6) candidates move forward in the General Election.

Passed For: 3; Against: 0; Abstain: 2 (Delaney and Rapson); Absent: 0

Public Comments

During the Public Comment portion of the agenda comments must be limited to matters within the authority and jurisdiction of the City Council. Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak to the City Council at this time, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name. Comments are limited to 3 minutes in length.

3. Public Comments

[5:14 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman opened the meeting to Public Comments.

[5:14 PM] Minutes:
Mike Benham: I want to thank you for what I believe is doing the right thing. I especially want to thank Mr. Hafen. I know we have had some run-ins in the past, but I think you have all stood up and did a great job. For someone to admit that you made a mistake, that is huge to me, because I have made mistakes in the past, too, and you just own up to them and say, hey, I made a mistake. I am going to put it right. We are going to move on. And I think you will gain a lot more respect from the public doing it this way than it was the other way. So thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Adjournment

4. Adjournment

[5:15 PM]
Minutes: Mayor Litman adjourned the meeting.

Allan S. Litman, Mayor

Tracy E. Beck, City Clerk

Mesquite City Council

Regular Meeting

Mesquite City Hall
10 E. Mesquite Blvd.
Tuesday, June 28, 2016 - 5:00 PM

Minutes of a scheduled meeting of the City Council held on Tuesday, June 28, 2016, at 5:00 P.M. at City Hall. In attendance were Mayor Allan S. Litman, Council members W. Geno Withelder, Rich Green, George Rapson and Cynthia "Cindi" Delaney and Kraig Hafen. Also, in attendance were; City Manager Andy Barton, Finance Director David Empey, Development Services Director Richard Secrist, City Attorney Robert Sweetin, City Clerk Tracy Beck, other city staff and approximately 68 citizens.

Mayor Litman called the meeting to order at 5:00 P.M. (NOTE: This meeting has been tape-recorded and will remain on file in the office of the City Clerk for four years for public examination.)

Below is an agenda of all items scheduled to be considered. Unless otherwise stated, items may be taken out of the order presented on the agenda at the discretion of the Mayor and Council. Additionally, the Mayor and Council may combine two or more agenda items for consideration, and may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time. Public comment is limited to three minutes per person and may only address items that are not on the meeting's agenda.

Ceremonial Matters

- INVOCATION - Ronnie Roberts, Pentecostals of Mesquite
- PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Public Comments

During the Public Comment portion of the agenda comments must be limited to matters within the authority and jurisdiction of the City Council. Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak to the City Council at this time, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name. Comments are limited to 3 minutes in length.

---

1. Public Comments

[5:01 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman: I am going to be moving one item this evening, and that is Item 15, Consideration of Approval of Proposed Dog Park, and I am going to put it right before Item 11. So that will be heard before Item 11 tonight. If you are making public comment on that particular agenda item, you might want to wait until that agenda item comes up, but that again is your prerogative. Otherwise, we are open for public comment.

[5:01 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman opened the meeting to Public Comments.

[5:02 PM] Minutes:
Ms. Nehrenz: Hi, I am Teri Nehrenz. I am here on behalf of the Mesquite Local News. We wanted to let the community know that on July 28th, we will be a holding a benefit, a murder mystery dinner titled "Alabama Jones and the Trailer Park of Doom," starring Barbara Ellestad, Stephanie Franer and myself. We're doing it in conjunction with the Eureka Community Initiative to benefit the Mesquite Reads Program. Tickets will be on sale very soon at J & S Merchant, or you can contact the Mesquite Local News Office. They're $25 and will include your dinner, dessert and the show, and there will be a cash bar available as well. Thank you very much. Oh, it will be at the Eureka in the Grand Canyon Ball Room. Thank you.

[5:03 PM] Minutes:
Jeff Powell: Hello, my name is Jeff Powell, and I am representing the Chamber of Commerce. Just wanted to share with the Council and the community at large Saturday, July 30th, is our 11th Annual Golf Tournament. Registration is at 6:15 a.m. Shotgun at 7. It's $100 for team or members, $120 for non-members, and for all the non-golfers, there's a $5,000 putting contest. Come out. Make a donation to help raise funds for the Chamber, and you might win $5,000. You can also join us for lunch as well. So Saturday, July 30th. It will be held at Wolf Creek. Thank you.

[5:03 PM] Minutes:
Barbara Ellestad: I am Barbara Ellestad, Mesquite Local News, and I need Bill Tanner and Joe Macias. I have learned a very important lesson over the last 7 months of construction of Exit 118, and that is I need to make better bets. Last December when Meadow Valley announced that they would be opening Exit 118, the new interchange that opens the door to a lot of really great things for Mesquite, I bet Bill that there was no way in the world that they would meet their June 24th deadline for opening the bridge across the tunnels. However, I was

not specific. All I said was you have to take me across in a truck and back across. You got to take me off the off ramp, across the bridge to Pioneer Boulevard, back over and back to the interstate. Well, he did that last Friday morning in a dump truck on dirt, no pavement. So I need to make better bets. So as a payoff, rather than either one of us enrich ourselves because that wouldn't look good, we decided to donate the $100 to the Mesquite Animal Control Shelter, so there.

[5:06 PM] Minutes:
Amanda Schweisthal: Good evening, Mayor, City Council. Amanda Schweisthal with the Retail Association of Nevada here to testify on the introduction of the liquor fee agenda, Item 17. Still collecting information from our members. We believe the number is a lot higher than the $242,000 in the Business Impact Statement, and we just humbly request that we postpone the introduction until more information can be gathered. I know, I don't mean to keep kicking the can down the road, I think the City's time is much more valuable than that, but I would hate to move forward on a set rate without all the information, so I am here for you if anyone has any questions. I believe you all have my business card, and thank you for your time.

Consent Agenda

Items on the Consent Agenda may not require discussion. These items may be a single motion unless removed at the request of the Mayor, City Council, or City Manager.

2. Consideration of Approval for the June 28, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting Agenda; the May 11, 2016 Budget Work Session #1 Meeting Minutes; the May 12, 2016 Budget Work Session #2 Meeting Minutes; the May 17, 2016 Special Tentative Budget Meeting Minutes and the May 24, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting Minutes.

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

[5:06 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman asked Council for a motion on Items 2-5.

Council member Withelder moved to approve Items 2 through 5 of the Consent Agenda. Council member Delaney seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

3. Consideration of approval of:
   a) Notification of Budget Transfers
   b) Notification of Budget Amendments
   c) Notification of Bills Paid
   d) Purchase Orders
   e) May 2016 Financial Statements

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

APPROVED WITH ITEMS 2, 4, AND 5 OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

4. Consideration of approval of an agreement with Granicus Inc. for Agenda Management Software and Services.

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

APPROVED WITH ITEMS 2, 3 AND 5 OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

5. Consideration of approval of an agreement with Sada Systems Inc. for Google Apps software services.

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

APPROVED WITH ITEMS 2,3,AND 4 OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

Resolutions & Proclamations

6. Consideration of Approval for Proclamation "General Aviation Appreciation Month"

   - Discussion and Possible Action

[5:07 pm] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title.

Mayor Litman: There is no one from this organization, but I will read the proclamation.

[5:08 PM] Minutes: Mayor Litman read the Proclamation:

General Aviation Appreciation Month, July, 2016

WHEREAS, the City of Mesquite in the State of Nevada has a significant interest in the continued vitality of general aviation, aircraft manufacturing, aviation educational institutions, aviation organizations and community airports; and

WHEREAS, general aviation and the Mesquite airport have an immense economic impact on the City of Mesquite; and

WHEREAS, Nevada is home to 49 public-use airports, which service 6,811 pilots and 2,246 active general aviation aircraft; and

WHEREAS, Nevada is home to 31 fixed-based operator, 31 repair stations, 139 heliports, 5 FAA approved pilot schools, 1,096 flight students and 1,341 flight instructors; and

WHEREAS, general aviation airports in Nevada support a total economic output of over $275 million; and

WHEREAS, general aviation not only supports Nevada's economy, it improves overall quality of life by supporting emergency medical and healthcare services, law enforcement, firefighting and disaster relief, and by transporting business travelers to their destinations quickly and safely; and

WHEREAS, many communities in Nevada depend heavily on general aviation and community airports for the continued flow of commerce, tourists, and visitors to the state; and

WHEREAS, the nation's aviation infrastructure represents an important public benefit, and Congressional oversight should be in place to ensure stable funding of this system;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Allan S. Litman, Mayor of the City of Mesquite and the members of the City Council, do hereby proclaim general aviation as a vital strategic resource to the City of Mesquite and declare July as

~General Aviation Appreciation Month~

Council member Delaney moved to approve the Proclamation "General Aviation Appreciation Month. Council member Withelder seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

7. Consideration of a Proclamation declaring the month of July 2016 as "Flash Flood Awareness Month" in the City of Mesquite. - Discussion and Possible Action

[5:10 PM] Minutes:
Mayor read this item by its title by its title and read the Proclamation.

PROCLAMATION

DECLARES July 2016

"Flash Flood Awareness Month"

WHEREAS, the Regional Flood Control District strives to improve the protection of life and property for existing residents, future residents, and visitors from the impacts of flooding in Clark County through a flood safety awareness campaign; and

WHEREAS, more than one-half of all flood-related deaths are the result of people attempting to drive through flooded areas; and

WHEREAS, currently 91 detention basins and 604 miles of channels and underground storm drains, of which 129 miles are natural washes, have been built to manage the flood risks in Southern Nevada; and

WHEREAS, another 30 detention basins and 209 miles of conveyance remain to be built; and

WHEREAS, each of these projects make another area of the community safer from floods; and

WHEREAS, it is critically important to educate the public about flood hazards, the potential for flash flooding, and how best to protect themselves in floods; and

WHEREAS, flash floods can occur in any month of the year, and summer rains in July through September have the greatest potential to create flash floods in Clark County.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Mesquite, Nevada proclaims the month of July 2016, as:

"Flash Flood Awareness Month"

And urge all citizens of Mesquite to become aware of the dangers of floods, flash floods and the precautions available for their safety. Public Works also urges each resident to familiarize themselves with and to utilize the Clark County Regional Flood Control District Web site for current and updated reports on

flooding and flash flooding.

[5:12 PM] Minutes:
Steve Parrish: Thank you. I am Steve Parrish. I am the General Manager and Chief Engineer of the Clark County Regional Flood Control District, and I would like to thank Mayor and Council today for issuing this Proclamation and helping us get our Be Flood Safe Message out to the community. I would like to have seen our website up on the screen there as opposed to the National Weather Service, but that's okay, this will do.

As we meet here today, you can already feel the change in the atmosphere outside. There is more humidity. The dew points are rising right on cue. It always never ceases to amaze me that within a week or so of July 1st that monsoonal flow starts coming in to Southern Nevada and mixes with our heat and gives us that potential for those big thunderstorms and flash flooding. So we always take this opportunity around this time of year to try to get our message out to the public to Be Flood Safe and to recognize the power that's in these storm flows. We always want to remind you that the streets are part of the drainage network, and that when it rains there's going to be flow in the streets, and 6 inches of rainfall is enough to sweep someone off their feet. One foot of rainfall or runoff is enough to carry or float a car. I don't care if you drive a Hummer or if you drive a Smart Car, it's going to float if you drive into enough water, so our advice is to avoid those areas. Try to find another route if you can or just wait the storm out. Usually our storms pass relatively quickly and the flows get out of the city pretty quick.

As mentioned in the Proclamation, we have come a long way over the last three decades or so since the formation of the district. Over $1.7 billion have been spent in Southern Nevada. These are local tax dollars that are being invested in the community with local projects, and we have come a long way. 91 detention basins have been constructed, as you mentioned, and we reached a milestone this year with surpassing the 600-mile mark of conveyance structures, storm drains and channels that have been constructed in Southern Nevada. More specifically here in Mesquite you have 26 miles of conveyance structures on our Master Plan. 14 miles of those structures have been built already. You have another 12 to be constructed and you have three detention basins here that all three have been constructed, so Mesquite's in pretty good shape. I would really like to thank Bill Tanner and Public Works Staff for all the hard work and dedication over the years getting these projects constructed. We are a planning and funding agency, but where the rubber meets the road is getting these projects off of paper and into the ground and protection life and property, and so they have done a great job maximizing their dollars and getting facilities built here in Mesquite. To date, Regional Flood Control District funds spent about $22 million here in Mesquite alone.

So I would like to thank Mayor Litman for his participation over the last two years on our Board of Directors. He's always made the trek down to Las Vegas once a month, and I really appreciate his involvement and his guidance over the last few years. And I want to thank you again for this Proclamation, and let's be flood safe through this monsoon season. Have a nice, safe, uneventful summer season. Thank you.

Council member Hafen move to approve the Proclamation declaring the month of July 2016 as "Flash Flood Awareness Month" in the City of Mesquite. Council member Withelder seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

8. Consideration of Approval of Resolution No. 900 of the City of Mesquite designating public buildings for use to collect or gather signatures on petitions.

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

[5:16 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Ms. Beck.

[5:16 PM] Minutes:
Ms. Beck: Thank you, Mayor and Council. This is just the annual renewal we do every year that goes to the County and to the State designating our public buildings that we are approved to collect signatures on petitions. Those buildings are here at City Hall and at the Mesquite Recreational Center.

Council member Rapson moved to approve Resolution No. 900 of the City of Mesquite designating public buildings for use to collect or gather signatures on petitions. Council member Hafen seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

Department Reports

9. Mayor's Comments

[5:17 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman: I am going to make some comments tonight about Item 15 on our agenda. We have an item on this agenda tonight that has really far more to it

than if anywhere should put another dog park or a dog park in general. Let me explain how this Item got on the agenda, and by the way I personally, so that everyone knows, do not approve of a dog park at Redd Hills Park. Redd Hills Park was actually a piece of the Oasis golf course located in the planned unit development of Mesquite Vistas, LLC, which was property once owned by Mr. Sye Redd. Once it was decided a park would be built by the developers, as a requirement it was to be a trail head park only because of its size. This would lead to trails that were never built. The developer never completed this project, and this is the reason it really has no amenities as a regular public park other than a restroom. It was just supposed to be a place to leave your car and head off on a hike down the trails. Mesquite Vistas gave the property to the City because they didn't want to maintain it. It became a public park, although it did not meet the minimum size requirements of a public park in Mesquite, which would be from 5 to 100 acres. This piece of property is 3.41 acres.

Here's the problem as I personally see it. There's some people that live near the park who believe it belongs to them only. They pay taxes, but we all pay taxes. In other words, they think it is a private park. They have publicly stated, and I was there, that they want nobody in this park other than people in Lake Ridge II which is a non-gated community and to have sole possession of this property. In fact I was personally told by one of the property owners down there that is was none of my concern because I didn't live in the area. I was able to point to my house which was approximately 200 yards away. The second issue deals with several people who are disabled and cannot walk their dogs. I have met three of them. Two of them are combat army veterans with 100% disabilities and an elderly lady that is bent over with a cane. They have someone clean up after their dogs when necessary. The third issue riles me even more. It's either been openly stated or eluded to that minorities are not wanted at Redd Hills Park. Also, Sun City residents are not wanted at this park, because I heard this for myself. This is not what Mesquite is all about, folks. There is no room for hate here. There is no room for discrimination in Mesquite, especially against people that have a disability. They didn't ask for this situation.

I have solutions that we'll talk about at some later date as to how we might remedy this and that's after I concur and speak with our City Attorney on this issue. I know we can solve this problem. Every problem that comes in for us in some fashion will be solved. Okay, and with that I will end my comments.

10. City Council and Staff Comments and Reports

[5:21 PM] Minutes:
Council member Withelder: Before we get too far onto public comment on this issue, I would like to make a disclosure that I am a property owner in La Scala and have started plans to build a home there. I want to make that disclosure and get it out in front of the public, so that there can be no conjecture after the vote is

taken. Thank you.

[5:21 PM] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: I know that there is going to be comment, but we don't an opportunity to speak sometimes at public comment on issues that are tangential to the real issue. The dog park, I'm inclined to agree with His Honor that I am not in favor of a dog park frankly in any public park, but this is more related to what Mayor Litman said. Two of our employees heard racist remarks. They happened to be Hispanic, and it was offensive, and I by God will not tolerate that. One was anonymous, but that's unacceptable, and several people have said or have the notion that these parks are not public parks, they are community parks. They are not. We don't have any of those in Mesquite. Transients can use those parks. They can use that park. Perfectly legal. We all pay taxes. I live on the South Side. Sorry, folks. I can use that park, and I'm offended by the notion that somehow you acquire rights to a park that is paid for by the general population, and this has got nothing to do with dog runs, guys. This has to do with the City of Mesquite and this community. Just like kids on the north side can go down to Hafen Park and get in the water feature. So that's why I'm offended. 90% of the people -- 99% of the people who were involved in this and cared passionately about this issue are fine and I get it. It's about a dog park in a community, near a residential area. I don't subscribe to that, either, and they were polite, and they were cordial, and they spoke clearly and professionally, but a few, and that's all it takes to gripe my butt, is to say something racist and claim something to be theirs that is not theirs. I just had to say it, and I'm sorry. You know me, my mouth gets going when it shouldn't probably, but that's the way I feel about it. I do not support a dog park there, a dog run of any sort, but I'm offended by some of the comments.

[5:23 PM] Minutes:
Council member Hafen: I am glad Council Rapson said what I wanted to say, because he said it more eloquently than I would have, and I would have probably offended a bunch of people, because I totally agree. This is Mesquite, not north side, south side. We should all be treated equal. I hope that comes across, we all pay taxes. It is a public park. It's been mentioned. I will say this, though. I know there's a number of you here that want to speak against the dog park, and I'll stay here until 6:00 in the morning if I have to listen to all of you; however, I think the Council, the Mayor, Staff, we get the message that there is no desire for a dog park up there. We got it. So with that being said, you are more than welcome to come up when the item comes; however, I think you'll like what the motion is going to be so we don't have to sit here all night, but again you are more than welcome to come up, but just so you know where we're coming from. I'm prepared to make a motion right off the gate to get this thing put to rest so that you can go home and know that can look out to your park and not have a dog park in your park. So just wanted to get that out there.

5:25 PM] Minutes:
Council member Delaney: I just like to echo what the Mayor and Council member Rapson have said. You know, after we looked at this, this is probably not a great place for a dog park. I think that we are going to need to look at other places for a dog park that will be more convenient on the northside of the freeway, and that's for convenience, not because it's north or south. It's so that some of those people that maybe do have disabilities can get to that park more easily. I am also very offended when anybody says the things that I have been told that people said to a Hispanic member of our community that were just uncalled for, and in this day and age, I am shocked that anybody will still even have that thought in their head, much less voice it.

[5:25 PM] Minutes:
Council member Green: It has been well said. I encourage Mr. Hafen to make his motion.

