



Mesquite City Council

Regular Meeting

Mesquite City Hall

10 E. Mesquite Blvd.

Tuesday, July 12, 2016 - 5:00 PM

Minutes of a scheduled meeting of the City Council held on Tuesday, July 12, 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; Finance Director David Empey, Development Services Director Richard Secrist, City Attorney Robert Sweetin, City Clerk Tracy Beck, other city staff and approximately 27 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 - Pastor Rick Casebolt - Mesquite United Methodist Church
- 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 opened the meeting to Public Comments.

[5:02 PM] Minutes:

Art Pereida: I am a candidate for Mayor, and I am here representing the Mesquite Veterans Center. I am here promoting the Mesquite Memorial new park that we are going to have here, and if you can see on the flyer, they started construction today laying some water lines, taking out some water lines, and tomorrow according to Mr. Montoya they are going to be putting in the Veterans Memorial Park sign in the morning. If you are not familiar with what this is, we are selling -- the bricks they are passing around, we are selling bricks here where you can honor a veteran or you can promote and sponsor the site. You get three lines, the name of the veteran, their rank, their military, the years they served, or if you want to promote or contribute to building this, this would be great. The bricks are \$50 a piece, and right now we have ordered bricks in lots of 50. We are in the process of ordering another 50, so we are going to have 100 bricks that will be laid and this will be over by the Veterans Memorial Park where the flags are by the cemetery, and this is going to add to the existing area. This up here in the top, those are where the flags are. That's the existing wall. So this 6 foot pillar, I'm 5'10", it's going to be about 6 feet high with a huge American Eagle on the top with a 6-foot wingspan. Here you are going to have some names of the Mesquite Veterans. On the bricks you can have any name you would like. Like my brother of Northern California, I have five high school veterans from Fullerton, California; we are going to put our bricks together. You know, so this gives you an opportunity to honor the veterans, all veterans, the Korean War, the Civil War, whatever, if you had somebody in a conflict or in a war, this is a time to honor them. Tomorrow the sign will be delivered. The press, you are welcome to come, document, takes some pictures. I'm going to be there. Mr. Litman, you are a veteran, anybody who is a veteran; please, you are welcome to come. There's not going to be a band or anything, but hopefully we will have this finished before July of next year, and right now we are looking at for the presentation and the having the honor guard, that we are going to try get a military band to help us bring in everything, so hopefully everything will pull together. Do we have any questions?

Mr. Montoya said it's going to be early in the morning. I'm going to be out there about 7:00, 6:00, because they start work at 6:00/7:00 anyway, so I'm going to be out there. Also, we have now a website. The Mesquite Veterans Center has a website, and it is www.mesquiteveteransmemorial.com. Again, that is www.mesquiteveteransmemorial.com. Come on in. Visit. Take a tour. We have photos; we have links to the Korean War, to the Veterans War, to VFW, the Veterans of Modern Warfare, etc., etc. I thank you very much. I hope to see

many of you tomorrow morning.

[5:08 pm] Minutes:

Teri Nehrenz (and Barbara Ellestad): My name is Jewel. This lovely lady here. She brought us all the way from Mistakey, Alabama, to entertain you all on the 28th. We're going to be over at the Eureka, a.k.a. The International House of Grits over there at the Grand Canyon room. I just got to let this woman know, who did you send here two weeks ago? That woman was stiff as a board up here, and I think she may given you all the wrong impression about what kind of fun we're going to have that night. What was her name?

Barbara Ellestad: Jewel.

Jewel: No, that's my name. The girl you sent two weeks ago.

Barbara Ellestad: Well, we fired her as a reporter so –

Jewel: What was her name?

Barbara Ellestad: Teri.

Jewel: Get rid of her. Don't ever put her in public. She ain't no good.

[5:10 pm] Minutes:

Barbara Ellestad: We found that out. We fired her. We're taking you on as a new reporter. After the performance on July 28th, we are bringing you out of the grits. We're bringing you into the real world.

Jewel: Well, listen here. Before you do that, I got to tell you all Madame Whoopi told me, Madame Whoopi, now she's a palm reader down on Route 14 in Mistakey, Alabama. Madame Whoopi told me that you all need to really support this Mesquite Reads Literacy Program. 'cause here's what's going to happen. One of these days these kids are going to grow up, and they're going to have our power of attorney, and you don't want no shyster lawyers having them sign away a kidney or something on the black market, do you?

Barbara Ellestad: These kids are going to pay your Social Security.

Jewel: That's right. So, here it is. Support Mesquite Reads, 'cause Hooked On Phonics ain't never worked for me. Okay. You all understand now. Tickets are only \$25. It is for a good cause. These youngsters need our help.

Barbara Ellestad: Good reporters are hard to find. We do want to caution everyone that on July 28th, we are going to manage to insult just about everyone. We have the Martian Tabernacle Choir. We are going to insult shyster lawyers,

kind of like the one over here. We are going to insult Indians. We are going to insult transvestites. We are going to insult men, women, and politicians.

Jewel: Sailors, smokers and beer drinkers.

Barbara Ellestad: Yeah, we're going to get them all. It's all in great fun. We at the Mesquite Local News as part of our community involvement are very excited about supporting Mesquite Reads, because in the newspaper business we need people that can read, so this is self-preservation. This is Jewel. She is the star of the performance. We insult trailer parks. We got it all.

Jewel: We'll see you there, 5:00 on the 28th over at the Eureka now. See you all. Have a good day now, folks.

[5:12 pm] Minutes:

Barbara Ellestad: Please join us for a great night of fun and just a great way to support one of the best charities and non-profits in Mesquite through Mesquite Reads and just remember, it's for the kids. Thank you.

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

[5:12 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman read this item by its title and asked for a motion on Items 2 and 3.

