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

Day: Tuesday
Date: May 20, 2014
Time: Beginning at 5:30 p.m.
Location: Community Center, Sierra Room
851 East William Street
Carson City, Nevada

Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call

3. Public Comments and Discussion:
The public is invited at this time to comment on and discuss any item not on the agenda that is relevant to, or within the authority of, the Carson City Charter Review Committee. In order for members of the public to participate in the Committee's consideration of an agenda item, the Committee strongly encourages members of the public to comment on an agenda item during the item itself. No action may be taken on a matter raised under public comment unless the item has been specifically included on the agenda as an item upon which action may be taken.

4. For Possible Action: Approval of Minutes - April 23, 2014

5. For Possible Action: Adoption of the Agenda

6. For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a change to the City Charter that allows School Board Trustees to be elected in the same manner as the proposed elections of Board of Supervisors. *(Submitted online by Maurice White)*

Summary: The change would allow for Trustees to be voted on by district in any primary and at large in the general elections. In view of the success this idea has had for Supervisors it is time to give the same consideration the Trustee elections.

7. For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action to recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to the Charter regarding changing the election of Supervisors from At Large to being elected by voters within the ward that they are to represent; the Mayor would continue to be elected At Large. *(Submitted online by John Vettel)*

Summary: Mr. Vettel is proposing that candidates for Supervisor be elected entirely from their residing ward in both the primary and general elections. His proposal does not propose to amend the current

practice of electing the Mayor at-large in both the primary and general elections. The Nevada Legislature passed a bill amending the charters of Carson City and several other Nevada cities in both 2011 and 2013 requiring that these local government supervisors or city council members be elected ward-only in both primary and general elections. Governor Sandoval vetoed each of these measures. Carson City, by action of the Board of Supervisors, has chosen to place a modified version of this proposal before the city's voters in November 2014. This ballot question will ask if the voters approve of ward-only voting for supervisor candidates in the primary election, with an at-large election of city-wide voters for the top two candidates in the general election.

8. For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding when any fax, email or US Postal letter arrives addressed to the Board of Supervisors, or similar type heading, examples: Mayor & Board of Supervisors; City Manager & Board of Supervisors. That all similar types of correspondences will be given to all Board of Supervisors. *(Submitted online by Jim Shirk)*

9. For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding the Mayor of Carson City should be elected every six years and serve only two terms. *(Submitted online by Jim Shirk)*

   Summary: As the Board members in Ward 1 & 3 election or re-election are not in parallel dates with the Mayor as are Ward 2 & 4 which then creates an unfair advantage to Ward 1 & 3.

10. For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding when the Board of Supervisors has an agenda item that requires the Board to vote and approve on two different dates on the same agenda item (example: imposing a new tax), then prior or at the second meeting of the Board - all minutes of the first meeting must be presented to the public and to the Board. *(Submitted online by Jim Shirk)*

11. Public Comment - The public is invited at this time to comment on any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda as an action item. No action may be taken today on a matter raised under this item of the agenda, but may be placed on a future agenda.

12. For Possible Action: To Adjourn

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

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

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

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

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

This notice has been posted at the following locations:
Community Center 851 East William Street
Courthouse 885 East Musser Street
City Hall 201 North Carson Street
Carson City Library 900 North Roop Street
Business Resource & Innovation Center (BRIC) 108 East Proctor Street

Date: May 13, 2014

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Carson City Charter Review Committee
Wednesday, April 23, 2014 ● 3:00 PM
Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Board Members:

Chair – Rob Joiner | **Vice Chair – Bruce Robertson**
Member – Donna DePauw | **Member – Christine Fregulia**
Member – Michael Matuska | **Member – Larry Messina**
Member – Keith Shaffer

Staff:

Marena Works, Interim City Manager
Randall Munn, Chief Deputy District Attorney
Tamar Warren/Deputy Clerk & Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the board's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and available for review during regular business hours.

The televised Carson City Charter Review Committee meetings are available on AccessCarsoncity.org, http://www.breweryarts.org/?page_id=2611.

1. CALL TO ORDER (3:00:18)

2. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM (3:00:31) – Roll was called and a quorum was present.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Rob Joiner	Present	
Bruce Robertson	Present	
Donna DePauw	Present	
Christine Fregulia	Present	
Michael Matuska	Present	
Larry Messina	Present	
Keith Shaffer	Present	

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

(3:01:17) – Carson City Supervisor Jim Shirk suggested reexamining, in a future meeting, a policy regarding letters, faxes, or emails addressed to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) and distributed to them by the City Manager. He expressed concern that a BOS member could instruct the City Manager to withhold his or her mail, according to Charter Section 3.02.0. He also suggested revisiting the reelection policy of the Mayor, relating to supervisors who would not be able to run for that position due to the timing of their expiration terms. Supervisor Shirk also suggested examining the timing of BOS meeting minutes between the first and second reading of ordinances.

(3:05:48) – Chairperson Joiner suggested that Supervisor Shirk "comply with our requirements for application" in writing to the City Manager's Office.

(3:06:32) – Chairperson Joiner invited Member Matuska to introduce himself, since this was the first time the members had met him in person.

4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF MINUTES - FEBRUARY 5, 2014.

(3:07:33) – **MOTION: I move approve the minutes of the last Charter Review Committee meeting.**

RESULT:	**APPROVED (7-0-0)**
MOVER:	Shaffer
SECONDER:	Fregulia
AYES:	Joiner, Robertson, DePauw, Fregulia, Matuska, Messina, Shaffer
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (3:08:52) – There were no modifications to the agenda.

6. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A CHANGE TO THE CITY CHARTER THAT ALLOWS SCHOOL BOARD TRUSTEES TO BE ELECTED IN THE SAME MANNER AS THE PROPOSED ELECTIONS OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

(3:09:15) – Chairperson Joiner read the submission information (incorporated into the record) by Maurice White and invited him to elaborate.

(3:09:52) – Mr. White cited Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) 386.200, noting the two ways that his proposal could be achieved. He added that the Committee should communicate to the BOS, directing Staff to set a process.

(3:12:18) – Member Shaffer received clarification that Mr. White's request was to model the election of the School Board of Trustees after the proposed changes in the election of the BOS.

(3:15:50) – Discussion ensued whether School Board elections would fall under this Committee's or the BOS' charters.

(3:20:32) – Mr. Munn noted that a better understanding of the School District Structure was required in order to read the statutes.

(3:20:42) – Chairperson Joiner suggested postponing the item to allow time for additional research.