[5:26 PM] Minutes:
Council member Hafen: Just one thing I failed to say about the Staff. I know there's been a lot of just rumor out there about who was going to pay for the dog park and this and that, and that was strictly rumor. Staff was just trying to solve a problem. It was a proposal. They do a tremendous job with trying to keep the parks up, and so it was nothing to offend anybody. There was some issues and they thought this might solve it. It was strictly proposed. It was going to come before Council, so I compliment staff on what they do.

[5:25] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: Just as a follow-up, and I think enough has been said about that part of the deal, but I do want to comment on the process. I mean, when public lands, any issue that involve City property, City governance, City ordinances, variances and so forth, any disputes, anything out of the ordinary needs to come to Council for resolution. So there was dispute down there at that park. Staff offered in good conscience a solution. That doesn't mean because it's on the agenda that it will pass all the time. It just means that we are offering a solution, and we will discuss it with public input and make a decision. I got panic emails that were bulk emails to hundreds of people that were panicked like this thing was happening. It doesn't happen until tonight. So again reminding you of the process. When there is a dispute, it needs to be resolved. This is the format to resolve it. It's not to have one person, whether it's the Mayor, whether it's one of our staff, to make a unilateral decision that affects the entire community. That's the process. So I want to thank you that participated in the process, that have made your feelings known. Your emails were read, but this is the right way to do it, and we'll get to the right answer, trust me.

PER MAYOR LITMAN AT THE BEGINNING OF THIS MEETING, ITEM 15 WAS MOVED TO THIS POSITION.

15. Consideration of Approval of a proposed dog park/runs (off leash areas) at Redd Hills Park located on Fountain View Lane and Redd Hills Parkway.

    The City of Mesquite Department of Athletics & Leisure Services has a vision for these parks and the community where dogs can run free and socialize safely at our parks for our K-9 friends and owners.

    Proposed 4 areas of fenced facilities, approximately 26,500 square foot area (2 small dog areas) (1 Large Dog area) and (1 open off leash area). 2 large dog underground waste receptacles and 2 water stations to clean animals.

    - Public Hearing
    - Discussion and Possible Action

[5:28 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and opened up to Public Hearing.

[5:29 PM] Minutes:
Julie Stephan: I live in Spyglass, and I'd like to advocate for some kind of a dog area there. It's a beautiful park. It has lush green grass, big cottonwood trees that provide lots of shade. We the dog owners are cleaning up not only after our own dogs, but people who run their dogs in the evening and clean up after them, and recently we have been cleaning up after the Canadian geese, okay, because somebody is putting cracked corn on the east side of the park. It's a really lovely area. It's a multi-use City park, and people that own dogs, if we are responsible we should be able to use it as well as everybody else, people with their grandkids, people picnicking, people reading, people bird watching, tourists, the elderly, little kids. Thank you.

[5:30 PM] Minutes:
Warner Grave: I am a board member of the Mesquite Vistas Homeowner's Association. We have 1720 members, and we discussed this issue at our last meeting which was last Thursday. First of all, let me offer an apology on the part of anybody in our association that would make comments or make insinuations that have any kind of racial overtones or ethnic overtones. That's not why we are there, and we certainly don't condone it, either. In that regard, our approach to the park, the proposed park, dog park was that, as you outlined, the original intent it's a general use green area and as such it was open to anybody in the

community at any time for any purpose, and for the last - I mean, I have been here 12 years, I guess for the last 10 years it has I guess attracted people in the morning that bring their dogs, people in the afternoon that bring their dogs, and they do clean up after themselves, and I think the park in general in addition to what the City does in terms of mowing and tending and watering. It is a very pristine area and serves many purposes. People go and have picnics, little kids go play ball, people walk their dogs, run their dogs. I know a couple of women go and sit under a tree and read for hours on end. So it's a multi-purpose park. Our position from an Association standpoint is to take probably almost half that area and create a designated use restricts the general purpose of the park, and restricts the general use of the park. The other point that we wanted to make is that within a mile of that particular park is a designated dog park with dog runs. 90% of the people that come to that park at the present time drive. For us, it seems that driving that extra mile is not an overly big burden and can be accommodated. And the other element of it is that at this particular time with the City of Mesquite and the financial burden it has to create another maintenance issue and to create another capital investment is probably not a prudent thing to do at this point in time. We think even at this present day today there were people out there with dogs. They were out in the morning. They didn't come in the afternoon because the wind was whipping, but they come there and everybody is fine with that. I think to create a dedicated area that restricts the use of the park to the general public is probably not from our perspective not the right thing to do.

[5:33 PM] Minutes:
Patricia Schroll: Good evening, my name is Patricia Schroll, and I am a resident at Villa La Paz, very close to the park. I have lived here about 10 years, and I have seen the dog parks that we have. The ones that used to be by the tennis courts. It used to be really nice until we were thrown out of that one. That was about 4 or 5 years ago. Then they placed the dog park at trails site or West 2nd whatever that one is. That park has really seen its better days already. It only took about 3 or 4 months before that park started to go down hill. We have people that come every single morning about 5 or 6 of us, and we are constantly picking up dog poop from other of the residents. It really is a shame that the City has not taken care of it, and we have to call every time the poop scoop needs to be taken care. There is a water issue.

I love the park down that everybody is talking about. Tonight it's beautiful. They're watering it in the afternoon, 1 o'clock, 2 o'clock. I didn't think that was appropriate for our water to be wasted, but it's a beautiful park. We need another dog park so that we can move and maybe replace the grass that has been taken away from the 2nd South dog park. We need another one, but dog parks don't bring in any revenue like all of our golf tournaments or our softball tournaments or our soccer tournaments. So unfortunately, the dog people are really kind of put aside. It's very discouraging, because that's one the reasons

why we bought our homes here.

[5:35 PM] Minutes:
Jeff Jacobson: Good evening, Mayor, City Council Members, Jeff Jacobson, Rancho Santa Barbara. I was asked to make a few comments, put on record, that I think - I believe that Chief Tanner and his officers and Mr. Macias have taken care of all the dog owners in the last seven years. I have been guilty of allowing my dog to run there without a leash. I have been contacted, reprimanded, but not cited. I believe that the Council and Chief Tanner and Mr. Macias need to get together and figure out the best plan for whatever decisions you make. If you decide not to fence it with galvanized fence, which would be a violation of CC and R for Mesquite Vistas, but if you did have some type of ruling that's allowed you to leave it the way it is now, there has to be some communication among the agencies to say what are you going to do if you have a big dog and that dog bites another dog. I haven't seen a situation in the last seven years that I have been going there with any problems.

So with that said, a crystal ball for me is just to leave it the way it is. I am a boy scout prior, and the people that have already spoke today, they leave that park better than it was prior. In my opinion, it's a park that has limited funds. There are still a lot of palm trees that are not properly cut there, and there's weeds during March and April, but I love the park. I'm only a couple of blocks away from it. I still go there. I still meet these people. I get to converse with them, talk about dogs and events and all the above. I have had the luxury of meeting with a few people because I'm on the board at Mesquite Vistas of developers off of Hardy Way, and they have property out there that is not being used at all. So does that mean that there is an opportunity for us dog owners to have an area to go to? That could be a resolution. That could be an opportunity for us, for the Sun City people, the people on the southside, the northside, to be able to go to an area, and just like the area that we have where if we want to grow some lettuce we can go over near Casa, property that is donated for the dog owners. Thank you for listening.

[5:39 PM] Minutes:
Del Brown: I live in Lake Ridge II, which is pretty much right next to the park, and it is a beautiful park, and the thing with that whole area right to there when you have the lake and the park and everything together it makes a very beautiful, pristine area within Mesquite, anybody driving through there, because a lot of people do coming down Redd Hill and so forth. It adds to the value of all our homes in that area, because of the view, and people want to live there. What I have seen of dog parks is that they soon become looking like a prison yard with a chain link fence and the dirt and everything else, because it's very difficult to maintain one of those. Most of the people that I've talked to in the neighborhood it's like they don't have any objection to the dogs, just keep them on a leash. They just run loose. We have a couple of instances where the dogs have run

into each other. They are out there playing and fighting and whatever and get to the point that people don't want to go too near them, because they're afraid they're getting bitten, because the dogs are not under control by the owners. A lot of them are fine. The dogs are very well controlled and maintained and trained; however, one person or some people will see dogs running around there without a leash, and they're like, oh, I can let mine go. Well, theirs my not be that well trained and somebody else is going to get hurt. So not having them on a leash is a detriment to both - or a danger to existing dogs that are out there, and also people that they can bite, because we've all had dogs and sometimes they're controllable and sometimes they're not. I think the intent of the leash law that we have in Clark County is to protect both the people and dogs from each other so they don't have these issues, because, I don't know, I've had to step between a dog fight in my time, and it's not fun. It can happen at any point in time when you have dogs run out there that aren't being controlled. But I appreciate the Council's decision. It's going to keep the value of our homes up, because it would make it more of a detriment trying to resell our homes if we have to with a chain link fence clobbering up the neighborhood, and that grass would not stay there very long when you make a dog park out of it. Thank you.

[5:43 PM] Minutes:
Carol Livingston: Lake Ridge II. I just want to say that I don't feel that if somebody made a racist comment that we should all be put in that category, and that's the way I feel. Maybe somebody mentioned this is their neighborhood. It's their neighborhood. It's not their park, but it's their neighborhood, and I take offense at some of the things that were said to us. I want to say this. My husband was over there. We have two dogs. We love dogs. We have two miniature Schnauzers. We walk them on a leash morning and night. My next door neighbor has two dogs he walks on a leash morning and night. The lady next door from Wyoming, when she's there in the winter, she puts her dogs in a pick up truck and takes them out to the fields to run. Everybody in Lake Ridge II walks their dog on a leash, everybody. Now, my husband was over there earlier this year. He was attacked by a German shepherd, and the person who was in charge of all the dogs running loose said, he's okay, he's okay. Jerry came back, and he was attacked again. So I just want you to know, there is a leash law. It's for safely. There is a lady from Vista Heights who goes there to walk with her friends. She's very afraid to go there, because she has osteoporosis. If a dog should come running at her, she said she can get a spinal injury, and she went over this, and she was so happy to sign my petition. I just want you to know, I've taught school 50 years, I'm not a racist, but I stick up for my neighborhood. That park is for anybody. We realize that, and I don't appreciate you saying we don't think that park belongs to other people. We certainly do, but we don't want to see it turned in to a pig sty.

[5:44 PM] Minutes:
Roselyn Coldiron: The Mayor and Mr. Montoya petitioned for a dog park. There

is a need for one at Redd Hills Park. They visited the park and saw our well-behaved dogs. Research shows that dog parks increase neighborhood values, not decrease them. The petition signed by opponents states some non-truths. It says in part a small group of selfish people, about 10, who do not want to comply with a leash ordinance are trying to get the City to modify the park for their convenience without regard for the people who live and own homes in the area. These people violate the ordinance daily. We are not selfish people. We do comply with a leash law. We have the best regards for the people who live nearby, as some of our own group resides there. We do comply every day with the ordinance. Shame on all the signees of the libelous language on the petition, for we do not appreciate the defamation of our characters. Shame on anyone here that condones his or her behavior or gives credence to it. Furthermore, our opponents have verbally bullied our group during a meeting at the park, which Mayor and some City officials were there. In many of their statements, we were told this is our neighborhood, you don't belong here. This is our park. Go use another. The park belongs to Lake View II Subdivision. None of you pick up after your dogs. I am going to call animal control every day until you don't come here anymore. You people are not welcome here, and cheese with rat poison is effective. I am afraid to put addresses on our petition in fear that our dogs would be poisoned at our homes. Adults behaving badly needs to stop. The bullying needs to stop. The lies being told to the City Council needs to stop. We clean dog poop every morning, no matter what dog leaves it there. We take pride in our City park. We live in the neighborhood and other areas. We come to enjoy the shade trees and the beauty and want to exercise and socialize our dogs and ourselves.

We ask a few homeowners to stop wasting City resources by making false reports to Animal Control. We ask that the City Council consider the facts and have insight and courage to find a happy resolution in this matter. It's evident a few opponents do not want us at the park at all and will continue to make false accusations about our group and attempt to deny us from taking our dogs to the park on a leash, and we do comply to the leash law. This is a City park which all residents should be able to visit without fear of harassment. We will continue to support an off leash area of some kind now and in the future. Some of our elderly and handicap group have service dogs and need a place to train and socialize. Redd Hills's Park is easily accessible and nearby. We visit the park for only one hour each morning. This park is of our choosing. Please do not mistake the smell of goose poop for dog poop. The residents may be mistaking this for our fault since the pond and irrigation channel is home to free wandering geese. We will continue to volunteer in efforts to keep the park free of poop every morning. We are nice people and love and take pride in our City and on behalf of some of the many dogs that frequent Redd Hills Park, Buddy, Nicky, Chris, Elvis, Frank, Penny, Annie, Augie dog, Snowy, Nelson, Penny #2, Petey, Peanut, Oscar, Nicky, Savannah, Patty, Lindy, Ruby, Sue, Sammy, Pepper, Buddy #2 and Rosie, I thank you. Here's my petition.

[5:47 PM] Minutes:
Donna Phelps: I wasn't going to speak, but I would like to make a statement from another perspective. My dog lives up the street about five blocks, and I don't use the park. I enjoy walking down there on the other side, seeing the geese, blah blah blah blah blah. My concern is that if I were coming to Mesquite today and wanted to buy in La Scala, I wouldn't consider that home right above there if it actually had a chain link dog fence, and I think we are wasting our time, because you already said you were going to approve that, but I happen to know that lady that owns that home. She's in terrible, terrible health, and I hope she was contacted or her estate was. Her children have to come in there from Cedar City. When you talk about chain link fence and dog parks, I would want no part of it.

[5:49 PM] Minutes:
Bill Ellis: Mayor and City Council, my name is Bill Ellis. I am one of the 10 selfish people that's referred to. My dog is off leash, but I think you can understand. I can't really control a dog on leash. I do have neighbors that go with me. They pick up all my dog's poop. They do everything else for me. But to turn this -- and I'm against the dog fence, I'll be honest, but what we've had over there for the last four years, and I've been using it for over two years after my wife passed away and I need a place to take my dog that's a controlled environment, so that's when I started taking my dog. My neighbors have been going over there four years. There hasn't really been any incident until now. We are getting bullied daily by phone calls to the police department, animal control. I have been riding my golf cart "illegally," because I'm not going to a golf course, but I have hand controls and I use a stick to control my pedals. I'm a safe driver. I got stopped by the police the first time in four years that I've been using a golf cart. Was the police called on me, was I bullied in that case not by the police, but by the person that notified the police, at 8:30 look for this golf cart coming down Hardy Way. It seems like things are getting out of hand in this City. Let's learn to get along. That park the way it is is fine. If we want it on lease with some variance, that's fine. Let's do it. But to close it off to everybody so that's it's in "a neighborhood park" is ridiculous. It's a beautiful park with one of the few areas that has shade. I invite all the people from the southside to come over and bring their dogs and use the fine park up there. Why not? It's a city park. Let's all get together and make this work one way or another. Thank you for your time.

[5:51 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman closed Public Hearing.

[5:51PM] Minutes:
Council member Delaney: You know, I noticed that Mesquite is a city of dog lovers. I have two of my own, and luckily I have a back yard they run in. I don't take them to the dog park. I do think we need a second dog park. As I talked to

Mr. Montoya, one of the problems with our current dog park is we can't really close it to do any reseeding. He said they tried to close it a couple of times so they can reseed, and it caused quite a stir, because people couldn't get to the dog park. So I think we do need to look at a second location for dog park, and of course it needs to be ADA qualified. We need it so that these people, any people, I don't mean these people, any person who needs to use this park, whether it's just to let their dog get a good run or whether it's because they need to have a chance for their dog to be off leash like Mr. Ellis, that we need a place like that.

Apparently from most of the public that we've heard, this is not the preferred park. I would like to see our Staff look on the north side of the freeway for other City-owned property or to find some other solution. And I think that's how this whole thing started out in the first place is we were trying to find a solution to a problem, and that's because we want to serve the people of Mesquite. The overwhelming majority of the people that have come forward both in emails and petitions and everything has said they don't want it there. I do worry sometimes about that NIMBY factor. You know, we don't want anything in our backyard, and so that causes a problem. I personally think that leaving the park as is, I've heard a lot of people say that they didn't want it restricted. I don't think there that there was ever any plan to suddenly say you can't take your dog to that park. I do think that maybe we as a City need to be a little firmer on if Mr. Macias gets called and there are dogs off leash, cite those people. You know, instead of being as nice as we've been for a long time. I think that maybe we need to enforce our own ordinance a little bit more. You know, there are some exceptions at times, and I think we need to recognize those exceptions and find a place that can be available to them.

[5:54 PM] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: We have two animal control officers, and apparently there's somebody up there that's got a real bone that they won't drop, pardon the pun, and they're ratting out everybody and they're annoying the heck out of our staff, and they're not being respectful to our staff or to the other users of the park. That being said, a couple of comments. First of all, just so you know, I've got dogs. I've got a lot of dogs, and they're unruly. Two of them are 70 pound boxers. They're stupid. They run like crazy, and I can't take them to a park, any park, on leash or off leash. They're idiots. I take them out to the desert. Last week, the two dogs chased a coyote up the hill up into the Town Wash and turned around and had the coyote chase their butts back down to the car, and this went on for 20 minutes to get their dumb butts back in the car. Went out there again a week later, today, this morning. The coyote was there waiting for them. It is a problem finding a place to walk stupid dogs, and I don't mean all dogs that need to be off leash are stupid, mine are, not everybody's.

I sympathize with the issue here. What I don't sympathize is what I said earlier is about the attitude towards a particular park and the people who use them. We

need a couple of things I think. Apparently, there is another issue about who picks up the turds. It sounds like a lot of people do, and you can't control that, and that's not the City's responsibility to patrol turds. End of story. If you don't like it, if you think there's a problem, go pick them up yourself, but the dog owner's need to take responsibility, and I think the vast majority do. Second thing, Staff does as good a job as they can possibly do in maintaining a dog park. I've done a lot of research on dog parks. Google dog park surfaces. There's a litany of what works and what has been tried and doesn't work. I should say, there's a litany of what doesn't work. Very few things work. We've got a unique climate where it's 150 degrees outside. Hard surfaces bake feet. Artificial turf is not porous. It doesn't let things drain. It gets nasty quickly. There's all kinds of issues here, decomposed granite, hot on the feet. What I would like to see, I did some research. There's stuff called canine grass. I don't know if it's the end all, be all but it's porous, it's breathable, and it seems to work in all climates. It's an artificial turf that's designed specifically for dogs. I would like to see Staff look at alternatives.