Council member Withelder moved to Approve the Consent Agenda Items 2 and 3. 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
 - Public Comment
 - Discussion and Possible Action

THIS ITEM WAS INCLUDED IN THE APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA.

Department Reports

4. Mayor's Comments

[5:13 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman: I do want to make a couple of comments tonight. In lieu of all the activity we have had around the country, which has been very, very negative in the last couple of weeks, so I wrote up just a little something to say. So Mesquite, Nevada is not Mesquite, Texas, but in the minds of a deranged individual or individuals, it could be. We're very fortunate that what has befallen many communities across this country has so far passed us by. St. Joseph, Michigan, St. Louis, Missouri, Mesquite, Texas, and so on have experienced the evil that plagues America. We as a community must not stick our heads in the sand and believe it could not happen here. We're not exempt. We must be more vigilant than ever. We need to be the eyes and the ears of our police and fire departments. Public safety employees are always in harm's way. We have the best police and fire personnel in Nevada, but they can't do it all. Mesquite needs to work together as a community, be aware of our surroundings, know your neighbors as best we can, and above all support those who are sworn to protect us. They go above and beyond, and we must do the same. To think evil cannot come here is foolish thinking. Be thankful we have the very best supporting us. We all need to go about our daily lives, but make sure we don't do it with our blinders on, and always make sure you thank our police officers and our firemen and our first responders for their service. Thank you.

5. City Council and Staff Comments and Reports

[5:14 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman asked City Council if they had any comments.

[5:15 PM] Minutes:

Council member Withelder: I would like to take this time to humbly thank the Pulle family and all the employees at the Eureka for the fabulous job they did on the 4th of July. If you weren't there, you missed something, but it was an absolute fabulous tribute to the United States, and they did a wonderful job promoting Mesquite and especially the Stars and Stripes and everything associated with America. So my hats off to the Pulle Family and all the employees at the Eureka. Thank you.

[5:23 PM] Minutes:

Travis Anderson: (Slide Presentation) Travis Anderson, City Engineer. Tonight, I would like to give you just a quick little briefing of the 118 that has been happening. We've prepared a quick little PowerPoint presentation of what has happened and a little bit of the review. We'll go through just real quickly some of the funding, the important dates, project elements, innovations, overcoming some of the challenges in the partnering that has happened throughout this project.

First of all the funding, the funding was provided by the Southern Nevada Regional Transportation Commission through the Fuel Revenue Indexing Project. The Engineering and Construction costs were approximately \$20 million, and that left the construction bid amount at \$14.7 million. We have had a few change orders on this project, and as of July 1st, they were around \$300,000, which is approximately 2% of the construction bid amount, which is really good. We've been really fortunate with a great contractor. We have had some great partnering on this. It's been a really great project.

Some important dates, as we went through this. Horrocks Engineering, which is our engineering admin consultant, they created the request for proposals. That was approved by Council on October 14, 2014, and then Meadow Valley Contractors was awarded the project on August 11, 2015. We had two notices to proceed, because this was a design/build project, so the design notice was on September 16, 2015, and then actual construction started with the notice to proceed December 9, 2015. The original substantial completion was dated for June 24th. We did have a few little setbacks which pushed that substantial completion to July 8th, which was last Friday, and right now we are in the 30 day punch list period which will end August 8, 2016. Those punch list items do include some painting, but mostly it's smaller striping things.

Project elements went with grading. You can see here also grading of the shoulders, some work being done, and also with storm drain culverts under I 115, concrete work. This is of the arch footing being cast. Then setting the actual arch bridge structure itself, and then with the MSC walls that were placed, and actually the last one is paving. This picture right here is looking from the south towards the north with the on and off ramps and then right across Lower

Flat Top.

We have had a couple of really awesome innovations with this project. The first one was with the arch segment bridge. To my knowledge, this is the only bridge in Nevada which incorporates arch segments for actual travel. There's a couple up at I-80 and also some with the new I-11 which will be wildlife crossings, but this is the first one. When we were looking at this, I always like to think of this as our own little gateway to Mesquite, something innovative and really unique.

The next innovation helped us out tremendously. It was being able to transport the soil under I 15. This happened through enlarging the culvert sizes under I 15. Then with the conveyor belt system, they transported the soil under. This helped the city of Mesquite greatly by keeping truck traffic off of the exit 120 roundabouts. This really made life a lot better, as we didn't have the trucks clogging up that intersection. So this was a very awesome innovation, and we were really happy that worked out.

In this project, though, we did have a few challenges, but with every challenge we were excited on what happened with that, because with our schedule -- this was a really tight schedule. From December to July 1st, this was a 7-month schedule. To do an actual bridge like this unheard of. This was a really tight schedule. The contractor NDOT, City of Mesquite, we all came together, and they made it happen, and it was really, really a great process. Next one, we had a little bit of a challenge with was the concrete MSC panels. They're a precast system, and with those there are form liners that goes on those for aesthetics with the bridge. Well, we had a few of those which actually got precast wrong, and they were at the very first. When we started the backfill, we noticed that. The reason I bring this up is being able to overcome that is the contractor revised their schedule, came up with a recovery schedule, worked overtime, and was able to accelerate their schedule. So again, partnering with the contractor really worked out well. The next thing was the arch footing failure. This one we had, when they started to set the arch segments, they got halfway through the first night and noticed that it started to crack along the joint of the footing. This was really detrimental, because they actually had to take out the segments that they already set up and start over. I bring this up because this really helped it -- well, overcoming the challenge, because the contractor with their designer, Atkins. We also went through NDOT, and we were able to repair this and have the arch segments going back up in 7 days. That's unheard of to get a redesign and approval from NDOT and the contractor getting this back in. They used a high strength early yield concrete which made it so they could set those in. This was really impressive, and I was really happy with the result of what happened here.