(3:20:27) – **MOTION: It was moved to postpone this agenda item to gather further information.**

(3:21:20) – Mr. Munn was given direction to review whether other districts in the State were involved in school board elections.

RESULT:	**APPROVED (7-0-0)**
MOVER:	Messina
SECONDER:	DePauw
AYES:	Joiner, Robertson, DePauw, Fregulia, Matuska, Messina, Shaffer
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

7. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AN AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER REGARDING CHANGING THE ELECTION OF SUPERVISORS FROM AT LARGE TO BEING ELECTED BY VOTERS WITHIN THE WARD THAT THEY ARE TO REPRESENT; THE MAYOR WOULD CONTINUE TO BE ELECTED AT LARGE.

(3:23:44) – Chairperson Joiner read a request by John Vettel, incorporated into the record, and invited him to elaborate on his proposal.

(3:26:10) – Mr. Vettel noted that this request would reduce the campaign expenditures to 25 percent of their current cost.

(3:27:30) – Chairperson Joiner clarified that this proposal had been presented to this Committee earlier, and noted that similar legislation had been vetoed by the Governor.

(3:28:50) – Member Messina noted that BOS members represented the interest of the entire City and not one ward, therefore he would vote against it.

(3:29:33) – Member DePauw expressed her support of the item, noting that she had observed the popularity of the issue when it was voted on by the legislature and vetoed by the Governor.

(3:31:38) – There were no public comments.

(3:31:554) – Vice Chairperson Robertson agreed with Member Messina that the BOS members vote on issues that concern the entire city and not a specific ward. This sentiment was echoed by Member Fregulia, who added that the primary elections could be ward-specific; however, the general elections should not. Discussion ensued and Member Matuska clarified that the agenda item was about amending the City's charter.

(3:43:03) – Mr. Munn stated that should this Committee vote for this agenda item, it would be addressed by the BOS. If the BOS disagreed with the Committee's decision, the members could appoint a representative to work with the legislature to introduce legislation. Discussion ensued regarding postponing the issue.

(3:48:54) – **MOTION: "I move that we continue the item for another meeting."**

RESULT:	**APPROVED (7-0-0)**
MOVER:	Messina
SECONDER:	DePauw
AYES:	Joiner, Robertson, DePauw, Fregulia, Matuska, Messina, Shaffer
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE CHAIRPERSON OR THEIR CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE (CRC) MEMBER APPOINTEE WILL ATTEND THE LEGISLATURE, WHEN A CHARTER CHANGE IS MADE TO REPRESENT THE ENTIRE COMMITTEE, AND ANSWER ANY OR ALL LEGISLATIVE REQUESTS ABOUT CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE AGENDA ITEMS.

(3:49:44) – Member DePauw presented the agenda materials submitted by her. She also noted that this item would represent a change to the current charter. Chairperson Joiner stressed the importance of being notified when items of interest are agendized for discussion during the legislative session.

(3:56:56) – Member DePauw clarified that changing the bylaws would not be as effective as a legislative change.

(3:58:40) – Mr. Munn read into the record the BOS Policies and Procedures for all City's Boards, Committees and Commissions regarding lobbying as an appointee. Chairperson Joiner noted that the policy was "negative".

(3:44:50) – There were no public comments.

(4:02:32) – Chairperson Joyner clarified that if the BOS rejects a proposal, the Charter Review Committee can take the item to the legislature.

(4:08:32) – Mr. Munn cautioned against having a quorum at the legislative session.

(4:09:30) – Vice Chairperson Robertson expressed concern that this Committee was appointed, and was unsure of representing the public with an opposing view to the BOS decision.

(4:13:08) – Member DePauw wished to have this Committee's chairperson or an appointee attend the legislative session.

(4:13:55) – **MOTION: "I move to change the charter to allow the chairperson or their member appointee to be able to attend the legislature as a representative of the Charter Committee on any change recommended and approved by the Board of Supervisors to go for a bill in request to change the charter."**

RESULT:	**Died for lack of a second**
MOVER:	DePauw
SECONDER:	None
AYES:	None
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

9. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ALL THE CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE (CRC) MEMBERS WILL RECEIVE FROM CARSON CITY EXECUTIVE OFFICE ADVANCE NOTICE WHEN CRC AGENDA ITEMS ARE TO BE PRESENTED OR DISCUSSED AT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MEETINGS, DURING UNSCHEDULED AND SCHEDULED CRC MEETING DATES.

(4:16:13) – Member DePauw presented the agenda materials incorporated into the record, and called it another enhancement to the charter.

(4:20:12) – Vice Chairperson Robertson stated that receiving email notifications of BOS meetings and agenda would be sufficient, and that a change of the charter was not necessary.

(4:29:20) – Member Matuska suggested a recommendation from Staff.

(4:22:09) – Mr. Munn noted that Staff was responsible for all Committees and Boards and suggested not to make special requests that would add complexity to the notification process.

(4:23:40) – Ms. Works stated that should a request be made to Staff regarding hard copies of BOS agendas, they will be mailed to the requesters.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

(4:28:09) – Mr. White stated that the issue dealt with an adversarial relationship created by Staff in the past. He suggested a mechanism for Staff to communicate better with this Committee.

(4:29:30) – Member DePauw suggested postponing the discussion of this agenda item and item 10 to a future date. Ms. Works reminded everyone to give their mailing addresses to her to ensure receipt of BOS meeting agendas.

10. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING ALL CHARTER CHANGES BEFORE RECOMMENDED BY STAFF TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR CHARTER CHANGES AND BEFORE GOING FORWARD FOR APPROVAL BY THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE WILL BE REVIEWED IN ADVANCE BY THE CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR THEIR RECOMMENDATION. (Postponed).

11. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO CANCEL THE MAY 7, 2014 CHARTER REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING.

(4:31:00) – Chairperson Joiner noted that the next CRC meeting will take place on Tuesday, May 20, 2014 at 5:30 p.m.

12. PUBLIC COMMENT (4:32:00) – There were no public comments.

13. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO ADJOURN (4:32:07) – **Member Shaffer moved to adjourn.** The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

The Minutes of the April 23, 2014 Carson City Charter Review Committee meeting are so approved this 20th day of May, 2014.

_____

ROB JOINER, Chair

Carson City
Agenda Report

Date Submitted: April 15, 2014 **Agenda Date Requested:** May 20, 2014

To: Charter Review Committee

Submitted Online By: Maurice White

Subject Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding a change to the City Charter that allows School Board Trustees to be elected in the same manner as the proposed elections of Board of Supervisors.