We have, and somebody else mentioned this and I can't remember if it was Nick or who, but mentioned that we have some land out by the existing animal shelter between the Wash and Hardy Way. We have a lot of land out there, and there's a strip that runs along the Wash. I would like to see us research some adequate surface materials for a dog park, make a sizable dog park, a meaningful dog park that's enclosed in an area that's not residential, and plant the easy trees, the cottonwoods and the Mesquites that don't require a lot of water, that will provide shades, maybe some shade shelters, artificial turf with some DG around the tree, something that looks pretty, something that looks inviting, something that we can use, that the dogs can use and run free. I would love it. I need it. Other people need it. There are solutions here. You also have to consider the ADA issue here. They can't question a service dog into a movie theater. Can you, Ernie? Alan, you can't in the store? It's a service dog. If people need dogs, you can't discriminate, and if that means they're off the leash sometimes, that means they're off the leash, and I think we have to make accommodations for all of that stuff. We have to revisit, maybe revisit our leash laws and some of the criteria. I don't know. Bottom line is there's alternatives, relocate. We're not going to do it tomorrow, because we don't have any money, but if we work up a plan and implement a long range plan, we can resolved this issue, and I can walk my stupid boxers out where there aren't coyotes. Anyway, that's my spiel.

[5:55 PM] Minutes:
Council member Hafen: I think we need to have some kind of motion so everybody can figure out what we we're going to do here. I think there's been some great comments both sides of the aisle. Somebody made the comment about down by the community garden. I will tell you there is plenty of dogs that run down there, and there's plenty of dog poop that's not picked up down there, because that's private property. I know the guy that owns it. I don't have a

problem with it. I have dogs, and I know how coyotes can be with dogs, but you have to have a smart dog that knows how to work a coyote and get the right results, so I'm going to invite Council member Rapson out and we're going to have a little training with the dog.

So it's a public park, multi-use. I will say this, okay, dog owners need to be respectful. The people that don't own dogs, I think it is a give and take here. I don't think that those of you that don't own dogs need to target somebody, and I'm not saying you are, but I don't know why this became an issue right now, because it's been fine for I don't know how many years, but apparently there's an issue up there. I hear the point and I think we all hear that you don't want a dog run right up in the middle of that nice park, okay, multi-use. Let's see if we can't get along. There are leash laws in place. We have Animal Control. We have police department. If there's an issue, that's where it is going to go. Hopefully, it can be resolved in a proper way and we can get along. I will also ask that Staff consider some of the other sites where we might be able to build some dog runs that are large enough for stupid dogs. I've owned a lot of dogs. I know what Mr. Rapson is saying, and I love dogs. My motion is that we do not build a dog park at Redd Hills Park, that we leave the park the way it is, multi-use. Now, if there are some things where we can put a couple of more trees to enhance it, it's not we are going to change the overall appearance but make it better, I would ask that you look into that, and I would ask Staff that they consider some of the property that the City owns, and let's make a park that dog owners can enjoy and dogs can go out and be stupid.

Council member Hafen moved that the City does not build a dog park at Redd Hills Park. The City will leave the park the way it is, multi-use. If there are some things, like put in a couple of trees to enhance it, and change the overall appearance and make it better, the City will look into that. I am asking staff to consider some other property that the City owns and let's make a park that the dog owners could enjoy and the dogs could go out and be "stupid". Council member Delaney seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

Zoning Items

11. Consideration of Extension of Time Case No. EOT-16-001 (Sun City Communication Tower) requesting additional time to construct the communication tower approved under Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-13-003. The proposed tower will be located at 1499 Falcon Ridge Parkway in the Planned Unit Development Park, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) zone.

- Public Hearing
- Discussion and Possible Action

[6:02 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Mr. Secrist...

[6:02 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Secrist: Several years ago the Council approved the conditional use permit for a Communications Tower down at the Mesquite behind their golf maintenance building in the top of Conestoga Parkway. A conditional use permit approval is good for a year. It lapsed or was going to lapse and they came in and requested an extension of time. We've done two of those. This is the third now. Anthem Mesquite has somebody who wants to build a tower. Their difficulty has been getting a cell-provider to locate in the town. They don't want to build it until it actually can provide service. Hopefully they can do that within this next year. So Staff recommends open to public hearing and approving the conditional use permit for the communications tower.

[6:03 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman opened the meeting to Public Hearing. There were no speakers.

Council member Hafen moved to approve the Extension of Time Case No. EOT-16-001 (Sun City Communication Tower) requesting additional time to construct the communication tower approved under Conditional Use Permit No. CUP-13-003. The proposed tower will be located at 1499 Falcon Ridge Parkway in the Planned Unit Development Park, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) zone. - Council member Rapson seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

12. Consideration of Conditional Use Permit Case No. CUP-16-002 (Eureka / Rising Star) to change the face of an outdoor billboard sign to a full color LED display, at 600 Eldorado Road, in the General Commercial (CR-2) zone.

    - Public Hearing
    - Discussion and Possible Action

[6:04 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Mr. Secrist;

[6:04 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Secrist: In 2012, the City adopted Ordinance 460 which made provision to

convert or make it possible I guess to convert non-conforming billboards into LED electronic message center signs. Urban Land, an owner of a couple of signs on the north side of the interstate, is applying again to do that. They converted one over by Dottie's a couple of years back. They now want to approve this one at 600 El Dorado converted to an LED sign, and it's a conditional use permit. The Code states that in order to do this, the sign has to be within 250 feet of the I15 travel way. It has to be at least 500 feet away from the closest residential zone, and this one meets both of those criteria. This is the existing sign that is there now that they want to change out to a LED. With that, Staff recommends opening public hearing for comment and approval of Conditional Use Permit 16-002.

[6:05 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman opened up the meeting to Public Hearing.

[6:05 PM] Minutes:
Ray Draper: Yes, Mayor and Council, I am Ray Draper with Young Electric Sign Company, and I wanted to let you know that I am here if you have any questions or comments that I can possibly answer. We did put one of these up a few years ago over by Dottie's, I guess is what it is, and it is a beautiful sign. I think everybody has looked at that. At nighttime, they're toned way down. They look much better than a normal billboard does, and then very effective for the client. So if you have any questions at all, I would be glad to answer those. This one and the next one in line, by the way.

[6:06 PM] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: I was confused. There are so many sign things on tonight, which sign you were representing right here, but you cleared that up for me. I mean, we have gone from painted signs to flex vinyl. We have gone to electronic and you see them all over the freeways nowadays, so I'm all for it. So without any other comment I'll make a motion.

Council member Rapson moved approve the Conditional Use Permit Case No. CUP-16-002 (Eureka / Rising Star) to change the face of an outdoor billboard sign to a full color LED display, at 600 Eldorado Road, in the General Commercial (CR-2) zone. Public Hearing. Council member Withelder seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

13. Consideration of Conditional Use Permit Case No. CUP-16-003 (Eureka / Rising Star) to change the face of an outdoor billboard sign to a full color LED display, at 333 Sandhill Boulevard, in the Hotel Tourist (HT) zone.

- Public Hearing
- Discussion and Possible Action

[6:07 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Mr. Secrist.

[6:07 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Secrist: This is the same as the previous item, except this sign happens to be over behind the Rising Star Hotel by I15. It's the back of the hotel and close to the interstate. The proposal is to change it out to a LED sign. This is the existing sign as it appears now and again it will just be converted to LED electronic. Staff recommends approval.

[6:07 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman opened up to Public Hearing. There were no speakers. Seeing none, Public Hearing is closed.

[6:08 PM] Minutes:
Council member Delaney: I would just like to say I like those signs when I drive down the road. I think that they are informational; they are eye catching; they are beautiful, and they don't fade and peel away, etc., like billboards do, and if there's no other comment, I'm ready to make a motion.

Council member Delaney moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit Case No. CUP-16-003 (Eureka / Rising Star) to change the face of an outdoor billboard sign to a full color LED display, at 333 Sandhill Boulevard, in the Hotel Tourist (HT) zone. - Public Hearing. Council member Rapson seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

14. Consideration of Variance Case No. V-16-001 (Eagles Landing Signs) to consider sign height and area variances for pole signs on the various properties of the Eagles Landing commercial subdivision, located generally at 1950 W Pioneer Boulevard in the Light Industrial (IR-1) Zone.

    - Public Hearing
    - Discussion and Possible Action

[6:09 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Mr. Secrist.

[6:09 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Secrist: This is a continuation of a discussion we had this past February regarding variances for signs on this Proposed Eagle's Landing property. At the time, I think we didn't have enough information. I'm not sure the applicants knew what exactly or how much they needed, and so the Council gave some direction and suggested they come back with more detail when they have signed plans and so forth. So that's why we're back today to look at their proposal, and they've changed the request slightly They're asking for both height and area variances for up to 5 signs and height and area variance for an American Flag that they want to put on the site. Eagle's Landing is still in their due diligence period on the purchase of this land from the City. They want to make sure that you know before they do that, that they're going to be able to have appropriate signage that can be seen from this site. It is a location and a site that is difficult because of the surrounding topography, particularly for northbound traffic on I15. This air photo is an old one. Obviously, if you've been by the new interchange, it looks a lot different today, but it does illustrate some of the topographical issues surrounding this roadway connection down to I15. This is another air photo from above that shows the road, highway I15, leading up to the site which is approximately this location, and the real difficulty is being able to see signs for this northbound traffic, partly because there are a number of horizontal curves through here and because of these hills on either side of the interstate, they block the visibility to this site. So this has brought up the request for variances to have taller signs. We went through an exercise back on May 25th where the applicants put some helium balloons up tethered on 100 foot tethers on the site, and we drove up and down the interstate so we could see, you know, find out exactly what point can you see the balloons or the signs, where the signs would be, and can you see them far enough in advance to be able to get off at the interchange. Well, until you get to about this point on the interstate you can't see anything, and when you get to that point, the 100 foot tethers were clearly visible, and we think 100 foot signs would be tall enough to serve the purpose of giving the motorist advance warning. There's going to be a truck stop up there, another commercial development, and they'd be able to get off at 118.

This is a high end of the proposed sign or one possible sign that they are proposing. It's 102 feet high, approximately 2,018 square feet of both copy on the sign. Several different versions of the same sign, I guess. And in their location plan they show three different signs. The first sign going in here at intersection of lower flat top at I15. The second sign down here midway through this lot on the west and then the third sign and halfway between the two, and the 100 foot flag pole with a 30 x 60 foot flag right here. The applicants have indicated to me that they could probably initially live with three signs, but in the future as other tenants come into this commercial subdivision, they want to be able to get up to five signs down the road and feel that they may need that amount of signage.

As we indicated in February, Staff does believe that there is justification for a

height variance because of the topography on the sites. And you understand with a variance, variances by nature are specific. They are unique because they're based on unique circumstances or hardship or practical difficulties with the site. They're different than every other site in the zone. In addition to the height, they're asking for an area variance. Now, the topography doesn't really impact the need for a sign area in the same way that it does height, but nonetheless they are asking for a change or for a variance on area. The current requirement for sign area is 0.5 square feet of sign area per linear foot of lot frontage. They want to triple that to 1 ½ square feet of sign area per linear foot of frontage so a trip we knew the amount of copy area that they could have on the signs. And then the question is how much is enough, how much is too much.

Staff went through an exercise looking at several different options that are kind of illustrated in these two tables here. Table 1 shows the amount of sign area allowed using the current standard of half of square foot per linear foot. One square foot per foot and 1.5. And this is the amount of signage that you end up with. The typical billboard sign is a 14 x 48 sign and our 672 square feet, and telling the Staff member -- we went through and we divided those areas by the 672 to see, well, how many billboards is this equivalent to help the Council kind of visualize how much signage is being requested. Under the existing standard of 0.5 square foot, the 2,329 square feet translates into about 3.46 billboards. At one square foot, it's 6.93 billboards and at the 1 ½ square feet that they've requested it's 10.39, almost 10.4 billboards equivalents of signage. Table 2 then shows the area per sign allowed under the three different scenarios if you use up to five signs. That's at the 1.5 foot standard if you had only one sign. You get 6,987 square feet on a sign which is like 1.5 times the size of the Casablanca sign, or they could have five signs with 1397 square feet or basically two billboards per sign, five signs.

As I looked at that, I thought the 1.5 square foot was too much signage. I think they get what they need with the 1 square foot. That's a lot of signage, and that's my recommendation. I think you know I want everyone to understand - I mean, I hope they're successful. We want to do business to be successful. My recommendation is in no way an attempt to undermine their efforts to do that. I think they can do that with said amount of signage. Obviously, if Council thinks they need additional signage, then by all means it's your prerogative to grant something else.

As far as the flag goes, again, they're asking for variance. The current standard is flag pole was not supposed to be hire than the building it's next to or 35 feet. They want a 100-foot flag and it's limited to 30 square feet, an area they want it to be 30 x 60, so 1800 square feet. The argument for having taller bigger signs makes sense in that you want the motorist to be able to see it in advance of getting off at the exit. I'm not sure the same argument exists for the flag other than they would like it to, I guess, act as an attention getting device along with the signs. I'm not recommending the variances for the flag, but again if the

Council thinks that's something that's important to this; my recommendation is limited to 50 feet high with a flag no bigger than 300 square feet. I guess with that, that'll open it up for public hearing.

[6:20 PM] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: Before we get to Public Comment, I want to disclose that I am a licensed real estate agent with Premier Properties who is the broker in this transaction. I do not have any monetary interest or have any business interest with either the petitioner or the broker in this particular case. I don't feel that it's necessary for me to recuse. I just want to make it clear that I have a relationship with Premier Properties, but I do not in any way benefit from this. This is a marketing decision, not a contractual decision.

[6:21 PM] Minutes:
Council member Withelder: I too am affiliated with Premier Properties, and I would like to make the same disclosure as Council member Rapson made. Thank you.

[6:21 PM] Minutes:
Council member Delaney: I am not with Premier Properties, but I would like to disclose that 333 Eagle's Landing has made a $400 donation to my campaign, has no way in any bearing on any of these decisions. It was long after we did the balloon tests and whatever, and I don't think it will have any effect on me, and I am not going to recuse.

[6:21 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman opened the meeting to Public Hearing.

[6:21 pm] Minutes:
Mark Yardley: I appreciate the opportunity here tonight. Just in support of the 100 foot flag with I15 being the Veteran's Memorial Highway, we have one of these flags in Beaver Dam, and the amount of attention that it has brought and the people that have personally thanked me for putting that flag up, it's very expensive to maintain one of those each year, but when you see one there absolutely gorgeous, but it needs to be the 100 feet high and it needs to be the 30 x 60 if we can get it. But that would be my recommendation on the flag. The sign at 1 foot we can probably get by with it. We would obviously prefer to have to the foot and a half if we could, just because of future development. Thank you and if you have any questions.

[6:23 PM] Minutes:
George Gault with Mesquite Regional Business: I had an opportunity to go along on the balloon flight exercise, and there really are blind spots caused by the topography and the shoulders, if you will, that you can't see where this is

going to be situated until you pass the exit to the ramp. So it clearly needs some signage. They've got to create visibility, and this project is really going to be the anchor for the exit, so we really need it to move ahead, and I think also that your decision here tonight. Richard mentioned they are in their due diligence phase, this could really affect the viability of the project, so my thought is that their suggestions and recommendations about what they need were formulated by people who've done this before. As Mark just mentioned, he's in the business, owns other truck stops. He knows what works. So my recommendation is, my hope is, that you'll pay attention to their requests and give them some other additional support on the variances. Thank you.

[6:25 PM] Minutes:
Mike Benham: They put a lot of money into this project and the last thing we want to do is to turn businesses away. They're not going to build there if they're not viable coming down the highway, and it's also a safety issue. You know, people slamming on the brakes trying to reverse. I would sincerely ask you guys to really consider and give them what they need. Thank you.

[6:25 PM] Minutes:
Linda Faas: This is a very non-professional comment, but perhaps from the viewpoint of a person who needs the services as I'm driving along the freeway. I think it's so important to have advanced cues for a convenience store or a gas station. So well in advance of that off ramp you need to know that there is this service that is available at Exit 118. I think that's really key to success of the business, and then yes, large signs can be very helpful, but I think once you get too large that perhaps you're looking a little small townish. Yet, you want something this is flashy and big, and this is Nevada, but I don't know if you need something that is completely in your face, but I'm not an expert on this.

I like the American Flag idea. I know of an example in Avon, Colorado, down the road form Vale, where a 100-foot flag pole was put up and with a very, very large flag. It really brought a lot of anger from the community who were neighbors who thought this was way too big. Every single person that passed that flag loved it. You had so many positive comments from people from out of town who came passed Avon, came passed Vale that said we love this flag and thank you for your patriotism. So I can see the value of this not just as a ploy to bring in business, but as again who we are in Mesquite. Thank you.

[6:28 PM] Minutes:
Jack Reed: I am also representing Eagles Landing. We just want to make sure, Richard, that that one square foot per lineal foot covers the full three signs. It's very important, and I'm not sure if those calculations work for all three with the requests that we're having, because it is very important. We got 100 acres. There's going to be many more hopefully tenants on the 100 acres than just the truck stop and Wendy's, and that's part of the request for five signs is later on.

And we understand it may be excessive right now, but if it can be written in some language that either the current Council or future Councils would consider future signs if we get a bunch of industrial users. So we are fine with the 3 signs as long as it fits the square footage criteria that we're asking for because it's make or break the project. I mean, this is going to be a multi-million dollar project. They are excited. I was in meetings today, and they've got a top notch designer out of Texas that's top of the line. They do about 20 a year, and it's all modern stuff. It's going to be really cool. They're not afraid to spend the money, but they're afraid if we don't have the proper signage and I will tell you these signs are a couple hundred grand a piece. It's not that they're going to happen overnight. Probably going to do one to start and phase it in as the group gets successful, so hopefully there's not any time limits that they have to put up a sign every 6 months, so we want that to be in consideration as well. Thank you.

[6:29 PM] Minutes:
Warner Grave: I was just curious, has any consideration been given to on the northbound 15 to put these signs just beyond exit, what is it, 112? As you come down slope, that gives you 4 to 5 miles of information before you ever get to 118.

[6:29 PM] Minutes:
Jack Reed: Since the group doesn't own the property, it's off site signage, so we are currently talking to folks that have billboards up and down to where hopefully we can get a couple of those as you come down the Mesa or prior to.

[6:29 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman closed Public Hearing.

[6:30 PM] Minutes:
Council member Green: Mr. Secrist, what do you see as the down side of too much signs? I am concerned here that these guys know their business. The signs are $200,000 a piece. I don't think they're going to do anything crazy there, so what do you see? We had one public comment along the lines of maybe too much, but what do you see as the downside of a too tall flag pole, too much flag or too much signage authorization at this point?

[6:30 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Secrist: I am not sure there is a big down side, other than the appearance. You know five huge signs kind of mar the landscape, but they do need signage obviously. To be successful they need to be able to let people know where they're at and see it early enough. NDOT also has these logo signs, and we've suggested that they talk to NDOT about getting the logo signs out around the corner of Flat Top Mesa so they really can see early on that there are services up ahead. They start looking for it. They see the signs when they come around the point of Flat Top. But I guess it's just, you know, how you want the

landscape I guess to look, and the City to look.