Like I said the partnering with all of these groups, Mesquite, Nevada DOT, the RTC, and Horrocks Engineering. Then American Civil Contractors is the parent name for Meadow Valley Contractors, so that's why you are seeing that there,

but along with their subs, GES doing the testing, Slater Hanifan, also doing the construction management with Horrocks Engineering. It was such a great partnering workshop. I don't say this a whole lot. With me, this is one of the best jobs I have ever done. Every contract job you are going to have challenges, but the ability to work with each other. We've all kind of heard horror stories with NDOT or whatever. Not on this job. We've had a great working relationship with NDOT, with the contractor. It all worked out really well. I've been extremely happy with the results of this.

The last thing I want to point is we're going to have a ribbon cutting ceremony on July 21st. Time will be at 9 a.m. out at exit 118. The one element that I haven't been able to show you here is the aesthetics of this bridge. We've had the unique setting with the arch segments of doing quite a picturesque type of situation. On the one side, we are going to have mesas depicted. In the middle will be the river going through, and on the other side we'll have mountains depicted. So it's kind of like you're driving through our community. Now the painting of these won't happen until the 18th. That's one of the items on the punch list. So you're going to actually have to come out to the ribbon cutting to enjoy this aesthetic treatment. It's really going to look awesome, and we're again excited for that. So I want to invite everyone out July 21st, 9 a.m., and come to check it out. And with that I'll field any questions if there are or sit down.

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

[5:24 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Mr. Secrist.

[5:25 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Secrist: Representatives from the Library District and their design team are here tonight. Pugsley Simpson Coulter Architects are the designers, and Sean Coulter here with their design team that's going to walk you through this proposal, and then I'll, of course, be around for questions after.

[5:26 PM] Minutes:

Sean Coulter: Pugsley Simpson Coulter Architects, the architect for the Library District on the project. So I just want to take about 5 minutes to kind of explained

the project so you understand it, and then I'm here to answer any questions that you have. So first what we're looking at is a 16,000 square foot new library building, but we're also looking at taking the existing library and converting that to what we're calling a learning center. And so we see these two buildings, the existing library and the new library as kind of a campus feel to this part of town. So what you're seeing here is we have the existing library located here and then the new library is the gray area that you see here with the site around that. So one of the things that we're looking at is the connection between the existing and the new by creating a kind of a paved or patterned crosswalk across the street there, which is West First North Street. Then it gets into the site, and the site we're looking at creating a public plaza out front, and so that public plaza we see events happening like art fairs, things like that. Something that's very community focused, as we kind of walk our way across the campus here. Then we also have, what we're proposing is on street parking, and we've been working with the redevelopment agency here, talking with them about that, and then of course looking at the existing pathway here and rerouting the pathway just a little bit so we can get parking on the site. And then we could create another crosswalk here to connect to the other side of the street for the trail system there. A couple of things about the site is that we have some onsite parking located to the east here, and with the combination between the onsite parking and the offsite/street parking is more than enough to accommodate the parking for the new library, as well as we have parking for the existing library that we would still have for the library area here.

So a couple of things. The new library like I said is about 16,000 square feet of program space, and we want to architecturally kind of keep that on a very, very kind of low profile streamlined look. I will talk about the elevations here for a second. This is the main entry. As you're walking from West First North Street, looking at the main entry of the elevation, so you can see the library is very low horizontal. We wanted to play off of the geology in the valley. You know, we have the Mesa we wanted to play off of and also we have these substantial overhangs that create shade. Now, we're kind of showing this. This is the north elevation, so in reality you wouldn't see the sun hitting it as hard as you see it here. We just wanted to show you the elevation lit up. We have the main entry located here. We also have a lot of glazing on the north and south side of the building. What we're trying to do is we want this to be a LEED certified building, and one of the requirements for that is natural daylight. So we're trying to open that up on the north and south side of the building. If we go back to the site plan real quick, we are keeping the building kind of long in the east/west orientation to allow the daylight to come into the south and the north and create some nice interior spaces as well. In terms of materials, we're looking at a lot of glazing. We're also looking at potentially some CMU, some small amounts of stone and potentially metal siding, so the kind of reddish-orange that you see there would be the metal siding for the building.

Then just quickly, this is the floor plan. What we are looking at programmatically,

I was mentioning earlier that the existing library will be a learning center, so we see a computer lab in there. We also see a conference room and functions that support those, and then in the new library we see it as kind of the family space, the family living room, in a way. And what's really interesting and what's really innovative with libraries anyway is we're going to have a drive-thru located here on the east side, and that drive-thru is where you can pick your books, drop off your books. There's also a café there that we were looking at, so as you pick up a book, you might pick up a cup of coffee, too. So that's one of the really nice things about the library.

We also have a community room, and this community room is large enough to accommodate about 100 people. So that's this kind of portion of the building here. We see that where you can have community events, things like that. It also opens up to a plaza in the back. One of the thoughts is that the library district wants to have a mobile maker station. So basically kind of a mobile learning lab in a way, and we could pull the truck up to the back here and have that as an extension to the library. Then we also have in the central area, very open, because we have glass along the south here, glass along the north, bringing that daylight in, and this is a primary library functions, and then of course we have the admin functions located on the southwest portion of the building. So I guess with that we're taking up about 1.3 acres of the site, and so what you see here kind of along the southern edge. that's kind of our southern boundary that we are proposing here.

And so with that, I'm here to answer any questions you have or if I didn't explain something very clearly, just let me know. I'd be happy to answer.