Summary: The change would allow for Trustees to be voted on by district in any primary and at large in the general elections. In view of the success this idea has had for Supervisors it is time to give the same consideration the Trustee elections.

Type of Action Requested: (check one)
(_X_) Formal Action/Motion (____) Other (Specify)

Supporting Materials: Online submission form and NRS 386.

Reviewed By: Date: 4/16/2014
(Chairman, Charter Review Committee)

Committee Action Taken:

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

_____
(Vote Recorded By)

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

vision Internet

Administration | Workspace | Core Components | Advanced Components | Utilities | Log Out | Help

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	280
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	68.190.189.155
Submission recorded on :	3/12/2014 10:34:22 AM
Time to take the survey :	10 minutes, 7 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:
T :
Maurice White

E-mail:
T :
fishingrampa@gmail.com

Suggestion:
T :
Rob, Please consider a change to the City Charter that allows School Board Trustees to be elected in the same manner as the proposed elections of Board of Supervisors. The change would allow for Trustees to be voted on by district in any primary and at large in the general elections. In view of the success this idea has had for Supervisors it is time to give the same consideration the Trustee elections. Thank you for your time regarding this matter. Maurice White 775-297-6484 fishingrampa@gmail.com

---

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

NRS 386.010 Creation; power to sue.

1. County school districts, the boundaries of which are conterminous with the boundaries of the counties of the State, are hereby created. The Carson City School District shall be considered as a county school district.

2. Each county school district created by this chapter is hereby declared to be a political subdivision of the State of Nevada whose purpose is to administer the state system of public education.

3. Each school district shall have the power to sue and may be sued.

[47:32:1956]—(NRS A 1967, 37; 1969, 336; 1971, 517)

NRS 386.030 Name. Every county school district shall be designated by the name and style of "..... School District" (using the name of the county or city the boundaries of which are conterminous with the boundaries of the county school district).

[49:32:1956]—(NRS A 1969, 336; 1971, 517)

BOARDS OF TRUSTEES

NRS 386.110 Body corporate; name.

1. The trustees of a school district shall constitute a board, which is hereby created a body corporate.

2. The board of trustees of a county school district shall be designated by the name and style of "The Board of Trustees of the ..... School District" (using the name of the county or city the boundaries of which are conterminous with the boundaries of the county school district).

[57:32:1956]—(NRS A 1969, 336; 1971, 518)

NRS 386.120 County school district: Number of trustees.

1. The board of trustees of a county school district consists of five or seven members as follows:

(a) If 1,000 or more pupils were enrolled during the school year next preceding any general election, the board of trustees consists of seven members. Except in school districts in which more than 25,000 pupils are enrolled, the members of the board must be elected at large until such time as an alternate manner of election is adopted pursuant to NRS 386.200 or NRS 386.205, 386.215 and 386.225.

(b) If fewer than 1,000 pupils were enrolled during the school year next preceding any general election, the board of trustees consists of five members. The members of the board must be elected as provided in NRS 386.160 until such time as an alternate manner of election is adopted pursuant to NRS 386.200 or NRS 386.205, 386.215 and 386.225.

(c) If 1,000 or more, but fewer than 1,500 pupils were enrolled during the school year next preceding any general election, the board of trustees consists of seven members unless the board, on or before December 1 in any year before a general election will be held, adopts a resolution specifying that the board will consist of five members. If the board consists of seven members, the election of members is governed by paragraph (a). If the board consists of five members, the election of members is governed by paragraph (b).

2. Before the adoption of a resolution pursuant to paragraph (c) of subsection 1, the board of trustees shall post conspicuously, in three different places in the school district, a notice containing in full the text of the resolution with the date upon which the board of trustees of the school district is to meet to act upon the resolution. Posting of the notice must be made not less than 10 days before the date fixed in the resolution for action thereon.

3. If a board of trustees adopts a resolution pursuant to paragraph (c) of subsection 1, it must transmit a copy of the resolution to the Superintendent of Public Instruction on or before December 15 of the year before the general election will be held.

[58:32:1956]—(NRS A 1971, 1534; 1979, 1574; 1981, 723; 1987, 181; 1995, 4)

NRS 386.150 Superintendent of Public Instruction to file certificates with county clerks.

1. On or before June 1 in any year in which a general election is held, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall file with each clerk of a county whose boundaries are conterminous with a county school district a certificate stating the total number of pupils enrolled during that school year in the county school district.

2. On or before January 1 in any year in which a general election is held, the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall file with each clerk of a county whose boundaries are conterminous with a county school district a certificate stating the number and offices of trustees of the county school district to be filled at the next general election.

[61:32:1956]—(NRS A 1971, 518; 1993, 2207)

NRS 386.160 Election of trustees in county school district whose enrollment of pupils is less than 1,000; terms.

1. At the general election in 1980 and every 4 years thereafter, in a county school district where fewer than 1,000 pupils were enrolled during the preceding school year, three trustees shall be elected at large within the district, as follows:

(a) One person who resides at the county seat; but if less than 40 percent of the residents of the county reside at the county seat then such person need not reside at the county seat.

(b) One person who resides in the county but not at the county seat.

(c) One person who resides in the county but not at the county seat; but if 80 percent or more of the residents of the county reside at the county seat then a person who resides at the county seat may be elected to the office.

2. At the general election in 1982 and every 4 years thereafter, in a county school district where fewer than 1,000 pupils were enrolled during the preceding school year, two trustees shall be elected at large within the district, as follows:

(a) One person who resides at the county seat; but if less than 20 percent of the residents of the county reside at the county seat then such person need not reside at the county seat.

(b) One person who resides in the county but who resides neither at the county seat nor in any incorporated city within the county.

3. The term of each person elected to the office of school trustee is 4 years.

[62:32:1956]—(NRS A 1979, 1574)

NRS 386.165 Election of trustees in county school district whose enrollment of pupils is over 25,000; terms.

1. In each county school district in which more than 75,000 pupils are enrolled, the board of trustees shall establish seven election districts for school trustees. The districts must be:

(a) As nearly equal in population as practicable; and

(b) Composed of contiguous territory.

2. In each county school district in which more than 25,000 pupils but not more than 75,000 pupils are enrolled, the board of trustees shall establish seven election districts for school trustees, as follows:

(a) Five districts which are as nearly equal in population as practicable, each of which includes approximately one-fifth of the population of the county; and

(b) Two districts which are as nearly equal in population as practicable, each of which includes approximately one-half of the population of the county.