[6:31 PM] Minutes:
Jack Reed: Again, because it is 100 acres and we've got some A hotel user looking at it right now, so if you look at the sign it says Wendy's and then Travel Plaza, etc. We hope to have a lot of use and make this 100 acres the game changer, a new gateway to Mesquite, so it's important. We're really asking for a decent amount of signage, but it's going to drive business and it's a huge commitment. You've seen the dirt that needs to be moved. It's a massive hole, so just in dirt moving the costs are going to be enormous, so hopefully you consider.

[6:32 PM] Minutes:
Council member Delaney: I think these are beautifully designed signs, and I've driven a lot of miles across this country, and I like signs because it lets me know, hey, there's a Wendy's there, or hey, there's a whatever kind of restaurant or truck stop. I don't think these guys are going to put the signs so close together or that it's going to mar the landscape. This is on the freeway side of the property there, and I even like the flag idea, because I know that every year when we have the Field of Flags at the rec center all the attention, the positive attention that even that draws with that giant flag on the side of the rec center and all the truckers going by honking their horns at that Field of Flags. I think that anything we can do to bring positive attention to Mesquite, and hey, we're not doing it. These guys are paying $200,000 a piece for them, and they need them for the business. It lets people know, and I guess I've never realized until we went out and did the balloon tests, how many like hills and valleys there were out there that you had to get past before you could see what was coming up. As we drive back and forth to Las Vegas, it all just becomes part of the wallpaper to us. Until something really happens to bring our attention to it, and where they had those balloons placed I think are very strategic. I think they're doing they're homework, and I think obviously if you had 10 billboards in that space it would start to look like Vegas. I think these are very classy looking, nicely designed signs, and unless somebody can show me a real downside to them, I don't have a problem with them.

[6:34 PM] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: First of all, I'm a veteran. I love the flag, so I'm in on that. Back when I worked at Solstice, we were trying to get a big project done, and this is a past administration. An example by the planner at the time was, wow, these signs are really big that you're asking for, which they weren't. Richard knows, he was involved, but not to the same extent he would be today, but they were not outrageous signs by any stretch. The planner at the time said, you know, the best sign I've ever seen is in Scottsdale, and it happened that my boss, Mike Kennedy, is from Scottsdale, and she mentioned where it was, and he said I know exactly where that was. That's a Safeway sign. He said it's a

beautiful sign, but that's the most underperforming Safeway in the United States, because nobody knows it's there, so you can't have it both ways. I know, I go to Park City a lot, and there's a market there, and they don't allow signs that are more than what 2 or 3 inches off the ground, I swear to God. I can't find the market until I've been there 10 times. Now I found my way. I dropped bread crumbs.

But anyway, signage is critical to the success of any business, particularly a freeway-related highway business. People have to have an advanced warning that it's there, and there's billboard restrictions. There has to be development within 1000 feet, I believe it is, something like that, or on a developed area. There can't be offsite signage that's meaningful in any respects. The highway signs from NDOT are great, but they're still the little blue things that you see. These are critical. I saw the balloons. I think they're great. Driving northbound you can see it in time to get off the freeway, but not a whole lot of time. The terrain is really tough there. So I think their positioning is good. I think the theory is good. I think the cost is to the extent that you don't put them up frivolously. You put them up because you need them, and I think with 100 acres, as Mr. Reed said, there's potentially a lot of businesses that need to be advertised, so yeah, I think we have to consider all of this, and I think that you know we've gone out of our way to say we're business friendly. We've gone out of way to say that we're trying to help businesses succeed. We're going to entertain a business tax, which frankly I'm not thrilled with, because I think it hurts business. We've extended hours of operation for Deep Roots Medical. We've done other things that help them succeed. We do things to help businesses success in this town quite often, and I think that this is an opportunity to help a business that's investing millions and millions and millions of dollars in this community in developing a quality project to success. So I frankly don't have any issue with the three signs particularly and five on any contingency, but I'm okay with five. I think they're cost prohibitive without demand, and so I'm good with 5 at 1.5 times the lineage, linear foot and the flag.

[6:39 PM] Minutes:
Council member Withelder: And I sort of echo Council member Rapson's comments. If these folks are going to make that kind of investment in the City of Mesquite and spend a million dollars on signage as well as the flag pole and the flag, as Mr. Reed said, it's going to be a game changer for the entire City, that new interchange and the new travel stop or whatever we're going to determine. It's a game changer for the City, without a doubt. Coming and going, back and forth, up and down, no matter how you want to view it, if you can't see the sign and you can't advertise your business you might as well not even open the door. So I agree with Mr. Rapson, and I think if anybody is going to make that sort of investment in our City we strongly got to consider their options. Thank you.

Council member Green moved to approve Variance Case No. V-16-001 (Eagles Landing Signs) to consider sign height and area variances for pole signs on the various properties of the Eagles Landing commercial subdivision, located generally at 1950 W Pioneer Boulevard in the Light Industrial (IR-1) Zone. Council member Delaney seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

Administrative Items

ITEM 15 WAS PLACED BEFORE ITEM 11

16. Consideration of approval of a Automatic Aid Agreement (AAA) between the Beaver Dam / Littlefield Fire District (BDLFD) and Mesquite Fire Rescue (MFR)

    - Public Comment
    - Discussion and Possible Action

[6:39 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Chief Christopher

[6:40 PM] Minutes:
Chief Kash Christopher: Real quick, Ill just get right to it. It's the same agreement we had with Beaver Dam and Scenic. Just a couple of changes: One, a dual responder, and this dual responder is one mile form Highway 91 to Scenic Boulevard down to the Virgin River. What I mean by dual response is we'll go as a well, because it will take them longer to get their Beaver Dam and Scenic, so we're right there. We'll take care of it. And it goes 3 miles inside the interstate into Arizona on Interstate 15. The second one, instead of waiting for us to call them if we have an actually working structure fire, it's an automatic aid. They're going to come out. Same with them. If they get a working structure fire, we'll go out there as well. But other than that, everything else is the same.

Council member Hafen moved to approve the Automatic Aid Agreement (AAA) between the Beaver Dam / Littlefield Fire District (BDLFD) and Mesquite Fire Rescue (MFR). Council member Rapson seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

17. Consideration of the introduction of Bill No. 495 Amending Mesquite Municipal Code Title 2 Chapter 1, Section 2-1-5 Entitled "Payment of License Fees," Subsection Entitled "Liquor License Fees;" And Chapter 4, Section 2-4-23 Entitled "Origination Fees and License Renewal Rates;" and other matters properly related thereto.

- Discussion and Possible Action

[6:41 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman read this item by its title. This is not a Public Comment item, and this is not a Public Hearing item. It's strictly an introduction of this bill at this point.

[6:41 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Sweetin: I don't have any, unless you would like me to explain it. I think it's just coming back before the Council and like you said Mayor it's just for introduction. It will be calendared at our next Council meeting for a public hearing.

[6:42 PM] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: I just want to be clear, it's still okay to discuss this, correct?

[6:42 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Sweetin: Yes you can. Yes, you don't have to limit the discussion or anything, but the purpose is whether it will be calendared for public hearing. That's the vote you will be taking, not --

[6:42 PM] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: I guess would like to say a couple of things, and I mentioned it the last time we had this discussion, but fundamentally I'm against any tax increase, and I have and I will say, which I generally don't go back on my word, I told just a couple of people, and in fact I think it might have been one of the community forums as well, that I would support some tax increase if it was specifically purposed, but that was based on discussions before I had discussions directly with Mr. Kempfer, and what was the underlying reason for his comment of compromise, and with Allan over at Smiths and a few other of the retailers in town. Frankly, I think it will have a detrimental affect. I'm inclined to agree that this is not the time to raise taxes in any form. The fact that it's predominantly or supposedly predominantly out of towners is irrelevant. It affects me. I drink, and I think there's other people in this town that drink. We can't go anywhere else to get liquor reasonably that has alcohol in it. So we're stuck. We're stuck. So I'm having a little issue with this thing, just so you know.

[6:44 PM] Minutes:
Council member Hafen: I listened to the last comments on the last item. Here are some of the things that were said. These guys know their business. I think the Lee's know their business. I want them to be successful. We're business friendly. We've gone out of our way to help business. We talked about game changers. It doesn't affect me. I don't drink the hard stuff. I really don't have a dog in this fight. We've talked all about dogs tonight. But I will tell you, this is nothing more than a tax. The Lee's came to town, built a nice facility. They're a great business partner, and now we want to tax them along with some others. I really have a problem with the concept that we need to go find some money. If you look on your power bill, and on your phone bill, you'll find a right of way fee. It should be a right of way tax. I protested that from day one. I watched as previous staff and Council and we had a previous City Attorney 2 or 3 prior to the one we have now, who I think is the best one we have ever had, but I will tell you that they came up with different names and scenarios and ways to put that on your power bill and your phone bill. They tried to put it on your water bill, but it was a stubborn guy down there at the water district that said, no, and heck, no, and it's not on your water bill. Every time your power bill goes up, your phone bill goes up that 3 percent, which we did change to 2 percent, and I'd like to have it gone, but we did reduce it, but you are still probably paying more than you did when it was 3 percent. Anyway, long story short, if we're going to be business friendly, let's be business friendly, or else let's not run that as our slogans for campaigns or the City. I think it's wrong. The Lee's have been tremendous business partners, and I just have a real problem with this.

[6:46 PM] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: Just a follow up. We've ridden this horse multiple times. Again, I use the same analogy. We extended the hours of Deep Roots. We reduced their taxes so they can survive. We just granted a variance that's significant for signage to help a business survive. We've done this over and over again, and we keep saying we're business friendly, and then we turn around and put this kind of thing out here and say, well, we're business friendly to everybody that buys something here from Utah and some of the locals, but we're not. You can't have it both ways. We balanced the budget for the first time in a long time, and I think that we've -- I'm not going to say we can do it every year, but we need to work within the confines of our budget, and we need to stop looking for specific sources. I mean, why not talk about a property tax here? A tax is a tax. At least it is spread over the entire City. I'm not for it. I'm just saying we're trying to do it in a surreptitious way that seems benign and seems like it's attacking out of towners, so I'm not buying it. I just don't think we should even move it forward.

[6:47 PM] Minutes:
Council member Delaney: When we first started discussing this, it was a simple tax, and then as Mr. Sweetin and they went to Carson City and found out we

really couldn't impose that tax or an excise tax on liquor. When it seemed it was a tax, a simple tax, going on liquor that would pass onto the consumer and not hurt the businesses in any way, I was for it, because I don't see that a 3 percent or a 5 percent tax is going to dissuade people from buying alcohol. I drink, and 3 cents on a dollar is not going to dissuade me from drinking. So it's not the money about it. Now this has become rather convoluted, and it's no longer just a simple tax, we're changing license fees and moving a lot of things around, and it's not as simple as it used to be, and so I'm really not in favor of it any longer. Also we just balanced the budget, and according to Mr. Empy, we're coming in this year in the black which is so exciting to all of us, and I think that's you know the economy has turned and things are looking better. In the mode of being business friendly, I think this is something that if you know in the future we needed to do because of fire and police, etc., that might be something we can look at, but there are other ways we can look at funding our fire and police that would actually go through -- Mr. Hafen or Mr. Rapson said something about a property tax or some other kind of tax that would make it so that it is spread out more to everybody. So the fact that this thing has really changed and has become very convoluted, it's not the simple thing it was when we first started discussing it. I'm not in favor of it.

[6:49 PM] Minutes:
Council member Rapson: I just want to make it clear, I'm not for property tax, either. I just want to make that absolutely clear, I'm not for it.

[6:49 PM] Minutes:
Council member Hafen: I want to make sure you quoted the right person. It was not me that wanted a property tax, so I am clarifying that. I just want to make one more comment. We have balanced the budget. We've done a good job. It's taken us a number of years. It was one of my goals here that we live within our means as we ask everybody else to do, so I just don't think it's necessary right now. So if nobody wants any more comment, I'll agree to make the motion on this.

Council member Hafen moved that the City does not move forward in introducing Bill No. 495 as Ordinance 495 Amending Mesquite Municipal Code Title 2 Chapter 1, Section 2-1-5 Entitled "Payment of License Fees," Subsection Entitled "Liquor License Fees;" And Chapter 4, Section 2-4-23 Entitled "Origination Fees and License Renewal Rates;" and other matters properly related thereto. Council member Rapson seconded the motion.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 0

Public Comments

During the Public Comment portion of the agenda comments must be limited to matters within the authority and jurisdiction of the City Council. Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak to the City Council at this time, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name. Comments are limited to 3 minutes in length.

18. Public Comments

[6:50 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman opened the meeting to Public Comments.

[6:51 PM] Minutes:
Mr. Lee: Mayor and Councilmen, thank you very much. I have put in this community Lee's Liquor and Lee's Liquor will continue to operate in town. So we have a lot of you know some 90 percent Utah peoples that continue. They come to Mesquite, they eating or shopping or not only liquor. So it continue bring over a lot of peoples. I will more try, and I will so desire I help this community. We the community work together. Thank you very much. Thank you again, Mayor and Council members. Thank you.

[6:52 pm] Minutes:
Ernie Hoffman: I am still a resident of this wonderful place called paradise. It's taken me 10 years to be able to stand up here and say this honestly to the Council and the Mayor sitting in front of me. It's wonderful what I've seen happen in the last couple of months in the way you're moving Mesquite forward. I think it's going to be a very progressive, well-run City. I hope that I have the ability to stay here and be able to be employed in this town. Unfortunately, as you all know, I'm looking for a job, because unfortunately I lost the one that I had, but I think it is time to really congratulate all of you for doing a job that was necessary to be done to bring this in line with the way the government and our country is not going, and that's forward. It's a pleasure to know all of you. Thank you.

Adjournment

19. Adjournment

[6:53 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman adjourned the meeting.

Allan S. Litman, Mayor

Tracy E. Beck, City Clerk

Mesquite City Council

Technical Review Meeting

Mesquite City Hall - Training Room
10 E. Mesquite Blvd.
Tuesday, July 05, 2016 - 1:30 PM

Minutes of a scheduled meeting of the City Council held on Tuesday, July 5, 2016, at 1:30 P.M. at City Hall in the Training Room. In attendance were Mayor Allan S. Litman, Council members W. Geno Withelder, Richard Green and Cynthia "Cindi" Delaney Also, in attendance were City Manager Andy Barton, Finance Director David Empey, Development Director Richard Secrist, City Liaison Aaron Baker, City Clerk Tracy Beck, other city staff and approximately 8 citizens.

Mayor Litman called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Council member Kraig Hafen and George Rapson were absent. (NOTE: This meeting has been tape-recorded and will remain on file in the office of the City Clerk for four years for public examination.

*Below is an agenda of all items scheduled to be considered for the Mesquite City Council Regular Council Meeting. Agenda items discussed on this agenda are considered **"Proposed"** until the final agenda for the Regular City Council Meeting is posted, according to NRS 241.020. Unless otherwise stated, items may be taken out of the order presented on the agenda at the discretion of the Mayor and Council. Additionally, the Mayor and Council may combine two or more items for consideration, and may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time. Public comment is limited to three minutes per person.*

Public Comments

During the Public Comment portion of the agenda comments must be limited to matters within the authority and jurisdiction of the City Council. Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak to the City Council at this time, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name. Comments are limited to 3 minutes in length.

1. Public Comments

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman opened up the meeting to Public Comment. There were no speakers.

Consent Agenda

Items on the Consent Agenda may not require discussion. These items may be a single motion unless removed at the request of the Mayor, City Council, or City Manager.

2. Consideration of Approval of the July 12, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting Agenda; the June 7, 2016 Technical Review Meeting Minutes; the June 15, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting Minutes and the June 21, 2016 Regular City Council Meeting Minutes.

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

3. Consideration of approval of:
   a) Notification of Budget Transfers
   b) Notification of Budget Amendments
   c) Notification of Bills Paid
   d) Purchase Orders

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and asked if there were any questions or comments. There were none.

Consideration of approval for the Introduction of Bill 504 amending MMC Election Code.

[Minutes:]
Ms. Beck: Mayor, I have been asked by City Attorney, Mr. Sweetin, to add a place holder for potential Ordinance 504 amending the election which would be

the Municipal Code 1-8-19. I believe this is what he is working on at this time.

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman: Do we need any motion to put that on?

[Minutes:]
Ms. Beck: Yes, we do, because we are amending the approval of the July 12th agenda.

Council member Delaney moved to approve the addition of the Introduction of Bill 504 amending MMC Election Code to the July 12, 2016 Regular Council Meeting Agenda. Council member Withelder seconded the motion.

Passed For: 3; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Absent: 2 (Hafen and Rapson)

Department Reports

4. Mayor's Comments

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman stated he had nothing at this time.

5. City Council and Staff Comments and Reports

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman read this item and asked Council and Staff if they had anything.

[Minutes:]
Council member Withelder: I will have something.

Zoning Items

6. Consideration of Architectural and Site Plan review Case No. ASR-16-003 (Mesquite Library) to get approval to build a new library building on a portion of the site at 105 West Mesquite Boulevard, in the General Commercial (CR-2) zone.

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and asked if there were any questions or comments.

[Minutes:]
Dave West: Candidate for City Council, but I am also an employee representing Reliance Connects which is adjacent to the property and maybe just a little more thought going into recognition that that is kind of a light industrial right next to the property. Just a comment that looking at the site plan that it is Light Industrial right next door for Reliance Connects. We have our yard there and some of the elements on here may need some adjustment and some further review.

[Minutes:]
Gary Eddington, PSC Architects: Yes, at some point we need to know when there are comments or what they are, and we can address them, I guess.

[Minutes:]
Council member Delaney: So you may just want to get with the folks at Reliance Connects and see what concerns they may have or --

[Minutes:]
Dave West: I would suggest that you call Harold Austin. I'll give him a copy of this. He's the General Manager there. As you're planning to turn that into a plaza area, I can see that conflicts a little bit with the existing use on the streets.

[Minutes:]
Council member Delaney: Well, that is the front part, though, isn't it, David?

[Minutes:]
Dave West: This is the back lot. We have part of our garage back here on this end of the street. We have our main lot right here, and there's actually – you even have parking stalls right; there is actually an egress to the parking area for employees, so just knowing that the current use of that area now may impact how you want to look at that street scape between the two buildings.

7. Consideration of Parcel Map Case No. PM-16-004 (Existing Library) to separate ownership of the existing library and city utilities and structures, located at 121 West First North Street in the Public Facilities (PF) Zone.

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Richard Secrist.

[Minutes:]
Mr. Secrist: These two Items, 7 and 8, basically just divide the existing parcel map into two separate parcel maps. One for the existing library, one for the proposed library, and the remainder City parcel to the south. It makes it so that remainder piece remains in the City ownership, and the future library parcel could be sold to the district, transferred to the district, I guess, for the library. These parcel maps include all the latest ALTA survey information, utility information, and so forth. It's basically kind of a cleanup and getting the properties ready to be transferred.