[5:33 PM] Minutes:

David Ballweg: I'm a candidate for City Council. I'm also on the Architectural Review Committee where we reviewed this before. One of the questions that I had is it seems like there's been some changes since we reviewed this the last time. Looks like the cover over the drive-thru has been removed, or was that just removing part of the prospective so it's easier to view or see?

[5:34 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Coulter: Right now, the cover is still there.

David Ballweg: And it's still there, because it looked like it was removed in some of the drawings.

Mr. Coulter: The prospective was kind of off.

David Ballweg: Okay, thank you.

[5:35 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: I would like to say that I am very excited about the project. I have some granddaughters that absolutely love the library. I think they would live there if they could. and this is going to be an exciting project for the future of Mesquite. And I would like to make the motion that we approve this Architectural and Site Plan Review.

Council member Delaney moved to approve the Consideration of the 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. Seconded by Council member Withelder.

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

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

[5:35 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman read this by its title and deferred to Richard Secrist.

[5:35 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Secrist: An ALTA survey was recently completed for Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 of the original parcel map for the Church of Jesus Christ and the Latter Day Saints, and these are the parcels that have the existing library and the future library on them. Item 7 and 8 combined are creating two new parcel maps are the original map, and the parcel map for the existing library is subdivided in Parcel 1 and Parcel 2. Parcel 1 is for the existing library in the parking lot. Parcel 2 is for the Library Park. This item Parcel Map 16-004 is for the existing library. So you can see how Parcel 1 is for the building parking lot. This is the second half of this equation, Number 8 Parcel Map 16-005, and it's dividing the existing Parcel 2 into three parcels. Parcel 1 on this map will be where the new library is going, and it's now divided or will be divided so it can be transferred. Parcel 2 is the drainage wash through the site, and then Parcel 3 is the remainder portion of the City's. Basically, these two parcel maps, they take all the information from the ALTA Survey, get all of the easement information, all of the improvements, and prepare these lots for separate ownership. With that, Staff recommends approval of basically Item 7 and Item 8.

[5:38 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: I think we just need to clarify for the public that by dividing these two, if the approval of this library is only going to take Parcel 1, then the City will still own Parcel 2, correct?

[5:38 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Secrist: Two and Three.

[5:30 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: Okay, so the library is only going to be taking the portion that they are going to build the new library on. The City will still own the piece of property that fronts Mesquite Boulevard.

[5:39 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Secrist: That's correct. It's about 1.63 acres where the parcel the Library District is taking; 1.38 acres would remain fronting Mesquite Boulevard that the City will retain.

[5:39 PM] Minutes:

Council member Hafen: First of all, I would just like to thank the Library District for going back, and you know, one of my contingents in the beginning was the City paid way too much in the beginning. We were going to give up all the acreage. So for whatever reason, I guess we don't have as big a facility, but I guess we still have some frontage on Mesquite Boulevard. I do have one other question that I was going to ask before. Is there going to be a lot of anything that needs to be done on the old site for the learning center? Is that pretty well just going to exist as it is?

[5:40 PM] Minutes:

Aaron Baker: That will also be covered in Item 9, but to your point right now; there will be need to be the existing irrigation separated between the two areas. The library district is bearing the cost of that, to bring out the two systems that water the existing park and the existing library.

[5:40 PM] Minutes:

Council member Hafen: So the maintenance of the landscape and all that, it's going to be them?

[5:40 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Baker: Yes, and they are also maintaining the parking lot.

[5:40 PM] Minutes:

Council member Hafen: I know we have agreements like with NDOT to do certain things, I don't know who -- maybe we can get involved in that later. Anyway, appreciate it.

Council member Hafen to Approve the 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. Council member Delaney seconded the motion.

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

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

[5:41 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Richard Secrist.

[5:41 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Secrist: I have covered both. If you have any questions, I'll answer them.

Council member Hafen moved to approve the 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. Council member Delaney seconded the motion.

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

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 Inter local Agreement and other matters properly related thereto.

- Public Comment
- Discussion and Possible Action

[5:41 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Aaron Baker.

[5:42 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Baker: You have before you Resolution 901 that approves an Inter Local Agreement between the City of Mesquite and the Library District. As part of the proposed library project moving forward, there are a number of little housekeeping items. Council member Hafen mentioned some of them earlier, separation of the existing water systems. There's also ingress/egress that we want to make sure are still in place, so we dropped in an Inter Local Agreement with the library district to assure that all those kind of hanging chads are addressed and formalized in an agreement there. So happy to answer any questions you may have about the agreement.

[5:42 PM] Minutes:

Council member Hafen: Just again, once it is built and completed, if the maintenance issues of the landscape, if that's something we can talk to Parks and Rec about.

[5:42 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Baker: Certainly if it's something that works as far as us maintaining that. I know that we do that with, like you said, at NDOT.

Council member Withelder moved to approve the adoption of Resolution Number 901 between the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District and the City of Mesquite adopting an Inter local Agreement and other matters properly related thereto. Council member Delaney seconded the motion.

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

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

- Public Comment
- Discussion and Possible Action

[5:43 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to David Empey.

[5:43 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Empey: Just a brief introduction to this item. Back in September of 2007, a Bond Sale was consummated where \$50,250,000 in City bonds were sold, and at the time in 2007, it was kind of near the top of the bubble, and, you know, several things were going on at that time. These bonds were sold with rather high interest rates that bond holders sought for the risk that they were taking and investing over 30 years. So where we find ourselves today is improving assessed values over there in the Anthem Special Improvement District along with lower interest rates, so things kind of come together where it is a rather ideal time to refinance those bonds, which ultimately will reduce the cost to the property owners which consists of two groups, the developers and also those private parties who have bought property there and are residing in their homes. So this will save a significant amount of costs. I've asked John Peterson of JNA Consulting to come by this evening and give you a little bit of a brief synopsis of what we're about to discuss and hopefully approve to do tonight.