➥ The districts must be composed of contiguous territory.

3. Each trustee of a school district to which this section applies must reside in the election district which the trustee represents and be elected by the voters of that election district.

4. In each school district in which more than 25,000 pupils are enrolled, the term of a school trustee is 4 years. Three trustees must be elected at the general election of 1982 and four trustees must be elected at the general election of 1984.

(Added to NRS by 1981, 722)

NRS 386.180 Election of trustees in county school district other than Clark or Washoe whose enrollment of pupils drops below 1,000 or in which resolution is adopted pursuant to NRS 386.120.

1. If the certificate of the Superintendent of Public Instruction filed with the county clerk states that the pupil enrollment during the preceding school year in a county school district other than Clark or Washoe was less than 1,000, or was 1,000 or more but less than 1,500 in a district in which the board of trustees has adopted a resolution in accordance with NRS 386.120 specifying that the board will consist of five members, and the board of trustees of the district is composed of seven members elected at large based upon a previous pupil enrollment of 1,000 or more, then two of the offices of trustee may not be filled at the next succeeding general election.

2. Thereafter, while continued pupil enrollment in the county school district is less than 1,000, or is 1,000 or more but less than 1,500 in a district in which the board of trustees has adopted a resolution in accordance with NRS 386.120 specifying that the board will consist of five members, the offices of school trustees must be filled as provided by law for school districts having pupil enrollments of less than 1,000.

[64:32:1956]—(NRS A 1971, 1536; 1979, 1576; 1995, 4)

NRS 386.190 Election of two additional trustees in county school district whose enrollment of pupils increases to 1,000 or more after general election; exception.

1. If the certificate of the Superintendent of Public Instruction filed with the county clerk states that the pupil enrollment during the preceding school year in a county school district was 1,000 or more, and the board of trustees of the district is composed of five members elected as provided in NRS 386.160, then at the next succeeding general election one additional trustee who resides at the county seat must be elected for a term of 4 years, and one additional trustee who resides in the county but not at the county seat must be elected for a term of 2 years.

2. Thereafter, while continued pupil enrollment in the county school district is 1,000 or more, the offices of school trustees must be filled as provided by law for school districts having pupil enrollments of that size.

3. The provisions of subsections 1 and 2 do not apply in a school district in which the pupil enrollment during the preceding school year was 1,000 or more but less than 1,500, and in which the board of trustees of the school district has adopted a resolution specifying that the board will consist of five members.

[65:32:1956]—(NRS A 1973, 27; 1979, 1576; 1995, 5)

NRS 386.200 Alternate manner of creating areas for election of trustees within county school district whose enrollment of pupils is 25,000 or less: Procedure; election of trustees; terms; change of boundaries of areas.

1. In addition to the manner of election provided in NRS 386.205, 386.215 and 386.225, the trustees of a county school district may be elected from school trustee election areas in the alternate manner provided in this section.

2. Within 30 days before May 1 of any year in which a general election is to be held in the State, 10 percent or more of the registered voters of a county school district in which 25,000 or fewer pupils are

enrolled may file a written petition with the board of county commissioners of the county praying for the creation of school trustee election areas within the county school district in the manner provided in this section. The petition must specify with particularity the school trustee election areas proposed to be created, the number of trustees to be elected from each area, and the manner of their nomination and election. The number of school trustee election areas proposed must not exceed the number of trustees authorized by law for the particular county school district. The description of the proposed school trustee election areas need not be given by metes and bounds or by legal subdivisions, but must be sufficient to enable a person to ascertain what territory is proposed to be included within a particular school trustee election area. The signatures to the petition need not all be appended to one paper, but each signer must add to his or her name his or her place of residence, giving the street and number whenever practicable. One of the signers of each paper shall swear or affirm, before a person competent to administer oaths, that each signature to the paper appended is the genuine signature of the person whose name it purports to be.

3. Immediately after the receipt of the petition, the board of county commissioners shall fix a date for a public hearing to be held during the month of May, and shall give notice thereof by publication at least once in a newspaper published in the county, or if no such newspaper is published therein then in a newspaper published in the State of Nevada and having a general circulation in the county. The costs of publication of the notice is a proper charge against the county school district fund.

4. If, as a result of the public hearing, the board of county commissioners finds that the creation of school trustee election areas within the county school district is desirable, the board of county commissioners shall, by resolution regularly adopted before June 1, divide the county school district into the number of school trustee election areas specified in the petition, designate them by number and define their boundaries. The territory comprising each school trustee election area must be contiguous. The resolution must further set forth the number of trustees to be elected from each school trustee election area and the manner of their nomination and election.

5. Before June 1 and immediately following the adoption of the resolution creating school trustee election areas within a county school district, the clerk of the board of county commissioners shall transmit a certified copy of the resolution to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

6. Upon the creation of school trustee election areas within a county school district the terms of office of all trustees then in office expire on the 1st Monday of January thereafter next following a general election. At the general election held following the creation of school trustee election areas within a county school district, school trustees to represent the odd-numbered school trustee election areas must be elected for terms of 4 years and school trustees to represent the even-numbered school trustee election areas must be elected for terms of 2 years. Thereafter, at each general election, the offices of school trustees must be filled for terms of 4 years in the order in which the terms of office expire.

7. A candidate for the office of trustee of a county school district in which school trustee election areas have been created must be a qualified elector and a resident of the school trustee election area which he or she seeks to represent.

8. The board of county commissioners may by resolution change the boundaries of school trustee election areas or the manner of nomination or election of school trustees after:

(a) Holding a public hearing of which notice must be given as provided in subsection 3; and

(b) Receiving, at the hearing or by resolution, the consent of the board of trustees of the school district.

9. If the Superintendent of Public Instruction certifies to the county clerk that the enrollment of pupils during the preceding school year in a county school district was less than 1,000, or was 1,000 or more but less than 1,500 in a district in which the board of trustees has adopted a resolution in accordance with NRS 386.120 specifying that the board will consist of five members, and the board of

trustees of the county school district is composed of seven elected members based upon a previous enrollment of 1,000 or more, the board of county commissioners shall alter the school trustee election areas or change the number of trustees to be elected from the areas, or the manner of their nomination and election, as may be necessary to provide for reduction of the membership of the board of trustees of the county school board from seven to five members, and only five school trustees may thereafter be nominated and elected at the forthcoming elections.