8. Consideration of Parcel Map Case No. PM-16-005 (Future Library) to separate ownership of the future library and city utilities and structures, located at 105 West Mesquite Boulevard in the Central Business District (CR-3) Commercial Zone

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

[Minutes:]
(The discussion for this item was included with Item 7).

Administrative Items

9. Consideration of approval and adoption of Resolution Number 901 between the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District and the City of Mesquite adopting an Interlocal Agreement and other matters properly related thereto.

   - Public Comment
   - Discussion and Possible Action

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Aaron Baker.

[Minutes:]
Mr. Baker: As part of this transaction, there are some items that need to be clarified in the sense of maintenance and some other costs and the Interlocal Agreement associated with Resolution Number 901. That's what this item is for.

So in order to approve an Inter local Agreement, you have to do it by ordinance or resolution, so we are doing it by resolution. And I will say this, I inadvertently attached the incorrect Resolution, so you have Resolution 841 I think to the Item. That was my mistake. I apologize. I have the updated Resolution here, so if you would like a copy of that for your reading pleasure. So that's there. That will be updated for the Council packet.

10. Consideration of Approval for refinancing Anthem Special Improvement Bonds Series 2007 to lower interest expense financing costs for property owners…i.e. homeowners and developer.

    - Public Comment
    - Discussion and Possible Action

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to David Empey.

[Minutes:]
Mr. Empey: This is I think one of those good kind of actions that we're going to take. Hopefully, they all are, but this one in particular, there's 21 years of remaining long life for these Anthem Special Improvement District Bonds. By doing this refinancing, we are effectively reducing the overall current interest rate of almost 6.4% down to about 3.8%, so it's a significant reduction in interest. And who are the beneficiaries? The beneficiaries are going to be the property owners. Now, the property owners are the developers and also the homeowners, so it'll reduce their interest costs substantially. I will invite John Peterson. We investigated doing something like this several years ago, but the interest rate environment wasn't – you know, it was somewhat better than when we initially took these bonds to market. The underwriters felt like interest rates weren't optimal at that time, so we put it off and revisited the topic, and now the interest rates are low, and given the City's financial strength and ability to not participate or back these, but they feel like the numbers within the improvement district itself will be more supportive of lowering these interest rates and protect the bond holder. So I think it's a win/win. Impact to the City, General Fund or any of the other funds is there is no impact.

[Minutes:]
Council member Green: The district pays all these costs.

[Minutes:]
Mr. Empey: Right, that's correct.

Public Comments

During the Public Comment portion of the agenda comments must be limited to matters within the authority and jurisdiction of the City Council. Items raised under this portion of the Agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Nevada Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak to the City Council at this time, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name. Comments are limited to 3 minutes in length.

11. Public Comments

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman opened up the meeting to Public Comment. There were no speakers.

Adjournment

12. Adjournment

[Minutes:]
Mayor Litman adjourned the meeting at 1:40 PM

Allan S. Litman, Mayor

Tracy E. Beck, City Clerk

July 26, 2016

City Council Regular

Agenda Item 3.

Subject:

Consideration of approval of:

a) Notification of Budget Transfers
b) Notification of Budget Amendments
c) Notification of Bills Paid
d) Purchase Orders

- Public Comment
- Discussion and Possible Action

Petitioner:

David R Empey - Finance Director/City Treasurer

Staff Recommendation:

Approval of Budget Transfers, Budget Amendments, Bills Paid and Purchase Orders.

Fiscal Impact:

See Attached

Budgeted Item:

Background:

See Attached

Attachments:

- Budget Transfers
- Budget Amendments
- Bills Paid
- Purchase Orders

Report Criteria:
Report type: GL detail

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	1	10-81-250	.00	100.93	100.93
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	2	10-81-240	.00	79.96	79.96
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	3	10-81-230	.00	52.24	52.24
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	4	16-71-230	.00	61.87	61.87
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	5	17-80-610	.00	91.88	91.88
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	6	10-81-610	.00	145.97	145.97
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	7	90-26118	.00	900.00	900.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	8	90-26117	.00	4,034.00	4,034.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	9	10-57-610	.00	13.68	13.68
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	10	10-57-230	.00	79.84	79.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	11	10-81-480	.00	120.82	120.82
07/16	07/05/2016	166683	8034	WAL*MART STORES, INC.	061616	12	10-54-240	.00	13.78	13.78
Total 166683:								.00		5,694.97
07/16	07/05/2016	166684	13280	1000 BULBS.COM	819719	1	10-65-250	.00	199.13	199.13
Total 166684:								.00		199.13
07/16	07/05/2016	166685	13745	ACTION TARGET INC.	93716-1	1	10-54-260	.00	3,700.00	3,700.00
Total 166685:								.00		3,700.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166686	1007	RHINO'S TURF EQUIPMENT	IR08618	1	10-76-610	.00	1,610.00	1,610.00
Total 166686:								.00		1,610.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166687	3655	AIRGAS USA LLC	9052550446	1	10-57-615	.00	171.80	171.80
Total 166687:								.00		171.80
07/16	07/05/2016	166688	8756	ALSCO	LSTG696479	1	10-60-310	.00	124.58	124.58
07/16	07/05/2016	166688	8756	ALSCO	LSTG698731	1	16-71-620	.00	81.68	81.68
07/16	07/05/2016	166688	8756	ALSCO	LSTG698735	1	10-60-310	.00	79.54	79.54
07/16	07/05/2016	166688	8756	ALSCO	LSTG698739	1	10-66-610	.00	42.30	42.30
07/16	07/05/2016	166688	8756	ALSCO	LSTG699842	1	10-66-610	.00	38.19	38.19

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
Total 166688:								.00		366.29
07/16	07/05/2016	166689	15447	AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE C	32141.1	1	10-51-310	.00	300.00	300.00
Total 166689:								.00		300.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166690	14353	AMERICAN TIRE DISTRIBUTOR	S075957809	1	10-66-250	.00	793.92	793.92
07/16	07/05/2016	166690	14353	AMERICAN TIRE DISTRIBUTOR	S076528505	1	10-66-250	.00	230.50	230.50
Total 166690:								.00		1,024.42
07/16	07/05/2016	166691	1017	AMERIGAS - ST GEORGE	3053104977	1	17-80-610	.00	1,452.90	1,452.90
Total 166691:								.00		1,452.90
07/16	07/05/2016	166692	2430	ANDERSON HERITAGE ELEC. I	13827	1	10-81-250	.00	107.50	107.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166692	2430	ANDERSON HERITAGE ELEC. I	13828	1	52-40-620	.00	500.00	500.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166692	2430	ANDERSON HERITAGE ELEC. I	13836	1	10-81-250	.00	110.00	110.00
Total 166692:								.00		717.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166693	15218	APPARATUS EQUIPMENT & SE	10190	1	10-57-250	.00	103.50	103.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166693	15218	APPARATUS EQUIPMENT & SE	10497	1	10-57-250	.00	93.08	93.08
07/16	07/05/2016	166693	15218	APPARATUS EQUIPMENT & SE	10631	1	10-57-250	.00	1,975.28	1,975.28
07/16	07/05/2016	166693	15218	APPARATUS EQUIPMENT & SE	10632	1	10-57-250	.00	1,996.30	1,996.30
Total 166693:								.00		4,168.16
07/16	07/05/2016	166694	13820	AQUA PERFECT	50824	1	10-57-610	.00	239.70	239.70
Total 166694:								.00		239.70
07/16	07/05/2016	166695	15457	ASHLEY SMITH	062816	1	10-23200	.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
Total 166695:								.00		1,150.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166696	11104	ASSESSMENT MANAGEMENT	AMG 1106	1	83-82-010	.00	1,609.62	1,609.62
07/16	07/05/2016	166696	11104	ASSESSMENT MANAGEMENT	AMG1130	1	83-81-010	.00	1,120.74	1,120.74

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
Total 166696:								.00		2,730.36
07/16	07/05/2016	166697	10454	AUTO AIR & MORE INC.	206991	1	10-66-480	.00	419.00	419.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166697	10454	AUTO AIR & MORE INC.	207250	1	10-66-480	.00	379.00-	379.00-
Total 166697:								.00		40.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166698	9268	AUTOMOTIVE CERTIFIED TECH	77447	1	10-66-250	.00	75.00	75.00
Total 166698:								.00		75.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166699	10955	AZ WASTEWATER IND. INC.	33970	1	52-40-610	.00	656.42	656.42
07/16	07/05/2016	166699	10955	AZ WASTEWATER IND. INC.	34093	1	52-40-610	.00	201.96	201.96
Total 166699:								.00		858.38
07/16	07/05/2016	166700	13237	BDP INDUSTRIES INC.	8177	1	52-40-620	.00	661.65	661.65
Total 166700:								.00		661.65
07/16	07/05/2016	166701	1081	BEARING BELT CHAIN CO	7114460	1	52-40-620	.00	640.10	640.10
Total 166701:								.00		640.10
07/16	07/05/2016	166702	12190	BETTY KING	JUNE 16	1	17-80-310	.00	525.00	525.00
Total 166702:								.00		525.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166703	14425	BG SOUTHERN NEVADA	PI0015821	1	10-66-250	.00	142.38	142.38
Total 166703:								.00		142.38
07/16	07/05/2016	166704	13453	BILL A BERRETT, P.C.	062716	1	10-51-310	.00	150.00	150.00
Total 166704:								.00		150.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166705	1100	BLAINE EQUIPMENT, INC	22892	1	10-66-250	.00	76.85	76.85

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
Total 166705:								.00		76.85
07/16	07/05/2016	166706	8158	BOB BARKER COMPANY INC.	UT10003842	1	10-55-610	.00	799.74	799.74
07/16	07/05/2016	166706	8158	BOB BARKER COMPANY INC.	WEB000428	1	10-55-610	.00	1,597.12	1,597.12
Total 166706:								.00		2,396.86
07/16	07/05/2016	166707	1150	BULLOCH BROTHERS, INC.	39001	1	10-65-480	.00	1,480.00	1,480.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166707	1150	BULLOCH BROTHERS, INC.	39001	2	45-40-812	.00	260.00	260.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166707	1150	BULLOCH BROTHERS, INC.	39002	1	10-65-480	.00	2,185.00	2,185.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166707	1150	BULLOCH BROTHERS, INC.	39077	1	10-65-480	.00	3,727.50	3,727.50
Total 166707:								.00		7,652.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166708	4755	CASELLE INC.	27042	1	10-46-230	.00	425.00	425.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166708	4755	CASELLE INC.	27045	1	10-46-230	.00	425.00	425.00
Total 166708:								.00		850.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166709	8377	CDW GOVERNMENT, INC.	DDX9217	1	10-55-610	.00	1,465.50	1,465.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166709	8377	CDW GOVERNMENT, INC.	DHQ9066	1	10-47-240	.00	43.65	43.65
07/16	07/05/2016	166709	8377	CDW GOVERNMENT, INC.	DKP8944	1	10-47-310	.00	14,514.22	14,514.22
Total 166709:								.00		16,023.37
07/16	07/05/2016	166710	14492	CENTURYLINK	JUN 16	1	10-47-310	.00	1,154.31	1,154.31
Total 166710:								.00		1,154.31
07/16	07/05/2016	166711	10598	CITY SHOPPES EMBROIDERY	061716	1	10-41-240	.00	299.40	299.40
Total 166711:								.00		299.40
07/16	07/05/2016	166712	1608	CLARK CO. DEPT. OF FINANCE	JUN 16	1	10-23240	.00	14,700.00	14,700.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166712	1608	CLARK CO. DEPT. OF FINANCE	MAY 2016	1	10-23130	.00	19,595.87	19,595.87
Total 166712:								.00		34,295.87

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166713	8634	CLARK CO. TREASURER	MAY 16	1	10-23140	.00	19,595.87	19,595.87
07/16	07/05/2016	166713	8634	CLARK CO. TREASURER	MAY 2016	1	10-23140	.00	12,247.42	12,247.42
Total 166713:								.00		31,843.29
07/16	07/05/2016	166714	12532	COLLECTIVE DATA	14462	1	10-66-310	.00	3,312.50	3,312.50
Total 166714:								.00		3,312.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166715	12005	COYOTE CARPET CLEANING	03471	1	10-66-480	.00	125.00	125.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166715	12005	COYOTE CARPET CLEANING	03473	1	10-63-310	.00	325.00	325.00
Total 166715:								.00		450.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166716	10588	DOCUMENT SOLUTIONS PLUS	123320	1	10-49-250	.00	1,059.56	1,059.56
Total 166716:								.00		1,059.56
07/16	07/05/2016	166717	14575	EFFORTLESS OFFICE ENTERP	001110026	1	10-47-310	.00	6,470.51	6,470.51
Total 166717:								.00		6,470.51
07/16	07/05/2016	166718	14672	ELECTRICAL WHOLESALE SUP	911390916	1	10-65-250	.00	759.42	759.42
Total 166718:								.00		759.42
07/16	07/05/2016	166719	14726	EXTREME NETWORKS	11177245	1	10-47-310	.00	8,962.50	8,962.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166719	14726	EXTREME NETWORKS	11177250	1	98-40-047	.00	955.20	955.20
07/16	07/05/2016	166719	14726	EXTREME NETWORKS	11177532	1	10-47-310	.00	8,090.00	8,090.00
Total 166719:								.00		18,007.70
07/16	07/05/2016	166720	14939	FABIAN LEE	062716	1	17-34-400	.00	60.00	60.00
Total 166720:								.00		60.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166721	8643	FINAL DETAILS	40083	1	10-55-610	.00	250.00	250.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166721	8643	FINAL DETAILS	40121	1	10-70-610	.00	42.00	42.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166721	8643	FINAL DETAILS	40133	1	10-61-240	.00	115.00	115.00

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
Total 166721:								.00		407.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166722	13904	FIRETRUCKS UNLIMITED	10258	1	10-57-610	.00	1,496.00	1,496.00
Total 166722:								.00		1,496.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004157841	1	10-70-610	.00	90.80	90.80
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004236099	1	10-54-610	.00	41.67	41.67
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004262797	1	10-54-610	.00	115.00	115.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004365216	1	10-54-610	.00	17.77	17.77
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004420861	1	10-70-610	.00	270.00	270.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004495302	1	10-54-610	.00	106.83	106.83
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004629127	1	10-54-610	.00	1,425.00	1,425.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004691765	1	10-54-610	.00	333.29	333.29
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004761419	1	10-54-610	.00	164.02	164.02
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004767110	1	10-54-610	.00	69.71	69.71
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	004870822	1	10-54-610	.00	99.88-	99.88-
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	005253270	1	10-70-610	.00	61.57	61.57
07/16	07/05/2016	166723	2251	GALLS, LLC	005269971	1	10-70-610	.00	61.57	61.57
Total 166723:								.00		2,657.35
07/16	07/05/2016	166724	13648	GLEN ALLEN HORLACHER	062916	1	15-51-500	.00	100.00	100.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166724	13648	GLEN ALLEN HORLACHER	06292016	1	15-51-500	.00	100.00	100.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166724	13648	GLEN ALLEN HORLACHER	6/29/16	1	15-51-500	.00	75.00	75.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166724	13648	GLEN ALLEN HORLACHER	62916	1	15-51-500	.00	75.00	75.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166724	13648	GLEN ALLEN HORLACHER	6292016	1	15-51-500	.00	150.00	150.00
Total 166724:								.00		500.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166725	10783	GOT BUGS?	12164	1	10-63-310	.00	400.00	400.00
Total 166725:								.00		400.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166726	2245	GRAINGER, INC.	9146372066	1	10-63-610	.00	133.74	133.74
Total 166726:								.00		133.74

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166727	9347	HARTWELL FAMILY PRACTICE	052716	1	10-54-320	.00	450.00	450.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166727	9347	HARTWELL FAMILY PRACTICE	060216	1	10-54-320	.00	450.00	450.00
Total 166727:								.00		900.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166728	2427	HELENA CHEMICAL COMPANY	63743313	1	10-76-610	.00	19,104.52	19,104.52
Total 166728:								.00		19,104.52
07/16	07/05/2016	166729	2452	HIGH DESERT SUPPLY	IN00165653	1	10-66-250	.00	215.05	215.05
07/16	07/05/2016	166729	2452	HIGH DESERT SUPPLY	IN00165782	1	10-66-250	.00	138.26	138.26
Total 166729:								.00		353.31
07/16	07/05/2016	166730	14966	HORROCKS ENGINEERS INC	40343	1	45-40-811	.00	10,041.67	10,041.67
Total 166730:								.00		10,041.67
07/16	07/05/2016	166731	2500	HUGHES OIL	13581	1	52-40-250	.00	635.75	635.75
Total 166731:								.00		635.75
07/16	07/05/2016	166732	13262	I WRITE TRANSCRIPTION, INC	6151	1	10-54-310	.00	460.20	460.20
Total 166732:								.00		460.20
07/16	07/05/2016	166733	2657	INTERSTATE BATTERY SO. UT	490077354	1	10-66-250	.00	1,001.40	1,001.40
Total 166733:								.00		1,001.40
07/16	07/05/2016	166734	8009	INTERWEST REBUILDERS, INC.	46204	1	10-66-480	.00	725.00	725.00
Total 166734:								.00		725.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166735	15455	ITALIA SEIALABBA	062016	1	17-80-610	.00	45.00	45.00
Total 166735:								.00		45.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166736	13293	JAMES E. GUESMAN	062816	1	10-51-310	.00	250.00	250.00

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166736	13293	JAMES E. GUESMAN	063016	1	10-51-310	.00	200.00	200.00
Total 166736:								.00		450.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166737	14171	JESSICA BUCKLIN	JUNE 2016	1	17-80-310	.00	1,316.25	1,316.25
Total 166737:								.00		1,316.25
07/16	07/05/2016	166738	13999	JO ANNE F SMITH	JUNE 2016	1	17-80-310	.00	252.00	252.00
Total 166738:								.00		252.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166739	15460	KAERCHER CAMPBELL & ASSO	CITY0-1	1	10-22250	.00	87,795.00	87,795.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166739	15460	KAERCHER CAMPBELL & ASSO	CITY0-1	2	10-14000	.00	122,057.00	122,057.00
Total 166739:								.00		209,852.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166740	14880	KASEY MICHAEL WINTERS	063016	1	17-80-310	.00	1,383.00	1,383.00
Total 166740:								.00		1,383.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166741	14292	KENA TOONE	062316	1	17-80-610	.00	50.00	50.00
Total 166741:								.00		50.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166742	15186	KIDS FOR SPORT FOUNDATIO	062316	1	10-81-480	.00	300.00	300.00
Total 166742:								.00		300.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166743	10984	KOKOPELLI LANDSCAPING	81600	1	10-76-310	.00	1,100.00	1,100.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166743	10984	KOKOPELLI LANDSCAPING	81609	1	10-76-310	.00	1,995.00	1,995.00
Total 166743:								.00		3,095.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166744	3050	L V REVIEW-JOURNAL	I0000816573	1	10-61-220	.00	190.52	190.52
07/16	07/05/2016	166744	3050	L V REVIEW-JOURNAL	I0000819386	1	10-44-220	.00	101.76	101.76
07/16	07/05/2016	166744	3050	L V REVIEW-JOURNAL	I0000821313	1	10-44-220	.00	438.04	438.04