[5:45 PM] Minutes:

John Peterson with JNA Consulting Group: I think Mr. Empey's summary of what we're doing here is very accurate. I would say that the bonds that we originally issued in 2007, I believe were if not the last, one of the very last successful transactions that were done with this structure where basically homeowners are assessed for the cost of various improvements to their homes. They make payments, and those payments are used to repay bonds. As Mr. Empey has pointed out, interest rates have definitely come down since 2007. I think that's just putting it mildly. What's happened in that amount of time, we are seeing very low interest rates, not only here in the U.S., but abroad. There has been some recent activity across the world that have driven rates even lower, so right now we're just looking to really capitalize on those low rates. I would point out that although the bonds would be issued by the City and have the City's name on them, no City funds are at risk when we issue these bonds; they are only paid by the assessments on those property owners. So again no City funds would be at risk. We would structure this so that there would be savings in every year, and again with the idea being that those interest savings, that debt service savings, would accrue to the property owners. I think really it's an opportunity to save some costs for residents of the City, and really I will just pause here and see if there are any specific questions from the Council.

[5:47 PM] Minutes:

Council member Green: What's our time table for the transaction?

[5:47 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Peterson: The contemplated time line would be that this is a first step, and assuming approval by the Council tonight, we would come back likely at the end of summer or early fall for approval of a bond ordinance, and at that point the City would go out and issue bonds. I think in the agenda materials it mentions

Stifel Nicholas as the underwriter. They have some expertise in doing these. They were formally known as Stone and Youngberg, who was the underwriter for the 2007 bond transaction. But that would be the schedule we are looking at this point is hopefully by September, at the very latest October, to try and wrap this up.

[5:48 PM] Minutes:

Council member Green: The sooner the better in respect to the rates.

[5:48 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Peterson: Definitely agree with that.

Council member Rapson moved to approve the refinancing Anthem Special Improvement Bonds Series 2007 to lower interest expense financing costs for property owners...i.e. homeowners and developer. Council member Withelder seconded the motion.

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

11. Consideration of the Introduction to Bill 504 (as Ordinance 504) amending the MMC Election Ordinance and to set a date for Public Hearing.

- Discussion and Possible

[5:49 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman read this item by its title and deferred to Robert Sweetin.

[5:49 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: With Item 11, I am not sure what the issue is. It's only being agendized for discussion. I think it should've been discussion and possible action but since it's agendized only for discussion. You won't be able to make a vote tonight. So what I did is instead of preparing a couple of ordinances that you would be able to vote on or actually take some action on or just skip it and hold it off for a couple of weeks, I've decided to present a couple of options to the City Council. We can have a discussion. I can get some of your ideas, and then I can bring back probably what would in all reality end up being a better ordinance.

So as we went through - and this just by way refresher of the public comes out of the primary elections, we had an ordinance change in 2011. What that ordinance change did was made it so that you look to the number of votes cast, not voters cast, and that created the question of what are you doing in an at large election? Do you divide by the number of seats, or how do you get there?

It mirrored a State statute that is interrupted to not apply to at large elections, and we have at large elections here in Mesquite.

So for Council, here are the five options. I'll present them. Feel free to interrupt and ask questions as you want, and as I go through these and I'll go through them fairly quickly so we can get out of here.

Item 1 is to keep the current language votes cast. So you would still rely on how many votes are cast in the election, but what you'd do is work in specifics as to how those votes break down per seat. So what we'd have to do is figure out a way that if there are three seats up for election you'd divide by three, similar to what was presented at the canvassing meeting last week. What we'd also have to do under that model is define the word "office", because the State under their statute that follows almost the same language, they define office as one office. So let's say all five City Council seats are up, that's one office under the State's interpretation of that rule. Now, State law hasn't defined it. That's just how the regulatory agencies define the word office. To me that doesn't make a lot of sense, but it does make sense when you're looking at it as there's only one seat available, not in at large elections. So we'd have to change office to each seat that's available. So that's option 1 is keeping that current language as relying on the votes cast. There are other issues that would come up there. We can discuss those, too.

The second would be move to State elections that's more specific to our at large elections. So this is just kind of a derivative of the first. What it would do is essentially create a system where no one could every win a primary outright. All it would do is, and there are cities that follow this model, that a primary election, all it is for is to eliminate surplus candidates, so if you have three seats and you have seven people running, six are going to advance. There's someone, just one person is going to get eliminated. That's another option we could go down.

A third option we could go down is go back to the prior language which the City had before, where you look at the number of voters. The two questions that you have to determine here is do you look to total voters in the election or total voters that voted on the question of Council seats. That can all be determined through the ordinance drafting process. The other part of that is that you'd still need to define the word office to avoid conflicts with State law. There's really only one other jurisdiction that uses that method, and that's Boulder City. We used it here in Mesquite for a long time, and it seemed to work for us just fine. So that may be something that Council would want to do.

The other two are novel ideas that we have not done in Mesquite, and I'll talk to both of them. The first one is divide the City Council into wards. That is permissible under 266. We wouldn't need to go through the charter process to do that, but what we would do, and there probably would be some work involved, because we would have to work through the Secretary of State's office and

probably some other regulatory agencies to define what our wards would be so that we'd have, we have five Council members. There would be five wards. They'd have to be wards that are essentially the same population wise, and then your ward would just vote on your ward Council member. So you would have a specific Council member. With the exception of Boulder City, this is how all the other cities in southern Nevada operate. That's how the County Commission operates. Growing cities and cities that get large, that's how they operate, and the reason for that is simple, because when you have let's say 100,000 residents, if all five of you, plus the Mayor -- the Mayor's always going to be responsible anyway for all residents, but if the five of you are, it becomes a lot more difficult to manage that then when you just have 5 or 10,000, like some of these smaller cities that kind of follow our method. Now we are growing. We're in influx, and that's why I'm presenting these ideas. And I think Mesquite is going to continue to grow. We're currently the fastest growing city in Southern Nevada, so that's something that ought to be considered.