10. If the Superintendent of Public Instruction certifies to the county clerk that the enrollment of pupils during the preceding school year in a county school district was 1,000 or more, and the board of trustees of the county school district is composed of five elected members, the board of county commissioners shall alter the school trustee election areas or change the number of trustees to be elected from the areas, or the manner of their nomination and election, as may be necessary to provide for increasing the membership of the board of trustees of the county school district from five to seven members, and two additional school trustees must thereafter be nominated and elected at the forthcoming elections.

11. The provisions of subsection 10 do not apply in a school district in which the pupil enrollment during the preceding school year was 1,000 or more but less than 1,500, and in which the board of trustees of the school district has adopted a resolution specifying that the board will consist of five members.

[65.1:32:1956]—(NRS A 1967, 933; 1979, 1577; 1981, 723; 1987, 181; 1995, 5)

NRS 386.205 Optional districts for election of trustees within county school district whose enrollment of pupils is not more than 25,000: Creation; continuity in number and terms of members of board of trustees.

1. In any county school district in which not more than 25,000 pupils are enrolled, the board of trustees may adopt a resolution dividing the geographical area of the school district into a number of election districts identical to the number of trustees.

2. The election districts must:

(a) Be single-member districts.

(b) Be formed with reference to assembly districts as far as is practicable.

(c) Have nearly equal populations as far as is practicable.

3. This section does not authorize any change in the number of members of the board of trustees.

4. If a board of trustees adopts a resolution pursuant to this section, the members of the board continue to hold office until the next following general election.

5. As used in this section, unless the context otherwise requires, "assembly district" means any district created pursuant to the provisions of chapter 218B of NRS for the election of members of the Assembly.

(Added to NRS by 1987, 180)

NRS 386.215 Optional districts for election of trustees within county school district whose enrollment of pupils is not more than 25,000: Documents to be filed with county clerk. Copies of maps or other documents evidencing the division of the county school district into election districts pursuant to NRS 386.205 must be filed with the appropriate county clerk.

(Added to NRS by 1987, 180)

NRS 386.225 Optional districts for election of trustees within county school district whose enrollment of pupils is not more than 25,000: Manner of election.

1. Election districts created pursuant to NRS 386.205 may be constructed so that the:

(a) Voters in each election district elect a trustee to represent them; or

(b) Trustees are elected by all of the voters in the county school district.

➥ In either case, each trustee must be a resident of the election district which he or she represents throughout his or her term of office.

2. The board of trustees shall adopt a resolution, after a public hearing on the matter, determining whether each trustee will be elected solely by the voters in the election district of the trustee or all of the voters in the county school district.

(Added to NRS by 1987, 180)

NRS 386.240 Qualifications of trustees. A candidate for the office of trustee of a school district shall:

1. Be a qualified elector.

2. Have the qualifications of residence within the county school district required for the office for which he or she seeks election.

[69:32:1956]—(NRS A 1971, 518)

NRS 386.250 Nomination of trustee; filing of declaration of candidacy and acceptance of candidacy.

1. Candidates for the office of trustee shall be nominated in the manner provided by the primary election laws of this state.

2. The declaration of candidacy and the acceptance of a candidacy by candidates for the office of trustee of county school districts shall be filed with the county clerk of the county whose boundaries are conterminous with the county school district boundaries.

[70:32:1956]—(NRS A 1960, 284; 1963, 1378; 1971, 518)

NRS 386.260 Election of trustees; certificate of election.

1. Trustees shall be elected as provided in the election laws of this state.

2. After the close of any election, and in accordance with law, the board of county commissioners shall make abstracts of the votes cast for trustees and shall order the county clerk to issue election certificates to the candidates elected.

3. Immediately, the county clerk shall transmit a copy of each election certificate to the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

[71:32:1956]—(NRS A 1959, 810; 1960, 285; 1971, 518; 1973, 88)

Carson City
Agenda Report

Date Submitted: April 15, 2014 **Agenda Date Requested:** May 20, 2014

To: Charter Review Committee

From: Rob Joiner, Chairman

Subject Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action to recommend to the Board of Supervisors an amendment to the Charter regarding changing the election of Supervisors from At Large to being elected by voters within the ward that they are to represent; the Mayor would continue to be elected At Large. *(Submitted online by John Vettel)*

Summary: Mr. Vettel is proposing that candidates for Supervisor be elected entirely from their residing ward in both the primary and general elections. His proposal does not propose to amend the current practice of electing the Mayor at-large in both the primary and general elections. The Nevada Legislature passed a bill amending the charters of Carson City and several other Nevada cities in both 2011 and 2013 requiring that these local government supervisors or city council members be elected ward-only in both primary and general elections. Governor Sandoval vetoed each of these measures. Carson City, by action of the Board of Supervisors, has chosen to place a modified version of this proposal before the city's voters in November 2014. This ballot question will ask if the voters approve of ward-only voting for supervisor candidates in the primary election, with an at-large election of city-wide voters for the top two candidates in the general election.

Type of Action Requested: (check one)
(_X_) Formal Action/Motion (____) Other (Specify)

Supporting Materials: Online submission form and agenda report and backup materials from the February 6, 2014 Board of Supervisor meeting.

Reviewed By: Rob Joiner Date: April 16, 2014
(Chairman, Charter Review Committee)

Committee Action Taken:

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

_____
(Vote Recorded By)

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

vision internet

Administration | Workspace | Core Components | Advanced Components | Utilities | Log Out | Help

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	284
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	71.83.102.118
Submission recorded on :	3/12/2014 12:12:00 PM
Time to take the survey :	1 minutes, 19 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
John Vettel

E-mail:

:
John@RyansDad.com

Suggestion:

:
Dear Charter Review Committee: I request formal consideration of the following proposal, which would change the election of Supervisors from "At Large" to being elected by voters within the ward that they are to represent. The Mayor would continue to be elected "At Large." The suggested motion would be: "I move to change Sec 1.010., 4. which currently reads, 'All Supervisors, including the Mayor, must be voted upon by the registered voters of Carson City at large and shall serve for terms of 4 years.' to read, 'Supervisors must be voted upon by the registered voters of Carson City who reside within the ward to be represented. The Mayor must be voted upon by the registered voters of Carson City at large. The Mayor and Supervisors shall serve for terms of 4 years.' " This is a logical change because: 1. While ALL members of the board serve Carson City, the Mayor is the only member both serves and represents the entire city. Other than residing in Carson City, there is no other residential requirement for the Mayor. 2. ALL Carson City residents will benefit from encouraging as many candidates for these offices as possible. 3. More residents will be encouraged to run under this change because the cost to be a candidate will be reduced by approximately seventy-five percent. 4. Candidates will be encouraged and more able to visit directly with their constituents because the geographical area to be covered will be reduced by approximately seventy-five percent. 5. While the difference in views on general items among different geographical areas (wards) is minimal, it is very possible that certain wards may have issues of import to them that are not shared by other wards - but are deserving of attention. They should be able to select a candidate based upon that candidates responsiveness to ward concerns. 6. The present system is unnecessarily expensive, and provides opportunity for monied interests to exert excessive control over Carson City policies. I will appreciate your consideration of this proposal. Thank You, John W. Vettel Jr., LtCol, USAF(Ret) 678 Derby Ct. Carson City, NV 89703