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
Total 166744:								.00		730.32
07/16	07/05/2016	166745	3230	L.N. CURTIS & SONS	280447	1	10-57-250	.00	3,340.00	3,340.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166745	3230	L.N. CURTIS & SONS	282243	1	10-57-250	.00	5,688.00	5,688.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166745	3230	L.N. CURTIS & SONS	INV31656	1	10-57-250	.00	814.67	814.67
Total 166745:								.00		9,842.67
07/16	07/05/2016	166746	9979	LARRY LEMIEUX	070416	1	12-87-310	.00	7,337.49	7,337.49
07/16	07/05/2016	166746	9979	LARRY LEMIEUX	070416	2	12-87-695	.00	409.02-	409.02-
07/16	07/05/2016	166746	9979	LARRY LEMIEUX	070416	3	12-87-610	.00	28.00-	28.00-
07/16	07/05/2016	166746	9979	LARRY LEMIEUX	070416 WC	1	12-87-610	.00	50.92-	50.92-
Total 166746:								.00		6,849.55
07/16	07/05/2016	166747	3000	LAS VEGAS CONVENTION AUT	JUN 16	1	10-23100	.00	3,522.50	3,522.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166747	3000	LAS VEGAS CONVENTION AUT	MAY 16	1	10-23100	.00	78,383.49	78,383.49
Total 166747:								.00		81,905.99
07/16	07/05/2016	166748	10158	LAS VEGAS METRO POLICE DE	90197038	1	10-54-310	.00	202.75	202.75
Total 166748:								.00		202.75
07/16	07/05/2016	166749	3030	LAS VEGAS METRO POLICE DE	063016	1	15-35-400	.00	417.00	417.00
Total 166749:								.00		417.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166750	13374	LHSC, INC	062216	1	10-32-200	.00	75.00	75.00
Total 166750:								.00		75.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166751	747	LINCOLN CO. POWER DISTRIC	139701 MAY	1	10-54-280	.00	23.29	23.29
Total 166751:								.00		23.29
07/16	07/05/2016	166752	9899	MADISON NATIONAL LIFE INS.	1216168	1	10-22510	.00	4,381.11	4,381.11

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
Total 166752:								.00		4,381.11
07/16	07/05/2016	166753	12972	MANDY MUIR	JUNE 16	1	17-80-310	.00	150.00	150.00
Total 166753:								.00		150.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166754	3276	MASTERTECH SECURITY SERV	261662	1	16-71-310	.00	17.31	17.31
Total 166754:								.00		17.31
07/16	07/05/2016	166755	12390	MATCO TOOLS	19157580	1	10-66-610	.00	74.90	74.90
Total 166755:								.00		74.90
07/16	07/05/2016	166756	696	MAXINE SHAW	JUNE 2016	1	17-80-310	.00	364.00	364.00
Total 166756:								.00		364.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166757	11236	MEADOW GOLD DAIRIES	29605282	1	16-71-480	.00	241.34	241.34
07/16	07/05/2016	166757	11236	MEADOW GOLD DAIRIES	59605346	1	16-71-480	.00	229.98	229.98
07/16	07/05/2016	166757	11236	MEADOW GOLD DAIRIES	59605412	1	16-71-480	.00	218.92	218.92
Total 166757:								.00		690.24
07/16	07/05/2016	166758	9980	MEGA-PRO INTERNATIONAL	20555	1	17-80-610	.00	194.00	194.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166758	9980	MEGA-PRO INTERNATIONAL	20773	1	10-81-610	.00	294.00	294.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166758	9980	MEGA-PRO INTERNATIONAL	20912	1	17-80-610	.00	882.50	882.50
Total 166758:								.00		1,370.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166759	10764	MESA VIEW REGIONAL HOSPIT	295-02	1	10-57-320	.00	154.79	154.79
Total 166759:								.00		154.79
07/16	07/05/2016	166760	10387	MESQUITE FIRE FIGHTERS AS	062716	1	10-21705	.00	10.00	10.00
Total 166760:								.00		10.00

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166761	11650	MESQUITE FORD	150683/1	1	10-66-250	.00	611.30	611.30
07/16	07/05/2016	166761	11650	MESQUITE FORD	150925/1	1	10-66-250	.00	147.84	147.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166761	11650	MESQUITE FORD	380328	1	10-66-250	.00	155.38	155.38
07/16	07/05/2016	166761	11650	MESQUITE FORD	380329	1	10-66-250	.00	127.93	127.93
07/16	07/05/2016	166761	11650	MESQUITE FORD	380405	1	10-66-250	.00	434.30	434.30
07/16	07/05/2016	166761	11650	MESQUITE FORD	380469	1	10-66-250	.00	70.49	70.49
07/16	07/05/2016	166761	11650	MESQUITE FORD	380483	1	10-66-250	.00	434.30-	434.30-
Total 166761:								.00		1,112.94
07/16	07/05/2016	166762	14391	MESQUITE REGIONAL BUSINE	2015-85	1	43-40-310	.00	11,666.66	11,666.66
Total 166762:								.00		11,666.66
07/16	07/05/2016	166763	3457	MESQUITE VETERINARY CLINI	128594	1	10-70-610	.00	7.20	7.20
07/16	07/05/2016	166763	3457	MESQUITE VETERINARY CLINI	128599	1	10-70-310	.00	645.63	645.63
Total 166763:								.00		652.83
07/16	07/05/2016	166764	8707	MIKE VAN HOUTEN	063016	1	15-51-500	.00	285.00	285.00
Total 166764:								.00		285.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166765	13651	MIRIAM C FLORES	063016	1	10-51-310	.00	400.00	400.00
Total 166765:								.00		400.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166766	14871	MITSUBISHI ELECTRIC POWER	UPSD-26470	1	10-47-310	.00	7,070.00	7,070.00
Total 166766:								.00		7,070.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166767	14526	MOAPA VALLEY TELEPHONE	JUN 2016	1	10-47-310	.00	199.78	199.78
Total 166767:								.00		199.78
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0012991-IN	1	10-76-610	.00	130.13	130.13
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0013106-IN	1	10-63-610	.00	123.84	123.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0013106-IN	2	10-57-610	.00	40.47	40.47
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0013107-IN	1	10-63-610	.00	58.22	58.22

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0013149-IN	1	10-55-610	.00	318.87	318.87
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0013171-IN	1	10-63-610	.00	35.03	35.03
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0013180-IN	1	10-63-610	.00	203.26	203.26
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0013191-IN	1	10-66-250	.00	47.60	47.60
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0013209-IN	1	10-63-610	.00	90.00	90.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166768	3580	MORCON INDUSTRIAL SPECIA	0013248-IN	1	10-63-610	.00	1,272.12	1,272.12
Total 166768:								.00		2,319.54
07/16	07/05/2016	166769	3653	MOUNT OLYMPUS WATERS, IN	10219318 06	1	10-54-240	.00	49.50	49.50
Total 166769:								.00		49.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166770	14058	MTM CLEANING SERVICE	215	1	10-63-310	.00	1,125.00	1,125.00
Total 166770:								.00		1,125.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166771	13039	MYERS TIRE SUPPLY	63508266	1	10-66-250	.00	148.37	148.37
Total 166771:								.00		148.37
07/16	07/05/2016	166772	5050	NV DEPT OF EMPLOYMENT SE	4363338	1	10-49-130	.00	1.58	1.58
Total 166772:								.00		1.58
07/16	07/05/2016	166773	15454	NV EMERGENCY PREPAREDN	061616	1	10-57-210	.00	100.00	100.00
Total 166773:								.00		100.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166774	3911	NV. PUBLIC AGENCY INS. POO	4552	1	10-49-510	.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
Total 166774:								.00		2,000.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166775	11404	OLIVER PRODUCTS CO.	862620	1	16-71-480	.00	84.00	84.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166775	11404	OLIVER PRODUCTS CO.	862659	1	16-71-480	.00	900.00	900.00
Total 166775:								.00		984.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166776	15441	PACIFIC FITNESS	19084	1	10-57-740	.00	3,635.00	3,635.00

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166776	15441	PACIFIC FITNESS	19085	1	10-57-740	.00	3,250.00	3,250.00
Total 166776:								.00		6,885.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166777	8133	PITNEY BOWES GLOBAL FINAN	3300684909	1	10-49-250	.00	804.45	804.45
Total 166777:								.00		804.45
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	1	10-49-290	.00	114.15	114.15
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	2	10-49-290	.00	128.87	128.87
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	3	10-49-290	.00	30.41	30.41
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	4	10-49-290	.00	31.51	31.51
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	5	10-49-290	.00	998.66	998.66
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	6	10-49-290	.00	150.97	150.97
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	7	10-49-290	.00	927.96	927.96
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	8	10-49-290	.00	1,010.55	1,010.55
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	9	10-47-310	.00	1,337.11	1,337.11
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	10	52-40-290	.00	84.73	84.73
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	11	10-47-310	.00	404.33	404.33
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	12	10-76-610	.00	52.84	52.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	13	10-54-280	.00	52.84	52.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	14	10-81-280	.00	79.57	79.57
07/16	07/05/2016	166778	4500	RELIANCE CONNECTS	JUN 16	15	90-26113	.00	52.84	52.84
Total 166778:								.00		5,457.34
07/16	07/05/2016	166779	14604	RICH GREEN	050516	1	10-41-230	.00	186.84	186.84
Total 166779:								.00		186.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166780	15458	RODERIC CARPENTER	062816	1	10-23200	.00	1,670.00	1,670.00
Total 166780:								.00		1,670.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166781	12215	RYAN TOONE	062716	1	15-51-230	.00	1,041.92	1,041.92
Total 166781:								.00		1,041.92
07/16	07/05/2016	166782	13868	S.E. MECHANICAL, LLC	INV 001622	1	52-40-620	.00	6,250.00	6,250.00

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
Total 166782:								.00		6,250.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166783	13715	SALT LAKE WHOLESALE SPOR	34423	1	10-54-250	.00	136.00	136.00
Total 166783:								.00		136.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166784	14963	SeamlessDocs	1361	1	10-47-310	.00	5,000.00	5,000.00
Total 166784:								.00		5,000.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166785	13011	SILVERSTATE ANALYTICAL LA	61443	1	52-40-310	.00	453.00	453.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166785	13011	SILVERSTATE ANALYTICAL LA	61596	1	52-40-310	.00	453.00	453.00
Total 166785:								.00		906.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166786	10743	SKM, INC.	5996	1	52-40-310	.00	2,679.11	2,679.11
07/16	07/05/2016	166786	10743	SKM, INC.	5997	1	52-40-620	.00	1,614.00	1,614.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166786	10743	SKM, INC.	5998	1	52-40-620	.00	1,183.82	1,183.82
07/16	07/05/2016	166786	10743	SKM, INC.	5999	1	52-40-620	.00	1,474.02	1,474.02
Total 166786:								.00		6,950.95
07/16	07/05/2016	166787	8282	SMITH CUSTOMER CHGS	418771-JUN	1	17-80-610	.00	46.26	46.26
07/16	07/05/2016	166787	8282	SMITH CUSTOMER CHGS	418771-JUN	2	16-71-480	.00	398.60	398.60
07/16	07/05/2016	166787	8282	SMITH CUSTOMER CHGS	421081-JUN	1	10-55-620	.00	341.04	341.04
07/16	07/05/2016	166787	8282	SMITH CUSTOMER CHGS	421081-JUN	2	10-55-610	.00	67.80	67.80
07/16	07/05/2016	166787	8282	SMITH CUSTOMER CHGS	421081-JUN	3	90-26113	.00	517.68	517.68
07/16	07/05/2016	166787	8282	SMITH CUSTOMER CHGS	421084-JUN	1	10-82-610	.00	17.84	17.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166787	8282	SMITH CUSTOMER CHGS	421084-JUN	2	10-54-240	.00	74.70	74.70
Total 166787:								.00		1,463.92
07/16	07/05/2016	166788	11387	SO. NV. HEALTH DISTRICT	0017022	1	10-57-310	.00	137.00	137.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166788	11387	SO. NV. HEALTH DISTRICT	0017198	1	10-57-310	.00	75.00	75.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166788	11387	SO. NV. HEALTH DISTRICT	0017283	1	10-57-310	.00	448.00	448.00
Total 166788:								.00		660.00

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166789	9500	SPILLMAN TECHNOLOGIES, IN	042016	1	10-54-230	.00	1,770.00	1,770.00
Total 166789:								.00		1,770.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166790	10591	SPRINKLER SUPPLY-ST. GEOR	K26208	1	10-76-610	.00	1,467.00	1,467.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166790	10591	SPRINKLER SUPPLY-ST. GEOR	K27451	1	10-76-610	.00	700.87	700.87
07/16	07/05/2016	166790	10591	SPRINKLER SUPPLY-ST. GEOR	K33175	1	10-76-610	.00	861.85	861.85
07/16	07/05/2016	166790	10591	SPRINKLER SUPPLY-ST. GEOR	K33176	1	10-76-610	.00	96.30	96.30
07/16	07/05/2016	166790	10591	SPRINKLER SUPPLY-ST. GEOR	K33177	1	10-76-610	.00	1,461.70	1,461.70
07/16	07/05/2016	166790	10591	SPRINKLER SUPPLY-ST. GEOR	K34399	1	10-76-610	.00	1,772.10	1,772.10
Total 166790:								.00		6,359.82
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3303226360	1	10-48-240	.00	57.31	57.31
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3303226361	1	16-71-240	.00	98.68	98.68
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3304588991	1	16-71-240	.00	79.27	79.27
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3304588992	1	16-71-240	.00	9.72-	9.72-
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3304588993	1	16-71-240	.00	9.72	9.72
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3304588995	1	10-49-240	.00	37.70	37.70
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3304761536	1	10-48-240	.00	15.30	15.30
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3304932626	1	10-61-240	.00	23.82	23.82
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3304932627	1	10-81-240	.00	404.98	404.98
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3304932628	1	10-81-240	.00	557.56	557.56
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3304998103	1	10-57-240	.00	19.98-	19.98-
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3305302114	1	10-57-240	.00	155.41	155.41
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3305302115	1	10-57-240	.00	16.84	16.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3305354709	1	10-63-610	.00	94.84	94.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3305354710	1	52-40-610	.00	46.37	46.37
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3305590023	1	10-76-610	.00	38.50	38.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3305590024	1	10-76-610	.00	15.85	15.85
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3305590025	1	52-40-240	.00	405.72	405.72
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3305663614	1	10-48-240	.00	15.30-	15.30-
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3306091588	1	10-48-240	.00	6.33	6.33
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3306091588	2	10-43-240	.00	43.49	43.49
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3306091589	1	10-54-240	.00	284.10	284.10
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3306587051	1	16-71-240	.00	79.27-	79.27-
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3306587052	1	16-71-240	.00	19.41-	19.41-
07/16	07/05/2016	166791	8989	STAPLES ADVANTAGE	3306703418	1	10-81-240	.00	115.01-	115.01-

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
Total 166791:								.00		2,133.10
07/16	07/05/2016	166792	1800	STATE OF NEVADA	MAY 16	1	10-23120	.00	7,348.45	7,348.45
07/16	07/05/2016	166792	1800	STATE OF NEVADA	MAY 2016	1	10-23145	.00	58,787.62	58,787.62
Total 166792:								.00		66,136.07
07/16	07/05/2016	166793	4000	STATE OF NEVADA	JUN 16	1	15-35-100	.00	973.00	973.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166793	4000	STATE OF NEVADA	JUN 16	1	15-35-100	.00	70.00	70.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166793	4000	STATE OF NEVADA	JUN 16	1	15-35-100	.00	8,664.00	8,664.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166793	4000	STATE OF NEVADA	JUN 16	1	10-23200	.00	50.00	50.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166793	4000	STATE OF NEVADA	JUN 16	1	15-35-100	.00	705.00	705.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166793	4000	STATE OF NEVADA	JUN 16	1	15-35-300	.00	200.00	200.00
Total 166793:								.00		10,662.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166794	10775	STATE OF NEVADA	AA16-326	1	10-48-210	.00	978.75	978.75
Total 166794:								.00		978.75
07/16	07/05/2016	166795	8579	STEPHEN WADE AUTO CENTE	5319650	1	10-66-250	.00	264.28	264.28
07/16	07/05/2016	166795	8579	STEPHEN WADE AUTO CENTE	5319948	1	10-66-480	.00	144.55	144.55
07/16	07/05/2016	166795	8579	STEPHEN WADE AUTO CENTE	5320004	1	10-66-480	.00	52.00	52.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166795	8579	STEPHEN WADE AUTO CENTE	5320117	1	10-66-480	.00	201.16	201.16
07/16	07/05/2016	166795	8579	STEPHEN WADE AUTO CENTE	5320780	1	10-66-250	.00	264.28-	264.28-
Total 166795:								.00		397.71
07/16	07/05/2016	166796	15351	STEVENS ELECTRIC MOTOR S	190	1	10-81-250	.00	520.51	520.51
Total 166796:								.00		520.51
07/16	07/05/2016	166797	1079	SUN BADGE COMPANY	366539	1	10-54-610	.00	198.25	198.25
07/16	07/05/2016	166797	1079	SUN BADGE COMPANY	367257	1	10-54-610	.00	198.25	198.25
Total 166797:								.00		396.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166798	5224	SUNRISE ENVIRONMENTAL	63330	1	10-70-610	.00	944.28	944.28

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
Total 166798:								.00		944.28
07/16	07/05/2016	166799	2680	SUNROC CORPORATION	40442777	1	10-65-480	.00	666.03	666.03
Total 166799:								.00		666.03
07/16	07/05/2016	166800	15461	SUSAN BRINTON	062916	1	10-23200	.00	1,190.00	1,190.00
Total 166800:								.00		1,190.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166801	15170	SYNCB/AMAZON	1210913711	1	10-54-240	.00	22.99	22.99
07/16	07/05/2016	166801	15170	SYNCB/AMAZON	1210913711	2	10-56-610	.00	42.99	42.99
Total 166801:								.00		65.98
07/16	07/05/2016	166802	13211	SYSCO LAS VEGAS, INC	613381399	1	16-71-480	.00	1,435.57	1,435.57
07/16	07/05/2016	166802	13211	SYSCO LAS VEGAS, INC	613471871	1	16-71-480	.00	1,350.59	1,350.59
07/16	07/05/2016	166802	13211	SYSCO LAS VEGAS, INC	613553187	1	16-71-480	.00	1,562.32	1,562.32
Total 166802:								.00		4,348.48
07/16	07/05/2016	166803	15285	TASER INTERNATIONAL	SI1438663	1	10-54-610	.00	579.12	579.12
Total 166803:								.00		579.12
07/16	07/05/2016	166804	9127	Teamster Local 14	AUG 16	1	10-54-130	.00	901.77	901.77
07/16	07/05/2016	166804	9127	Teamster Local 14	AUG 16	1	10-54-130	.00	901.77	901.77
07/16	07/05/2016	166804	9127	Teamster Local 14	AUG 16	1	10-50-130	.00	715.43	715.43
07/16	07/05/2016	166804	9127	Teamster Local 14	AUG 16	1	10-54-130	.00	352.23	352.23
Total 166804:								.00		2,871.20
07/16	07/05/2016	166805	9127	TEAMSTERS LOCAL 14	AUG 2016	1	10-54-130	.00	1,068.00	1,068.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166805	9127	TEAMSTERS LOCAL 14	AUG 2016	1	10-81-130	.00	1,068.00	1,068.00
Total 166805:								.00		2,136.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166806	9127	TEAMSTERS SEC. FUND #14	AUGUST 16	1	10-22500	.00	55,800.00	55,800.00