The final option would be run each Council seat as an individual seat. You wouldn't need to necessarily break the Council into wards, but what we could do by ordinance is say we just start at one end and have to be an arbitrary decision that's made, but Council member Rapson would hold Seat 1. Council member Hafen would hold Seat 2. Council member Green would hold Seat 3, and so on down to the end, and then you choose which Council seat you want to run for. Policy-wise, I've talked to a lot of folks in Mesquite and a lot of - you know, I kind of have a large interest in policy and why things are done a certain way. I think the reason we've never done that in Mesquite, and the reason that's not done in a lot of cities, is because what it does is right now the way things are set up when you at large is voters are able to pick the best three candidates or the best two candidates in a race. What happens when you get into seat 1, seat 2, seat 3, and we've seen this with, for example, judicial races. As you say, hey, well that's a weak judge, and I'm not a very good judicial candidate, so I'm going to run against that weak judge. You end up getting seven or eight people running for that one judge seat, and maybe only one or two people running for another seat, and all the people running for that bad judge seat are not necessarily good judges or would make good candidates. So I think that's the policy behind that. With that said, it makes it very easy in elections, because you just have one seat. We can stick to the current ordinance as it exists. We literally need to make no change to that at all. The primary would lead to the final two that come out on top. If someone wins the primary, they win the primary with 50% of the votes cast in that race.

So with that long boring presentation on the five potential options, let me know your thoughts, and I'll go back and I'll get working on drafting anything. Are there any questions that you guys have?

[5:56 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: So, you said if we go to wards, how will that affect the primary? That had been discussed in Mesquite a long time ago and people kind of for whatever reason decided it wasn't a good idea.

[5:57 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: It wouldn't affect the primary at all. It would just be another vote in the primary.

[5:57 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: So since we are looking at how the primary is determined, what would separating into wards have to do with that ordinance?

[5:57 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: So what would happen right now, this most recent example, there were seven people running total and there were three seats available. That would be impossible if you ran in wards, because there would only be one seat available for each ward. So that would be the difference. So in a primary, what you would do is you would look to the statute on the primary, which says that if you want a majority of the votes cast, then you would just proceed to the general. We could still make a change to that ordinance if we wanted to. We wouldn't have to, but under current law if you want a majority of the votes cast, then you would move forward. You would just look to how many votes were cast in that ward election, and if you won the majority of the votes cast in that ward election, you'd move on. If you didn't then you'd pick the top two, and they would proceed. That's how wards would be different. You wouldn't have to do that math, that dividing by three that we kind of had to get to otherwise to --

[5:59 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: You know, we've never done that before. That was never something that - and I went back. Actually, it's very interesting. If anybody's interested, go to Clark County Elections, it's clarkcountynv.gov, and you can look at past elections. There's some really interesting information there. I think that 2001 is the first municipal election that shows up for Mesquite there. The only time that we have ever had - David Bennett was the first one that tested the rule of the 50% of the voters plus 1. We had more than enough, and, then of course then Council member Litman also won, and also Mayor Mark Weir won by a huge margin. I think you said it earlier. You know it's the majority of the voters, and I think the voter's term breaks it down, because I'm sure all of us had people coming saying, well, I only voted for one person. I only voted for two people. So if you divided it by three, those people felt like it wasn't fair, because they were voting at large. Now, if they could only vote per ward, to me it's a little odd if you say, okay, seat 5 is up and seat 2 is up. You know, does everybody get to vote on seat 5 and 2, or is it also an at large?

[5:59 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: Yes, they would be at large elections. That is the method by which currently judicial offices are run, so when district court seats or justice court seats are up in Las Vegas or in the County, when those seats are up, you run for that seat. Judges are not selected at large, which means if there are five open judge seats, 20 people and the top five vote getters get to fill those seats. You pick which judge seat you run for, but everybody gets to vote on those judges.

[6:02 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: Well, you know, you said it when you first started out. It worked for us for years. I'm usually of the if it's not broke don't fix it kind of attitude. And you know I have known the four people that were on that Council in 2011 since long before any of us thought about going on Council. I know that they would never have let that part of the ordinance just slide through. Had they been aware of it, the way the introduction was worded, it said nothing about that. It was about moving the election dates, and just because I have been asked all the time since the primaries. Everybody's like what happened, what happened. And I can tell you what happened. We had two newspapers that took it upon themselves to declare an election without any attribution or any siding of any official body and cause a lot of confusion. No election is final until it is canvassed by the Council.

That being said, I think we should go back to the voters plus 1. That is my suggestion. I think Kraig said it at the special meeting. That's the American way to do it. That is a true voice of the people. You know, either way I was going to go on until November. Maybe I should have argued for us to do it the other way. I would have just had one competitor, not five. But let's face it, we have always done it that way, and it worked quite well, and I cannot imagine any one of these gentlemen saying no we're going to screw everybody up. Quite frankly, I think it was one last up yours from a previous administration that that got slipped in there as they were trying to get the dates changed, and you know, unless we're going to move to wards, which I'm not completely unopposed to that, because I think you can represent the people that you live around. You know, I'm not necessarily in favor of it, either. But I think we should stick with the 50% plus 1, and that's what I have to say about that.