City of Carson City
Agenda Report

Date Submitted: January 26, 2014

Agenda Date Requested: Feb. 6, 2014
Time Requested: 10 min

To: Mayor and Board of Supervisors

From: Alan Glover, Clerk-Recorder

Subject Title: For Possible Action: to adopt a resolution to place an advisory question on the 2014 General Election ballot asking the Nevada State Legislature to amend the Carson City Charter to provide for ward only voting ward-supervisor primary elections with an at-large general election runoff between the two highest primary vote receivers in each ward.

Staff Summary: The Board of Supervisors is to set by resolution all City ballot questions.

Type of Action requested: (check one)
(X) Resolution
(____) Formal Action/Motion
(____) Ordinance
(____) Other (Specify)

Does This Action Require A Business Impact Statement: (____) Yes (X) NO

Recommended Board Action: I move to adopt Resolution No. _____, a resolution to place an advisory question on the 2014 General Election ballot asking the Nevada Legislature to amend the Carson City Charter to provide for ward only voting in ward-supervisor primary elections with an at-large general election runoff between the two highest primary vote receivers in each ward.

Applicable Statue, Code, Policy, Rule or Regulation: CCMC 2.010

Fiscal Impact: $5000.00

Explanation of Impact: Staff time.

Funding Source: General Fund. Account 0216 Elections

Alternatives:

Supporting Material:

Prepared By: Alan Glover

Reviewed By: : Kathleen Kinsey for Alan Cvitanich Date: 1.28.14
(Department Head)

: Paul S. Morris Date: 1/28/14
(City Manager)

: _____ Date: 1/28/14
(District Attorney)

: Linda Purtis Date: 1/28/14
(Finance Director)

Board Action Taken:

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

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

_____
(Vote Recorded By)

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION PLACING AN ADVISORY BALLOT QUESTION ON THE 2014 GENERAL ELECTION BALLOT, THE EXPLANATION AND DIGEST OF THE QUESTION AND A FISCAL NOTE REGARDING WHETHER THE NEVADA LEGISLATURE SHOULD AMEND THE CARSON CITY CHARTER TO PROVIDE FOR WARD ONLY WARD-SUPERVISOR PRIMARY ELECTIONS WITH AN AT-LARGE RUN OFF OF EACH WARD'S TWO HIGHEST PRIMARY VOTE RECEIVERS

WHEREAS, pursuant to a vote of the Carson City Board of Supervisors on Agenda Item No. 26(C) at its August 16, 2012 Joint Meeting with the Carson City Charter Review Committee concurring in the Charter Review Committee's recommended changes, among others, with respect to separate ward voting only in a primary election for a Board of Supervisor's office, the Board directed this resolution be brought for consideration and adoption; and

WHEREAS, NRS 293.481 and SB 325 (2013 Legislature) requires such ballot question resolution set forth the question, an explanation and digest of the question, the description of the anticipated financial effect on the City, and that in this case the arguments for and against shall be later included in the ballot question, pursuant to the Clerk-Recorder's committee process under NRS 295.121; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NRS 295.121(1)(a), the Board shall, in consultation and recommendation of the Clerk-Recorder pursuant to NRS 295.121(5), appoint two committees that are exempt from the Open Meeting Law pursuant to NRS 295.121(13), who will develop, pursuant to NRS 295.121(7)-(10), the arguments for and against to be placed in the ballot question at a future date by the Clerk-Recorder.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Carson City shall place an advisory ballot question, including the explanation and digest of the question, a description of the anticipated financial effect and the arguments for and against the question, on the November 2014 General Election Ballot whether the Nevada Legislature should amend the Carson City Charter to provide for ward only voting in ward-supervisor primary elections with an at-large general election run off of each ward's two highest primary vote receivers;

and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ballot question shall read as follows:

CARSON CITY ADVISORY BALLOT QUESTION NO. 1. Shall the Nevada Legislature amend the Carson City Charter to provide for ward only voting in ward-supervisor primary elections with an at-large general election run off between the two highest primary vote receivers in each ward?

and, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the explanation and digest of the ballot question to be included in the sample ballot shall be as follows:

Explanation:
A "YES" vote could encourage the Board of Supervisors to ask the Legislature to make a change to the Charter's primary voting process to ensure that the two candidates for a ward's supervisor office (but not for mayor) receiving in the primary the highest number of votes solely from their ward will have their names placed on the general election ballot for all city voters to decide in an at-large run off between the two finalists.

A "NO" vote could discourage the Board of Supervisors from asking the Legislature to make any Charter changes to the current voting system that requires at-large voting by all city voters in both the primary and general elections for any supervisor's office.

District Attorney's Digest:
Currently, under Section 2.010 of the Carson City Charter, candidates for ward supervisor run at-large in both the primary and general elections. Currently, under Section 5.010 of the Charter, if a candidate in the primary receives more than a majority of at-large votes cast in that election for the office for which he or she is a candidate, his or her name alone must be placed on the ballot for the general election. Currently, under Section 5.010 of the Charter, if in the primary election no candidate receives a majority of the at-large votes cast in that election for the office for which he or she is a candidate, the names of the two candidates receiving the highest numbers of votes must be placed on the ballot for the general election. This ballot question seeks *advisory* approval to seek legislative changes to the relevant articles and sections of the Carson City Charter to establish a ward-only primary election for a ward's Board of Supervisor office to establish two candidates of that ward from which all the voters of the City can choose from by at-large voting in a general election run off. The primary's two candidates receiving the highest number of votes solely from their ward would be placed on the general election ballot for their ward. Because the Office of Mayor represents the entire City, but is also deemed a supervisor under the Charter, an election for the Office of Mayor would *not* be subject to this ward-only primary change.