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166806	9127	TEAMSTERS SEC. FUND #14	AUGUST 16	1	10-22500	.00	74,700.00	74,700.00
Total 166806:								.00		130,500.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166807	14215	TERRIE ELAINE MCARTHUR	JUNE 16	1	17-80-310	.00	476.00	476.00
Total 166807:								.00		476.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166808	15393	TESTNOTICE	0000569	1	15-51-500	.00	35.00	35.00
Total 166808:								.00		35.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166809	5290	THATCHER COMPANY	5018963	1	10-81-610	.00	200.00-	200.00-
07/16	07/05/2016	166809	5290	THATCHER COMPANY	5020918	1	52-40-480	.00	1,833.10	1,833.10
07/16	07/05/2016	166809	5290	THATCHER COMPANY	5020934	1	10-81-610	.00	543.00	543.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166809	5290	THATCHER COMPANY	5021188	1	10-81-610	.00	543.00	543.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166809	5290	THATCHER COMPANY	5021234	1	10-81-610	.00	1,366.60	1,366.60
Total 166809:								.00		4,085.70
07/16	07/05/2016	166810	5301	THE SPECTRUM	0000578631	1	10-54-320	.00	450.00	450.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166810	5301	THE SPECTRUM	0000587275	1	10-54-320	.00	105.08	105.08
07/16	07/05/2016	166810	5301	THE SPECTRUM	041516	1	10-81-490	.00	600.00	600.00
Total 166810:								.00		1,155.08
07/16	07/05/2016	166811	11278	THOMAS PETROLEUM	M235287-IN	1	10-66-255	.00	3,268.65	3,268.65
07/16	07/05/2016	166811	11278	THOMAS PETROLEUM	P235287-IN	1	10-66-255	.00	10,239.14	10,239.14
Total 166811:								.00		13,507.79
07/16	07/05/2016	166812	15287	TINK'S SUPERIOR AUTO PART	143118	1	10-66-250	.00	11.51	11.51
07/16	07/05/2016	166812	15287	TINK'S SUPERIOR AUTO PART	144836	1	10-66-250	.00	39.96	39.96
07/16	07/05/2016	166812	15287	TINK'S SUPERIOR AUTO PART	145617	1	10-66-250	.00	49.39	49.39
07/16	07/05/2016	166812	15287	TINK'S SUPERIOR AUTO PART	147474	1	10-66-250	.00	230.84	230.84
07/16	07/05/2016	166812	15287	TINK'S SUPERIOR AUTO PART	147492	1	10-66-250	.00	51.58	51.58
Total 166812:								.00		383.28

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166813	3499	TRADE WEST CONSTRUCTION	062616	1	10-65-480	.00	48,450.00	48,450.00
Total 166813:								.00		48,450.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166814	14904	TRUCKPRO LLC SIX STATES	65 032065	1	10-66-250	.00	535.46	535.46
Total 166814:								.00		535.46
07/16	07/05/2016	166815	8770	U.S. FOODSERVICE - L.V. DIV.	4716412	1	16-71-480	.00	1,654.64	1,654.64
07/16	07/05/2016	166815	8770	U.S. FOODSERVICE - L.V. DIV.	4816917	1	10-55-620	.00	648.23	648.23
07/16	07/05/2016	166815	8770	U.S. FOODSERVICE - L.V. DIV.	4844911	1	16-71-480	.00	1,515.41	1,515.41
Total 166815:								.00		3,818.28
07/16	07/05/2016	166816	5661	UNIFORM CENTER II	66870-1 CRE	1	10-57-610	.00	10.00-	10.00-
07/16	07/05/2016	166816	5661	UNIFORM CENTER II	67846-1	1	10-57-610	.00	131.94	131.94
07/16	07/05/2016	166816	5661	UNIFORM CENTER II	67952-1	1	10-57-610	.00	180.00	180.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166816	5661	UNIFORM CENTER II	68104-1	1	10-57-610	.00	1.98	1.98
07/16	07/05/2016	166816	5661	UNIFORM CENTER II	68114-1	1	10-54-610	.00	8.00	8.00
Total 166816:								.00		311.92
07/16	07/05/2016	166817	5616	UNITED PARCEL SERVICE	00009E1629	1	10-49-240	.00	25.00	25.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166817	5616	UNITED PARCEL SERVICE	00009E1629	2	10-57-240	.00	55.41	55.41
07/16	07/05/2016	166817	5616	UNITED PARCEL SERVICE	00009E1629	3	16-71-240	.00	33.50-	33.50-
Total 166817:								.00		46.91
07/16	07/05/2016	166818	5643	USA BLUE BOOK	983066	1	52-40-260	.00	544.58	544.58
Total 166818:								.00		544.58
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	1	10-70-290	.00	108.18	108.18
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	2	10-50-290	.00	61.07	61.07
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	3	10-43-290	.00	61.07	61.07
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	4	10-41-290	.00	214.28	214.28
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	5	15-51-310	.00	29.27	29.27
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	6	15-51-500	.00	49.01	49.01
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	7	10-61-290	.00	102.14	102.14

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	8	10-57-290	.00	1,220.01	1,220.01
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	9	10-48-290	.00	51.07	51.07
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	10	10-47-290	.00	223.22	223.22
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	11	10-76-290	.00	322.12	322.12
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	12	10-54-290	.00	1,211.87	1,211.87
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	13	10-54-290	.00	99.99-	99.99-
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	14	10-54-290	.00	58.54	58.54
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	15	10-54-290	.00	117.08	117.08
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	16	10-54-310	.00	965.91	965.91
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	17	52-40-290	.00	80.82	80.82
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	18	10-63-290	.00	112.14	112.14
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	19	10-65-290	.00	102.14	102.14
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	20	10-81-290	.00	102.14	102.14
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143070	21	52-40-290	.00	170.74	170.74
07/16	07/05/2016	166819	9528	VERIZON WIRELESS	9767143593	1	10-57-290	.00	244.90	244.90
Total 166819:								.00		5,507.73
07/16	07/05/2016	166820	14952	VIEVU LLC	18153	1	10-54-625	.00	1,499.99	1,499.99
07/16	07/05/2016	166820	14952	VIEVU LLC	18156	1	10-54-625	.00	7,266.01	7,266.01
Total 166820:								.00		8,766.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166821	5900	VIRGIN VALLEY DISPOSAL	20162806	1	10-73-260	.00	196,103.12	196,103.12
07/16	07/05/2016	166821	5900	VIRGIN VALLEY DISPOSAL	5180055	1	52-40-310	.00	2,891.44	2,891.44
07/16	07/05/2016	166821	5900	VIRGIN VALLEY DISPOSAL	5180056	1	10-73-310	.00	3,325.12	3,325.12
Total 166821:								.00		202,319.68
07/16	07/05/2016	166822	8748	VIRGIN VALLEY VETERINARY H	222598	1	10-70-310	.00	75.19	75.19
07/16	07/05/2016	166822	8748	VIRGIN VALLEY VETERINARY H	222965	1	10-70-310	.00	11.00	11.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166822	8748	VIRGIN VALLEY VETERINARY H	223222	1	10-70-310	.00	11.00	11.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166822	8748	VIRGIN VALLEY VETERINARY H	223227	1	10-70-310	.00	153.75	153.75
07/16	07/05/2016	166822	8748	VIRGIN VALLEY VETERINARY H	223748	1	10-54-610	.00	61.60	61.60
Total 166822:								.00		312.54
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	APRIL 2016	1	52-21400	.00	49,153.62	49,153.62
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	1	10-49-280	.00	1,582.00	1,582.00

GL Period	Check Issue Date	Check Number	Vendor Number	Payee	Invoice Number	Invoice Sequence	Invoice GL Account	Discount Taken	Invoice Amount	Check Amount
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	2	10-55-694	.00	2,195.50	2,195.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	3	10-54-694	.00	302.00	302.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	4	10-57-694	.00	762.00	762.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	5	10-65-694	.00	190.00	190.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	6	10-66-693	.00	209.50	209.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	7	10-76-694	.00	52,907.00	52,907.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	8	10-81-694	.00	3,198.00	3,198.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	9	10-82-694	.00	39.00	39.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	10	12-87-694	.00	330.50	330.50
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	11	16-71-694	.00	273.00	273.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	12	10-65-610	.00	339.17	339.17
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	13	10-38-701	.00	227.00	227.00
07/16	07/05/2016	166823	5901	VIRGIN VALLEY WATER DISTRI	JUN 16	14	52-40-620	.00	750.50	750.50
Total 166823:								.00		112,458.79
07/16	07/06/2016	166824	14706	SOLARWINDS, INC	QN690905	1	10-47-310	.00	5,367.00	5,367.00
Total 166824:								.00		5,367.00
Grand Totals:								.00		1,220,413.4

Dated: _____

Mayor: _____

City Council: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

City Recorder: _____

Report Criteria:
Report type: GL detail

CITY OF MESQUITE

PURCHASE ORDERS REQUIRING COUNCIL APPROVAL

DATE OF COUNCIL MEETING: July 26, 2016

A. P.O's for Not Previously Budget-Approved Items...amounts exceed $5,000

							For Fiscal Year 2016/2017		
								Current	Remaining
				G/L	Account	Po's to be	Original	Budget	Budget
Vendor	Description	Requested By:	Department	Account #	Description	Approved	Budget	Balance	(Over)Under

B. P.O's for Budgeted Items…amounts exceed $25,000

							For Fiscal Year 2015/2016		

CITY OF MESQUITE
NOTIFICATION OF BUDGET TRANSFERS
DATE OF COUNCIL MEETING: July 26, 2016

TRANSFERS FROM:				TRANSFERS TO:			

NRS 354.5980005
any fiscal year and is not in conflict with other statutory provisions:
(a) The person designated to administer the budget for local government may transfer appropriations within any function.
(1) The governing body is advised of the action at the next regular meeting and
(2) The action is recorded in the official minutes of the meeting
(c) Upon recommendation of the person designated to administer the budget, the governing body may authorize the transfer of appropriations between funds or from the contingency account, if:
(1) The governing body announces the transfer of appropriations of a regularly scheduled meeting and sets forth the each amount to be transferred and the accounts, functions, programs and funds affected;
(2) The governing body sets forth its reasons for the transfer; and
(3) The action is recorded in the official minutes of the meeting.

CITY OF MESQUITE
NOTIFICATION OF BUDGET AMENDMENTS AND BUDGET AUGMENTS
DATE OF COUNCIL MEETING: July 26, 2016

BUDGET AMENDMENTS

Revenues Increase <Decrease>			Amended Amounts		Expenditures Increase <Decrease>			Amended Amounts	
Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget	Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget
DESCRIPTION:									
Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget	Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget
DESCRIPTION:									
Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget	Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget
DESCRIPTION:									
Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget	Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget
DESCRIPTION:									
Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget	Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget
DESCRIPTION:									

BUDGET AUGMENTS

Revenues Increase <Decrease>			Amended Amounts		Expenditures Increase <Decrease>			Amended Amounts	
Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget	Fund	Account #	Account Description	Incr.<Decr>	Budget
DESCRIPTION:									
DESCRIPTION:									
DESCRIPTION:									
DESCRIPTION:									
DESCRIPTION:									

July 26, 2016

City Council Regular

Agenda Item 4.

Subject:

Consideration of Approval of Resolution No. 902, adopting Amendment No. 2 to Interlocal Agreement (NM068-15-015) between the City of Mesquite (COM) and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) for the Construction of Exit 118 located on I-15 within the City of Mesquite, Nevada.

- Public Comment
- Discussion and Possible Action

Petitioner:

Bill Tanner, Public Works Director

Staff Recommendation:

Recommend adoption of Resolution No. 902.

Fiscal Impact:

None

Budgeted Item:

Yes

Background:

On March 25, 2015, the City of Mesquite (COM) and The Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) entered into Agreement No. (NM068-15-015), to complete the work to build a new interchange on Interstate 15 (I-15) at Milepost 118, including an approach roadway, interchange ramps, and a bridge over I-15.

On May 19, 2016, the City of Mesquite (COM) and the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) entered into Amendment No. 1 to

Agreement (NM068-15-015) to set forth the department's and the city's cost participation and responsibilities to upgrade and rehabilitate existing drainage culverts crossing I-15 and identify the right-of-way ownership within the control access of the project.

The purpose of this amendment is to set forth NDOT's and the COM's cost participation and responsibilities related to testing. NDOT has directed the COM to perform Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) testing of local materials used on the project. As a result of NDOT's direction to the COM to perform testing, the City's contractor was delayed and has incurred additional costs to complete testing requirements, and NDOT is willing to participate in such contractor costs resulting from the testing.

Attachments:

- Resolution No. 902
- Amendment No. 2 Agreement (NM068-15-015)

Mesquite
Nevada

RESOLUTION NUMBER 902

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MESQUITE ADOPTING AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT (NM068-15-015) BETWEEN THE CITY OF MESQUITE (COM) AND NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (NDOT) FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF EXIT 118 LOCATED ON I-15, WITHIN THE CITY OF MESQUITE, NEVADA.

WHEREAS, Nevada Revised Statues Chapter 277.180 provides that two or more public agencies may enter into an agreement for the performance of any governmental service, activity or undertaking which any of said agencies is authorized by law to perform; and

WHEREAS, Nevada Revised Statues Chapter 277.045(2) requires that interlocal agreements be adopted by formal resolution or ordinance; and

WHEREAS, on March 25, 2015, the Parties entered into Agreement No. NM068-15-015 to complete the work to build a new interchange on Interstate 15 (I-15) at Milepost 118, including an approach roadway (the extension of Lower Flat Top Parkway), interchange ramps, and a bridge over I-15; and

WHEREAS, on May 19, 2016, the Parties entered into Amendment No.1 to Agreement No. NM068-15-015 to set forth the DEPARTMENT's and the CITY's cost participation and responsibilities to upgrade and rehabilitate existing drainage culverts crossing I-15 and identify the right-of-way ownership within the control access of the PROJECT; and

WHEREAS, the DEPARTMENT has directed the CITY to perform Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) testing of local materials used on the PROJECT (hereinafter called the "TESTING"); and

WHEREAS, as a result of the DEPARTMENT's direction to the CITY to perform TESTING, the CITY's Contractor was delayed and has incurred additional costs to compete TESTING requirements, and the DEPARTMENT is willing to participate in such Contractor costs resulting from the TESTING; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this Amendment is to set forth the DEPARTMENT's and the CITY's cost participation and responsibilities related to the TESTING; and

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED, by the Mayor and City Council of the City of Mesquite that Amendment No. 2 to the Interlocal Agreement (NM068-15-015) between the City of Mesquite and Nevada Department of Transportation is adopted.

PASSED, ADOPTED AND APPROVED by the City Council of the City of Mesquite, Nevada on the 26th day of July, 2016.

THE CITY OF MESQUITE, NEVADA:

By: _____
Allan S. Litman, Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

By: _____
Robert Sweetin, City Attorney

ATTEST:

By: _____
Tracy E. Beck, City Clerk

Amendment No. 2 to
INTERLOCAL Agreement No. **NM068-15-015**

This Amendment is made and entered into on , between the State of Nevada, Department of Transportation, (hereinafter referred to as the ("DEPARTMENT"), and The City of Mesquite, Nevada (hereinafter referred to as the "CITY") (collectively referred to as the "Parties").

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, on March 25, 2015, the Parties entered into Agreement No. NM068-15-015 to complete the work to build a new interchange on Interstate 15 (I-15) at Milepost 118, including an approach roadway (the extension of Lower Flat Top Parkway), interchange ramps, and a bridge over I-15 (described in Attachment A) (hereinafter called the "PROJECT") that will be delivered through the Design-Build method; and

WHEREAS, on May 19, 2016, the Parties entered into Amendment No. 1 to Agreement No. NM068-15-015 to set forth the DEPARTMENT's and the CITY's cost participation and responsibilities to upgrade and rehabilitate existing drainage culverts crossing I-15 and identify the right-of-way ownership within the control access of the PROJECT; and

WHEREAS, the DEPARTMENT has directed the CITY to perform Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) testing of local materials used on the PROJECT (hereinafter called the "TESTING"); and

WHEREAS, as a result of the DEPARTMENT's direction to the CITY to perform TESTING, the CITY's Contractor was delayed and has incurred additional costs to complete TESTING requirements, and the DEPARTMENT is willing to participate in such Contractor costs resulting from the TESTING; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this Amendment is to set forth the DEPARTMENT's and the CITY's cost participation and responsibilities related to the TESTING; and

WHEREAS, the CITY and the DEPARTMENT are willing and able to perform the services described herein; and

WHEREAS, the services of the Parties will be of benefit to each other and to the people of the State of Nevada; and

WHEREAS, the PARTIES hereto desire to make certain amendments to Interlocal Highway Agreement No. NM068-15-015.

NOW, THEREFORE, the PARTIES agree as follows:

A. Insert the following paragraph in Article I – CITY AGREES:

"24. To bill the DEPARTMENT for costs incurred by the CITY's Contractor related to the naturally occurring asbestos TESTING not to exceed Sixteen Thousand Three Hundred Ninety-Two and 51/100 Dollars ($16,392.51)."

B. Insert the following paragraph in Article II – DEPARTMENT AGREES:

"18. To pay for the costs resulting from the naturally occurring asbestos TESTING with State funds, estimated to be, and not to exceed, Sixteen Thousand Three Hundred Ninety-Two and 51/100 Dollars ($16,392.51)."

All of the other provisions of Agreement No. NM068-15-015 dated March 25, 2015, and Amendment No.1 NM068-15-015 dated May 19, 2016, shall remain in full force and effect as if set forth herein.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the above named Parties have hereunto set their hands and executed this Amendment on the date first written above.

City of Mesquite

_____

Allan S. Litman, Mayor
Attest:

_____

Tracy E. Beck, City Clerk

Approved as to Form:

_____

Robert Sweetin, City Attorney

STATE OF NEVADA, acting by and through its DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

_____

Director

Approved as to Legality and Form:

_____

Deputy Attorney General

July 26, 2016

City Council Regular
Agenda Item 5.