[6:03 PM] Minutes:

Council member Rapson: I think the wards are not the right answer for a small town like Mesquite. There's gerrymandering. The growth is going to be on the one side of the freeway right now, because you can't grow south very much, so there's going to be a continual changing of lines to get the population right; that's ripe for corruption and gerrymandering, so to speak. I agree 100% with Mr. Sweetin's analysis of a weak candidate, and you're going to have a whole boatload chasing the weak candidate, and you won't have anybody running

against the strong candidate, and I don't think that serves the City. I think you have the best candidates and all of the citizens can have the input and vote for the best candidates, the best three. Done. So I know I'm out on those two, on the districts or the wards. I do not support those at all, and frankly, I don't care about the voters' votes. It doesn't matter to me.

[6:04 PM] Minutes:

Council member Withelder: Mr. Sweetin, are you going to put this in print, so we have a chance to really study it and read it?

[6:04 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: Yes I can. It's just a very brief piece of paper, but what I can do is do a further analysis and mail it out to Council members, and I'll give a copy to the City Clerk, so it's available to the public and attached to the minutes of tonight's meeting. So I can do that, yeah.

[6:04 PM] Minutes:

Council member Withelder: What are you proposing for the date for the Public Hearing?

[6:04 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: Well, I'm going to go back, and I'm going to draft an ordinance based on your comments. By the next Council meeting, I'll have those on, and certainly we can continue the debate. For example, if we went with Council member Delaney's option, go back to voters. Right now no one has expressed strong dissent against that, so let's just assume we pick that one. There are four or five really serious sub-issues that have to be figured out in order to go that route. I don't think this is the type of issue that's going to be solved it may be. I may be wrong, but I don't think it's the type of issue that's going to be solved in one Tech Review Meeting and one Council meeting. I think there's going to be going back and discussion and debate and talking about. And we have time on it, too. That's the thing. There's not an election for a bit.

[6:05 PM] Minutes:

Council member Green: Just my input, Mr. Sweetin. I don't have any problem with the voters' thing, but I would have problems with the ward or the seat by seat thing, because as I think as Council member Rapson said, we're asking for a weaker Council, and in a ward system we're asking for seat conflict, I believe, so I wouldn't be in favor of either of those.

[6:06 PM] Minutes:

Council member Hafen: Just so the citizens understand why we cannot vote on this tonight, and I've had this conversation with my daughter. I was going to ask the attorney, can't we assume that after possible action, but that there's a saying

about assume, and I'm not going to get into here but if you want to talk to me later I can or have my daughter talk to you about it, because I use it with her all the time. It was posted as discussion and possible, that's why we can't do it, so that's why we can't have any action.

Back to the issue, I think in the early days of Mesquite, I do believe we were within some kind of ward where you could choose the seat you were going to run for. I'd have to go back and check history, but I think that's the way it was. It got changed to at large. A little example, if we would have that third mayoral candidate stay in the race that dropped out, there would have been a primary election. There could have been one of the mayoral candidates, it's hypothetical here, so don't print this in the press and you know run with it until you understand it, we could have a situation had we had three candidates still in the race of mayor this year, where one of those candidates could have got more than the highest vote getter, more than Mr. Rapson, more than and still not been push through because they didn't meet the 50 plus 1 threshold. Same criteria applies, so that's why you have to go with the voters. Because you cannot assume, back to the word assume, that everybody's going to cast three votes, because there's also no place for people that go in and say I'm just going to vote for my one candidate. There's no place for them to cast two other votes for none of the above. It's not on the ballot. So unless you want to keep going through this for years and years and years every time we have an election, we have to go with the number of bodies that walk through the door, absentee ballot and early vote. You take that number, and if there's three seats available, that's how you come to the 50 plus 1 rule. So I mean that's where I'm at. I mean, I really wouldn't have a problem going back to the wards, but I can see a lot of problems that way. This is the simplest, cleanest way. It allows everybody to vote on everybody that sits up here, and you are good to go. I see the press shaking their head, but nobody's come with the good analogy yet to explain the math. When you do the math, 50 plus 1 of the people that cast a ballot is the only fair way to make it work. Thank you.

[6:09 PM] Minutes:

Ms. Beck: For history sake, in 1984, they were in wards and they stayed in wards because they only had three Council members. Once they turned to five Council members, I think the wards faded away at that point in time.

[6:09 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: I have some clarifying questions, Mayor. Okay, so because again as Council member Hafen noted again, this is not noted for action. It would be nice, because then we could take a vote on some of these so I could clarify, but that it's not I guess the way that I'll propose this question, I didn't hear any discussion related to the issue of candidates never being able to win outright in a primary. Am I correct in understanding that I don't think there's anyone on Council that feels that in a primary election you should never be able to win

outright? Does anybody have any objection to that?

[6:09 PM] Minutes:

Council member Hafen: If you get 50 plus 1 of the people to go through –

Mr. Sweetin: No, I know that's review, I'm just asking --

[6:09 PM] Minutes:

Council member Green: If you dominate according to the criteria that Council member Hafen laid out, then you should go.

[6:09 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: It's the majority of the people. That's the democratic way to do it.

[6:10 PM] Minutes:

Council member Rapson: Just for clarification, I think whatever we do, we need to have an example, an absolute example that says if 3,000 voters voted and there's three seats, then if you got 1501 voters to vote for you, you win.

[6:10 PM] Minutes:

Council member Hafen: I don't mean to be disagreeable here, but it has happened. Okay. It happened with Mayor Litman when he ran, because the first time he ran, he was third place, but he ran in two years and he got 50 plus 1. Go do the math. He got 50 plus 1. Mark Weir did the same thing. If some guy gets 50 plus 1 of the people that cast an early vote, absentee ballot, or the day election, I mean back to the example. And this is what I don't get with people, okay. Let's say Mayor Litman, there were three people in, he could have got whatever that number is 26, 25 divided 2, whatever that number is, 1313 I think is what you would have had to have. He could have got 1312. He could have got 50 or 60 more votes than Rapson or Wirston and been one vote short and not been seated. To me, how do you justify when the threshold for Council and the Mayor is the same? They get seated, he doesn't. I need it explained to me.