///

///

and, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the description of the anticipated financial effect to be included in the sample ballot question shall be as follows:

> **Description of Anticipated Financial Effect:**
> The financial effect of this change to the primary and general election process for the office of ward supervisor will be nominal. There will need to be some program changes by the Carson City Clerk-Recorder to the creation of the ballot and the vote counting process. The estimated fiscal impact is $5,000.

and, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to NRS 293.481(1)(a)(3), the arguments for and against the ballot question shall be crafted and included in the ballot question pursuant to the committee process set forth in NRS 295.121.

Upon motion by Supervisor _____, seconded by Supervisor _____, the foregoing Resolution was passed and adopted this _____ day of _____, 2014 by the following vote:

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

_____
Robert L. Crowell, Mayor
Carson City, Nevada

ATTEST:

_____
Alan Glover, Clerk - Recorder
Carson City, Nevada

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

vision internet

Administration | Workspace | Core Components | Advanced Components | Utilities | Log Out | Help

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	335
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	75.141.196.212
Submission recorded on :	4/23/2014 12:25:42 PM
Time to take the survey :	1 minutes, 11 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
Ron Smith

E-mail:

:
rlsmith711@gmail.com

Suggestion:

:
Dear Charter Review Committee: I request formal consideration of the following proposal, which would change the election of Supervisors from "At Large" to being elected by voters within the ward that they are to represent. TheMayor would continue to be elected "At Large." The suggested motion would be: "I move to change Sec 1.010., 4. which currently reads, 'All Supervisors, including the Mayor, must be voted upon by the registered voters of Carson City at large and shall serve for terms of 4 years.' to read, 'Supervisors must be voted upon by the registered voters of Carson City who reside within the ward to be represented. The Mayor must be voted upon by the registered voters of Carson City at large. The Mayor and Supervisors shall serve for terms of 4 years.' " This is a logical change because: While all members of the board serve Carson City, the Mayor is the only member who both serves and represents the entire city. Other than residing in Carson City, there is no other residential requirement for the Mayor. By running within a single ward, a candidate's time and financial costs will be reduced to 25% of the current costs, thus enabling lower income people with larger families to serve. The best candidates are actively involved with family and community and may have limited time and financial resources. Reducing a candidates time and financial commitment will encourage good people to run for office, and thereby benefit all Carson City residents. Both candidates and Supervisors, once elected, will be encouraged and more able to visit directly with their constituents because of the greatly reduced geographical area. While the difference in views on general items among the various wards may be minimal, it is quite possible that certain wards may have issues only of significant import to ward residents. Thus their issues deserve committed representation. Supervisors should know that their first responsibility is representation of their ward's interests and that they must effectively represent those interests in order to be reelected. The present system is unnecessarily expensive and provides opportunity for monied interests to exert excessive control over Carson City policies. I thank you for your attention and will appreciate your consideration of this proposal. Sincerely, Ron Smith Carson City, NV

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	334
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	167.187.101.241
Submission recorded on :	4/23/2014 9:31:13 AM
Time to take the survey :	3 minutes, 6 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
Linda Barnett

E-mail:

:
lbarnett@eaglegroupnv.com

Suggestion:

:
While all members of the board serve Carson City, the Mayor is the only member who both serves and represents the entire city. Other than residing in Carson City, there is no other residential requirement for the Mayor. By running within a single ward, a candidate's time and financial costs will be reduced to 25% of the current costs, thus enabling lower income people with larger families to serve. The best candidates are actively involved with family and community and may have limited time and financial resources. Reducing a candidates time and financial commitment will encourage good people to run for office, and thereby benefit all Carson City residents. Both candidates and Supervisors, once elected, will be encouraged and more able to visit directly with their constituents because of the greatly reduced geographical area. While the difference in views on general items among the various wards may be minimal, it is quite possible that certain wards may have issues only of significant import to ward residents. Thus their issues deserve committed representation. Supervisors should know that their first responsibility is representation of their ward's interests and that they must effectively represent those interests in order to be reelected. The present system is unnecessarily expensive and provides opportunity for monied interests to exert excessive control over Carson City policies.

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

vision internet

Administration | Workspace | Core Components | Advanced Components | Utilities | Log Out | Help

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	333
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	71.92.162.215
Submission recorded on :	4/23/2014 6:54:39 AM
Time to take the survey :	1 minutes, 29 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
FG Voltz

E-mail:

:
zebedee_177@yahoo.com

Suggestion:

:
The Charter Review Commission needs to recommend ward-only voting for the four supervisor positions in both the primary and general elections.

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	332
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	207.200.116.65
Submission recorded on :	4/22/2014 7:53:42 PM
Time to take the survey :	2 minutes, 41 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:
:
Patricia Puchert

E-mail:
:
ppuchert@aol.com

Suggestion:
:
I believe CC supervisors should be elected by their district only--not by open city voting. I feel this will definitely improve future decisions made for our city.

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Administration | Workspace | Core Components | Advanced Components | Utilities | Log Out | Help

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	331
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	69.239.157.47
Submission recorded on :	4/22/2014 7:06:21 PM
Time to take the survey :	3 minutes, 11 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
Tom Lahey

E-mail:

:
lahey1@att.net

Suggestion:

:
Let's knock off the political BS and go to ward voting and get things done in a correct and fair manner.

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	330
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	207.200.116.65
Submission recorded on :	4/22/2014 7:05:58 PM
Time to take the survey :	3 minutes, 3 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
Robert J Richard

E-mail:

:
BOBA85vet@aol.com

Suggestion:

:
I feel we want to simplify the system, encourage good people to run for our Board of Supervisors and reduce their costs and requirement to raise funds by electing our Supervisors only from within the ward where they live and would represent. This would cut the cost and time commitment for an effective campaign (signs, door knocking, phone calls) to 1/4th of the present system! This would encourage good, intelligent people to serve Carson City and would benefit our entire city.