Subject:

Mayor's Comments

Petitioner:

Andy Barton

Staff Recommendation:

None

Fiscal Impact:

None

Budgeted Item:

No

Background:

None

Attachments:

None

July 26, 2016

City Council Regular

Agenda Item 6.

Subject:

City Council and Staff Reports

Petitioner:

Andy Barton

Staff Recommendation:

None

Fiscal Impact:

None

Budgeted Item:

No

Background:

None

Attachments:

None

July 26, 2016

City Council Regular

Agenda Item 7.

Subject:

Consideration of the introduction of Bill No. 502 (Medical Marijuana Separation Requirements) to amend Mesquite Municipal Code Section 9-15-8 Location Restrictions and Section 9-8-8 Separation Requirements by inserting language to exempt schools, community facilities, and residential zones, from the separation requirements if they knowingly choose to locate closer to existing medical marijuana establishments.

- Possible Action

Petitioner:

Richard Secrist, Development Services Director

Staff Recommendation:

Introduce Bill No. 502 as Ordinance No. 502, and set the public hearing date for August 9, 2016 at 5:00 p.m.

Fiscal Impact:

None

Budgeted Item:

No

Background:

On August 5, 2014 the City Council approved Ordinance No. 484 establishing zoning regulations for Medical Marijuana Facilities. These regulations included location restrictions or separation requirements from

public or private schools, churches, community facilities, and residential zones.

City staff recently met with MLF Receiverships, Inc. regarding the Barcelona Partners properties. They've been tasked by the Courts to market the properties and pay off creditors. As a part of our discussions, they asked what the properties at 195 Willis Carrier Canyon were being used for. Staff explained that that is where Deep Roots Medical LLC operates its medical marijuana establishments. Hearing that, the next question asked was, "are there required distance separations from things like schools, churches, etc.?"

Staff explained the location restrictions, generally, and we discussed the impact these may have on some of the Barcelona Partners parcels nearby. In light of the questions raised about the impact of these requirements on surrounding residential and commercial properties, staff has reviewed again the language of 9-15-8. In hind-sight now, it appears there may be some loop-holes and inconsistent language staff hopes to correct with this amendment.

Attachments:

Staff Memo
Bill 502

Mesquite
Nevada

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council

FROM: Richard Secrist, Development Services Director

DATE: July 8, 2016

SUBJECT: Consideration of the introduction of Bill No. 502 (Medical Marijuana Separation Requirements) to amend Mesquite Municipal Code Section 9-15-8 Location Restrictions and Section 9-8-8 Separation Requirements by inserting language to exempt schools, community facilities, and residential zones, from the separation requirements if they knowingly choose to locate closer to existing medical marijuana establishments.

Recommendation

Introduce Bill No. 502 as Ordinance No. 502, and set the public hearing for August 9, 2016.

Background

On August 5, 2014 the City Council approved Ordinance No. 484 establishing zoning regulations for Medical Marijuana Facilities. These regulations included location restrictions or separation requirements from public or private schools, churches, community facilities, and residential zones.

City staff recently met with MLF Receiverships, Inc. regarding the Barcelona Partners properties. They've been tasked by the Courts to market the properties and pay off creditors. As a part of our discussions, they asked what the properties at 195 Willis Carrier Canyon were being used for. Staff explained that that is where Deep Roots Medical LLC operates its medical marijuana establishments. Hearing that, the next question asked was, "are there required distance separations from things like schools, churches, etc.?"

Staff explained the location restrictions, generally, and we discussed the impact these may have on some of the Barcelona Partners parcels nearby.

Key Facts

A. All medical marijuana establishments must be located a distance of at least 1,000 feet from any of the following land uses:
   1. Public or private schools (grades K-12)
   2. Community Facilities as defined in MMC 9-15-3.
   3. This distance limitation does not apply to a church or synagogue that is located in an industrial zone.

B. All medical marijuana <u>dispensaries</u> must be located a distance of at least 300 feet from a Residential Zone Boundary Line. The foregoing distance requirement may be waived through the conditional use permit only if it can be shown by clear and convincing evidence by the applicant that a waiver of such distance requirements will not

compromise the general intent of this code to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of the city.

COMMUNITY FACILITY: Any of the following: a facility that provides daycare to children, a public park, a playground, a public swimming pool, a center or facility which provides recreational opportunities or services to children or adolescents, a church, synagogue, or other building, structure or place used for religious worship or other religious purposes.

Analysis

The intent of the location requirements for Medical Marijuana establishments is to protect the health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of the city. It is also the intent to not draw attention to such facilities by placing them in less visible areas away from the more heavily trafficked destinations.

The separation from schools, churches, parks etc. is an affirmative requirement on those seeking to locate MMEs in the community. But what about those seeking to locate schools, churches, parks within those separation limits established by code? Do they get denied because of the existence of an MME in close proximity to their proposed location? And what impact would that have on the value of properties seeking to develop around such facilities?

These are the types of questions now being asked by those seeking to market foreclosed properties around the Deep Roots Medical Establishment.

MMC 9-15-8 partially addresses this question in sub-section A.3. where it states, "This distance limitation does not apply to a church or synagogue that is located in an industrial zone." In other words, MMEs are an allowed use in the Light Industrial Zone and if a church locates in this zone, it does so knowing that these types of facilities may exist. And the church's presence should not disqualify someone from applying for permits for a Medical Marijuana establishment.

Similar language exists in MMC 9-8-8-3 Separation of Liquor License Buildings from Public Facilities. The second line under sub-section (A) states, "This liquor license distance limitation does not apply to a church that is located in a commercial or hotel/tourist zone.

In light of the questions raised about the impact of these requirements on surrounding residential and commercial properties, staff has reviewed again the language of 9-15-8. In hind-sight now, it appears there may be some loop-holes and inconsistent language.

<u>Exemption for Churches in IR-1 Zone</u>

Does the exemption from the separation requirement of churches in an industrial zone go far enough? What about those seeking to locate schools, churches, parks, pools, child daycare centers, within those separation limits established by code? Particularly those community facilities not in an Industrial zone, but those wanting to locate in nearby residential and commercial zones? Or what about other community facilities besides churches, wanting to

locate in industrial zones? The fact the distance separations are imposed on MMEs does not mean that such distance separations need be imposed on schools, churches, community facilities wishing to accept closer proximity. But if such facilities are allowed to locate closer to existing MMEs, that also should not mean that the MMEs have to move, or that they are now treated as "non-conforming uses."

Method of Measurement for Distance Separation

Under the existing rule, the measurement is taken from the nearest point on the property lines of the land use parcels in question. This is a different method of measurement than that found in MMC 9-8-8-3 for liquor license establishments. There the measurement is taken from the entry door of the prospective liquor establishment to the entry door of the nearest church, school, or other community facility.

To avoid future confusion, staff believes the method of measurement should be the same for both types of separation requirements. Therefore, staff is suggesting MMC 9-15-8 and MMC 9-8-8-1 be amended.

Previous Council Action

On June 15, 2016 the City Council Approved (4-1 Hafen) Bill No. 500 by amending the business license hours of operation and security video storage requirements for Medical Marijuana Facilities.

On July 14, 2015 the City Council Approved (4-1 Hafen) Bill No. 493 by amending the business license fees for Medical Marijuana Facilities.

On November 25, 2015 the City Council Approved (3-1, Hafen) Conditional Use Permit Nos. 5, 6, & 7 for Deep Roots Medical Cultivation, Production, and Dispensary Facilities.

On August 5, 2014 the City Council Approved (4-1, Hafen) Bill Nos. 484 & 485 adopting Zoning and Business License regulations for Medical Marijuana Facilities.

BILL NO. 502
ORDINANCE NO. 502

INTRODUCTION OF BILL NO. 502 (MEDICAL MARIJUANA SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS) TO AMEND MESQUITE MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 9-15-8 LOCATION RESTRICTIONS AND SECTION 9-8-8 SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS BY INSERTING LANGUAGE TO EXEMPT SCHOOLS, COMMUNITY FACILITIES, AND RESIDENTIAL ZONES, FROM THE SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS IF THEY KNOWINGLY CHOOSE TO LOCATE CLOSER TO EXISTING MEDICAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS.

WHEREAS, it is reasonable and appropriate to amend the Mesquite Municipal Code from time to time; and

WHEREAS, the Nevada Legislature has granted to the governing body (City Council) authority to prepare and adopt business license regulations (NRS 268.095); and

WHEREAS, In November 2000, Nevada voters passed an initiative amending Article 4 of the Nevada Constitution to allow the use of marijuana for medical purposes; and

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 374, now codified in Nevada Revised Statues 453A, which allows for the creation of medical marijuana establishments in Nevada was passed by the State Legislature during the 77th Legislative Session; and

WHEREAS, on August 5, 2014 the City Council adopted Ordinance 485 to provide access to medical marijuana to patients within the City of Mesquite consistent with the provisions of Nevada Revised Statues 453A; and

WHEREAS, regulation and licensing of medical marijuana establishments is necessary to protect the safety and welfare of the patients and citizens of the city of Mesquite; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MESQUITE AS FOLLWS:

SECTION 1: Section 9-15-8 is hereby amended to modify location restrictions:

9-15-8: MEDICAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENT LOCATION RESTRICTIONS:

A. All medical marijuana establishments must be located a distance of at least one thousand feet (1,000') from any of the following existing land uses:

1. Public or private schools (grades K-12).

2. Community facilities as defined in this chapter.

3. This distance limitation does not apply to any school or community facility ~~church or~~

~~synagogue that is located in an industrial zone~~ whose owners / operators sign a disclosure statement acknowledging that they are moving to a location within 1,000 feet of an existing Medical Marijuana Establishment.

B. All medical marijuana dispensaries must be located a distance of at least three hundred feet (300') from the closest residential dwelling ~~a residential zone boundary line~~. The foregoing distance requirement may be waived through the conditional use permit only if it can be shown by clear and convincing evidence by the applicant that a waiver of such distance requirements will not compromise the general intent of this code to protect the public health, safety, and general welfare of the citizens of the city.

C. These separation requirements in subsections A and B of this section shall be measured by a straight line in all directions, without regard to intervening structures or objects, from ~~the nearest point on the property lines of the land use parcels in question~~ the entry door of the prospective medical marijuana establishment to the entry door of the nearest church, school, community facility, and residential dwelling. (Ord. 484, 8-5-2014, eff. 8-26-2014)

SECTION 2: Section 9-8-8 is hereby amended by adding separation requirements for Medical Marijuana Establishments:

9-8-8-1: PURPOSE AND INTENT OF SEPARATION AND DISTANCE REQUIREMENTS:

A. The city council declares that this liquor license and medical marijuana license distance requirements section is an exercise of the regulatory powers delegated to the council by the state of Nevada pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes 268.090, and Nevada Revised Statutes 453A inter alia.

B. The public health, safety, morals and welfare of the inhabitants of the city require the regulation and control of all persons engaged in the businesses of alcoholic liquor and medical marijuana sales. All such persons as defined in Title 2, Chapter 4 and Chapter 14 of this code shall be licensed and controlled so as to protect the public health, safety, morals, good order and general welfare of the inhabitants of the city and to safeguard the public. (Ord. 402, 7-8-2008, eff. 7-31-2008)

9-8-8-2: SEPARATION OF LICENSEES:

A. No tavern or off-sale liquor license shall be issued in the city unless the entry door of the prospective business is located one thousand feet (1,000'), in a direct line, from the entry door of the nearest existing business holding a tavern license or off-sale license. This distance limitation does not apply to a resort hotel as defined in Nevada Revised Statutes 463.01865 or as may be amended or renumbered from time to time, and a commercial business containing thirty thousand (30,000) square feet or more of floor space.

B. No tavern liquor license or medical marijuana dispensary license shall be issued in the city unless the entry door of the prospective business is located one thousand feet (1,000'), in a direct line, from the entry door of the nearest existing business holding a sexually oriented business license. (Ord. 402, 7-8-2008, eff. 7-31-2008)

9-8-8-3: SEPARATION OF LIQUOR LICENSE BUILDINGS FROM PUBLIC FACILITIES:

A. No tavern or off-sale liquor license shall be issued in the city unless the entry door of the prospective liquor license building is located one thousand feet (1,000'), in a direct line, from the entry door of the nearest church or school. This liquor license distance limitation does not apply to a church that is located in a commercial or hotel/tourist zone.

B. A liquor license business shall not be located in any zone classified residential. (Ord. 402, 7-8-2008, eff. 7-31-2008)

9-8-8-4: SEPARATION OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENT LICENSE BUILDINGS FROM PUBLIC FACILITIES:

A. No medical marijuana establishment license shall be issued in the city unless the entry door of the prospective medical marijuana license building is located one thousand feet (1,000'), in a direct line, from the entry door of the nearest church, school, or other community facility. This medical marijuana license distance limitation does not apply to any church, school or community facility whose owners / operators sign a disclosure statement acknowledging that they are moving to a location within 1,000 feet of an existing medical marijuana establishment.

B. All medical marijuana dispensaries must be located at least three hundred (300) feet from the closest residential dwelling.

SECTION 3: If any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this ordinance shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall in no way affect remaining provisions of this ordinance.

SECTION 4: All ordinances, parts of ordinances or chapters, sections or paragraphs contained in the Mesquite Municipal Code in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5: The City Council finds that this ordinance is not likely to impose a direct and significant economic burden upon a business or directly restrict the formation, operation or expansion of a business, or is otherwise exempt from Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 237.

SECTION 6: This ordinance shall become effective twenty (20) days after its publication once by title in a newspaper qualified pursuant to provisions of Chapter 238 of NRS, as amended from time to time.

SECTION 7: The City Clerk shall cause this ordinance to be published once immediately following its adoption, by title, in a newspaper qualified pursuant to provisions of Chapter 238 of NRS, as amended from time to time.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED this 9th day of August, 2016.

By: _____
Allan S. Litman, Mayor

ATTEST:

BY:_____
Tracy Beck, City Clerk

AYE:

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

PUBLICATION DATE:

EFFECTIVE DATE:

Approved as to Form

By:_____
Robert Sweetin, City Attorney

July 26, 2016

City Council Regular

Agenda Item 8.

Subject:

Consideration of the Introduction of Bill 504 (as Ordinance 504) amending Title 1 of the Mesquite Municipal Code "Administration"; amending Chapter 8 "Elections and Districts"; amending Section 19 "Primary and General Elections"; and other matters properly related thereto and to set a date for Public Hearing.

- Discussion and Possible Action

Petitioner:

Robert Sweetin, City Attorney

Staff Recommendation:

Introduce Bill 504 (as Ordinance 504) amending Title 1 of the Mesquite Municipal Cod "Administration", amending Chapter 8 "Elections and Districts", amending Section 19 "Primary and General Elections",and set a date for Public Hearing.

Fiscal Impact:

None

Budgeted Item:

No

Background:

None

Attachments:

Bill 504 as Ordinance 504

BILL NO. 504
ORDINANCE NO. 504

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MESQUITE, NEVADA, AMENDING TITLE 1 OF THE MESQUITE MUNICIPAL CODE "ADMINISTRATION"; AMENDING CHAPTER 8 "ELECTIONS AND DISTRICTS"; AMENDING SECTION 19 "PRIMARY AND GENERAL ELECTIONS"; AND OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Mesquite may set its own standards to carry elections into effect pursuant to NRS 293C.110; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mesquite City Council is charged with declaring the results of an election canvass pursuant to NRS 293C.387; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mesquite desires that the will of the electorate be clear; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mesquite desires that the will of the electorate be followed; and

WHEREAS, the City of Mesquite desires to avoid contested election results;

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Mesquite, Nevada, does ordain:

Section 1: Mesquite Municipal Code Title 1, Chapter 8, Section 19, is hereby amended to read as follows:

A. CITY PRIMARY AND GENERAL ELECTIONS: City Primary or General Elections shall comply with the notice requirements of Nevada Revised Statutes section 293C.175(2), as amended from time to time.

1. City primary elections shall be held on the second Tuesday in June before the general election in each even numbered year pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes section 293.175, as amended from time to time.

2. City general elections shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in each even numbered year pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes section 293.12755, as amended from time to time.

B. PRIMARY ELECTION RESULTS:

1. If, in a primary city election, a candidate receives votes equal to or greater than a majority of the voters participating in the primary election, that candidate shall be declared elected to the office and the candidate's name must not be placed on the ballot for the general city election. This provision shall apply without regard to whether the election is a multi-seat or multi-office, at-large election.

2. Except as otherwise provided in subsection 3, if in a primary city election, a candidate does not receive votes equal to a majority of the voters participating in the primary election, the names of the two candidates receiving the highest number of votes must be placed on the ballot for the general city election.

3. In a multi-seat or multi-office, at-large primary city election, candidates not declared elected to the office shall be placed on the ballot for the general city election in the following manner: two candidates per seat or office that is available after those elected pursuant to subsection 1, if any, are accounted for. The candidates shall be advanced to the general election according to the number of votes received. Candidates receiving the highest number of votes, but not declared elected, shall be advanced to the general election until each available seat or office has two candidates to be placed on the general election ballot.

C. DEFINITIONS: The following definitions shall be applied to this section.

1. Multi-seat or multi-office, at-large election: An election where more than one office or seat is available, and all electors within the City of Mesquite cast votes upon all eligible candidates for those offices, without regard to wards, districts or other election boundaries.

2. Candidate: A candidate for any elected seat or office or position of public trust with the City of Mesquite.

3. Majority of Voters: One-half the total voter turnout number as determined by the Statement of Vote released by Clark County following the election, rounded up, plus one.

4. Office: Each and every seat of responsibility or trust that a person may be elected to.

Section 2: All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Section 3: The City Clerk is instructed and authorized to publish the title to this ordinance as provided by law.

Section 4: This ordinance shall become effective upon passage, approval and publication.

Section 5: The provisions of this ordinance shall be liberally construed to effectively carry out its purpose in the interest of the public health safety, welfare and convenience.

Section 6: If any subsection, phrase, sentence or portion of this ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct and independent provision, and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions.

Section 7: The City Council finds that this ordinance is not likely to impose a direct and significant economic burden upon a business or directly restrict the formation, operation or expansion of a business, and complies with Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 237.

PASSED, ADOPTED, AND APPROVED this ___ day of _____, 2016.

By: _____

Allan S. Litman, Mayor

ATTEST:

By: _____

Tracy E. Beck, City Clerk

AYE:

NAY:

ABSTAIN:

PUBLICATION DATE:

EFFECTIVE DATE:

Approved as to Form

By: _____

Robert D. Sweetin, City Attorney

July 26, 2016

City Council Regular

Agenda Item 9.

Subject:

Public Comment

Petitioner:

Andy Barton

Staff Recommendation:

None

Fiscal Impact:

None

Budgeted Item:

No

Background:

None

Attachments:

None

July 26, 2016

City Council Regular

Agenda Item 10.

Subject:

Adjournment

Petitioner:

Andy Barton, City Manager

Staff Recommendation:

None

Fiscal Impact:

None

Budgeted Item:

No

Background:

None

Attachments:

None