[6:12 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: So the final point I'd make, and I know this has been brought up in the past and especially through the City Attorney's office, I think Mesquite is getting big enough that I would suggest that Council or policymakers or whomever staff, that we start getting to the point where we look at doing a city charter. Currently, we're the biggest City in the State without a charter. Fernley arguably doesn't have a charter. They're theoretically bigger – they are theoretically bigger than us, because they have an Amazon factory or did at one point. But we're the biggest and fastest growing City without one. The problem with not having a charter is this, is that in 2011 an ordinance was slipped in that

changed the intent of the City Council. What a charter does, there's a lot of horror stories that you got to go to the legislature and they got to approve all your changes. That's not necessarily true. They just have to approve the initial charter, which is more or less a rubber stamp process, but if we had a charter, I mean, we could make all these changes today, and then Council can come in, the new Council can come in next year and say, you know, what I like votes. That's how I like it and we end up with just going to and fro. I would recommend to the Council, and if I can take that assignment on or whoever, to at least start exploring the idea of a City charter. We're a big enough city. It will provide stability into the future, stability for growth and stability for government.

[6:13 PM] Minutes:

Council member Hafen: Start writing it.

[6:13 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: I think it has been discussed before. They said something about is there a rule that says when you hit 25,000, you have to do it? That's what they were saying years ago, Bob. I don't know if that's a fact or not.

[6:13 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: That is not true. Well, I mean, I guess it may be true. I don't know. I know they're cities much smaller than 25,000 that have charters. I know, that's the reverse of the rule that you're talking about.

[6:13 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: No, I'm saying did you have to do it at 25,000?

[6:13 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: I can't think of a city with 25,000 that doesn't have it, but I've never seen that rule. There may be one. I'll look it up.

[6:14 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: And you know the thing about it is, is I agree to some extent on that, because if we make an ordinance, there are many things that we do today that we know that next year there could be a different set of people up here that look at it a different way that might change things. I don't necessarily think that's a bad thing, either. I mean, if we set some – you're saying if we make a rule and we're a charter city, that rule is forever?

[6:14 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: No, it works essentially like a constitution. It's much harder to change. You only put certain issues in there. For example, hot topic right now is dog leash length. That wouldn't go in a charter. That's going to be an

ordinance, because that's something that's going to change as the City grows and develops. Something like how you get elected to office would go into a charter, because that way what can't happen is we say hey we're going to change the dates of the vote and what we're also going to do is change the entire method that people are elected to office and we're going to slide it into that vote and then everyone will just vote on it because they don't realize it's in there. That's impossible with a charter. So those critical key issues go into the charter, and I mean the charter is a long process. It really is, but in my mind, it's worth it. I think it gives legitimacy to the City as far as its governance and long term standing. I think Mesquite's pretty much here to stay. I don't think we have any issues of you know going away anytime soon or disincorporating or going into the County. We've been in existence now 32 years, and I think you know - and it's growing so a charter's going to -- as an incorporated City, 32 years. Sorry I don't know if that's what Council member Hafen is saying.

[6:15 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: Mr. Sweetin, so if we go to a Charter, do we then have to go to the ward or district system?

[6:15 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: No. Nope.

[6:16 PM] Minutes:

Council member Delaney: Okay, interesting. I would say that it is probably a good time, then, to start discussing it. I know you and I have talked about this before in a past administration that we felt were trying to build in some abuses of power maybe with that process.

[6:16 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: I know there was a lot of heartburn in the past with it. I think I've talked to everyone on Council about getting a charter. This has been a big push. I think we're ready for it. I think in the past they went about it the wrong way, and I think with open government and with the Council as currently constituted or as it may be constituted is a good time to do it.

[6:16 PM] Minutes:

Council member Hafen: Why don't you put both things on a Council agenda, and we'll get you an official vote so you can go forward?

[6:16 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: Thank you, Council member, will do.

[6:16 PM] Minutes:

Mayor Litman: Our direction then is to just hold on this until you come back, is that correct, with some paperwork?

[6:16 PM] Minutes:

Mr. Sweetin: Yeah. I'll be back next week for Tech Review with a draft ordinance, and then on the charter stuff, I'll start speaking with you, Mayor, about exploring that.

Mayor Litman: Okay so we do not need a motion on this item?

Mr. Sweetin: We can't.

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.

12. Public Comments

[6:17 PM] Minutes:

Dave West: I'm a candidate for City Council that was affected by the ordinance that was being discussed just a moment ago. I also was a person that sat with Mr. Litman on one of the ballot question committees back when that first started, and one of the major arguments for the change to the even years was participation by voters, and right now after this little mix up where we were not quite sure who won, who moved on and who didn't, I had a lot of people tell me, why is it that way? How can in a primary election where very few people, especially even in a presidential year where we don't even vote for presidents in our primary because of the caucus system, why is a Council seat being decided in a primary? And a lot of people were asking me that and saying especially in an at large election that maybe that is a place that we shouldn't have the 50 plus 1 rule, because there is lower voter turnout, especially in light of that ballot initiative. When that was on a question, a ballot question, and people said they want to be involved in politics, but because of our summer months, because a lot of our residents are gone during the summer, they don't participate in that primary election that's in June. So I'd ask you to consider that when you're giving direction to the City Attorney as you're drafting this language, and possibly leave that 50 plus 1 rule out for at large elections.

Adjournment

13. Adjournment

[6:18 PM] Minutes:
Mayor Litman adjourned the meeting.

Allan S. Litman, Mayor

Tracy E. Beck, City Clerk