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Administration | Workspace | Core Components | Advanced Components | Utilities | Log Out | Help

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	329
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	68.190.189.14
Submission recorded on :	4/22/2014 7:03:19 PM
Time to take the survey :	9 minutes, 35 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
Noel Waters

E-mail:

:
noelwaters@gmail.com

Suggestion:

:
I DO NOT favor amending the charter to allow election of supervisors by ward, either at the primary nor in the general election. A majority of the Board of Supervisors has the power to make all manner of changes in the community, to levy or reduce taxes, and to amend or adopt ordinances. I do not wish the fate of my community to be decided by people who are not beholden to my vote, and who are obliged to follow only the narrower interests and smaller voting population of their own wards. I view this as a scam to reduce my voting rights and encourage generalvoter apathy. Thank you, I hope you listen. Noel Waters

---

Carson City, NV Official Board of Supervisor Ward Boundaries

Washoe County
Carson City

Lyon County
Carson City

Carson City
Douglas County

Ward 1

Ward 2

Ward 3

Ward 4

N

DOUGLAS COUNTY GIS

1 " = 1,300 '

BOS Wards

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

Douglas County
GIS Department
P.O. Box 218
1615 8th Street
Minden, NV 89423
(775) 782-9894

T:\Z_CARSON_PROJECTS\RECORDER\RE-DISTRICTING\MAPS\BOS_Ward_Boundaries_2011_34X48.mxd, Editor: jmax, Printed: 4/10/2012

Carson City
Agenda Report

Date Submitted: April 15, 2014 **Agenda Date Requested:** May 20, 2014

To: Charter Review Committee

Submitted Online By: Jim Shirk

Subject Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding when any fax, email or US Postal letter arrives addressed to the Board of Supervisors, or similar type heading, examples: Mayor & Board of Supervisors; City Manager & Board of Supervisors. That all similar types of correspondences will be given to all Board of Supervisors.

Type of Action Requested: (check one)
(_X_) Formal Action/Motion (____) Other (Specify)

Supporting Materials: N/A

Reviewed By: _____ Date: 5/13/14
(Chairman, Charter Review Committee)

Committee Action Taken:

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

_____
(Vote Recorded By)

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

vision internet

Administration | Workspace | Core Components | Advanced Components | Utilities | Log Out | Help

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	336
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	10.66.2.206, 127.0.0.1
Submission recorded on :	4/30/2014 8:11:39 AM
Time to take the survey :	3 minutes, 9 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
jim Shirk

E-mail:

:
jshirk@carson.org

Suggestion:

:
1. When the Board of Supervisors have an agenda item that requires the Board to vote and approve on two different dates on the same agenda item (example: imposing a new tax), then prior or at the second meeting of the Board - all minutes of the first meeting must be presented to the public and to the Board. 2. When any fax, email or US Postal letter arrives addressed to the Board of Supervisor's, or similar type heading, examples: Mayor & Board of Supervisors; City Manager & Board of Supervisors. That all similar types of correspondences will be given to all Board of Supervisors. 3. The Mayor of Carson City should be elected every six years and serve only two terms. As the Board members in Ward 1 & 3 election or re-election are not in parallel dates with the Mayor as are Ward 2 & 4 Which then creates an unfair advantage to Ward 1 & 3

Carson City
Agenda Report

Date Submitted: April 15, 2014 **Agenda Date Requested:** May 20, 2014

To: Charter Review Committee

Submitted Online by: Jim Shirk

Subject Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding the Mayor of Carson City should be elected every six years and serve only two terms.

Summary: As the Board members in Ward 1 & 3 election or re-election are not in parallel dates with the Mayor as are Ward 2 & 4 which then creates an unfair advantage to Ward 1 & 3.

Type of Action Requested: (check one)
(_X_) Formal Action/Motion (____) Other (Specify)

Supporting Materials: N/A

Reviewed By: _____ Date: 5/13/14
(Chairman, Charter Review Committee)

Committee Action Taken:

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

_____
(Vote Recorded By)

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

vision internet

Administration | Workspace | Core Components | Advanced Components | Utilities | Log Out | Help

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	336
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	10.66.2.206, 127.0.0.1
Submission recorded on :	4/30/2014 8:11:39 AM
Time to take the survey :	3 minutes, 9 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
jim Shirk

E-mail:

:
jshirk@carson.org

Suggestion:

:
1. When the Board of Supervisors have an agenda item that requires the Board to vote and approve on two different dates on the same agenda item (example: imposing a new tax), then prior or at the second meeting of the Board - all minutes of the first meeting must be presented to the public and to the Board. 2. When any fax, email or US Postal letter arrives addressed to the Board of Supervisor's, or similar type heading, examples: Mayor & Board of Supervisors; City Manager & Board of Supervisors. That all similar types of correspondences will be given to all Board of Supervisors. 3. The Mayor of Carson City should be elected every six years and serve only two terms. As the Board members in Ward 1 & 3 election or re-election are not in parallel dates with the Mayor as are Ward 2 & 4 Which then creates an unfair advantage to Ward 1 & 3

Carson City
Agenda Report

Date Submitted: April 15, 2014 **Agenda Date Requested:** May 20, 2014

To: Charter Review Committee

Submitted Online By: Jim Shirk

Subject Title: For Possible Action: Discussion and possible action regarding when the Board of Supervisors has an agenda item that requires the Board to vote and approve on two different dates on the same agenda item (example: imposing a new tax), then prior or at the second meeting of the Board - all minutes of the first meeting must be presented to the public and to the Board.

Type of Action Requested: (check one)
(_X_) Formal Action/Motion (____) Other (Specify)

Supporting Materials: N/A

Reviewed By: Bob Jenkins Date: 5/13/14
(Chairman, Charter Review Committee)

Committee Action Taken:

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

_____
(Vote Recorded By)

Carson City

VISION INTERNET CONTENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

vision internet

Administration | Workspace | Core Components | Advanced Components | Utilities | Log Out | Help

Advanced Components: Forms: Reporting: Voter Details

User: Janet Busse [Reset Password]

Back

graphical report | text fields entries | cross tabulation | data export

Submission information

Submitter DB ID :	336
ASP.net's user name :	Disabled
Submitter's Email :	Anonymous
Submitter's language :	Default language
IP address :	10.66.2.206, 127.0.0.1
Submission recorded on :	4/30/2014 8:11:39 AM
Time to take the survey :	3 minutes, 9 secs.

Survey answers

Switch to submitter's answers edit mode

Name:

:
jim Shirk

E-mail:

:
jshirk@carson.org

Suggestion:

:
1. When the Board of Supervisors have an agenda item that requires the Board to vote and approve on two different dates on the same agenda item (example: imposing a new tax), then prior or at the second meeting of the Board - all minutes of the first meeting must be presented to the public and to the Board. 2. When any fax, email or US Postal letter arrives addressed to the Board of Supervisor's, or similar type heading, examples: Mayor & Board of Supervisors; City Manager & Board of Supervisors. That all similar types of correspondences will be given to all Board of Supervisors. 3. The Mayor of Carson City should be elected every six years and serve only two terms. As the Board members in Ward 1 & 3 election or re-election are not in parallel dates with the Mayor as are Ward 2 & 4 Which then creates an unfair advantage to Ward 1 & 3
