



**CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS  
CHARTER COMMITTEE  
SUMMARY MINUTES**

April 29, 2024  
4:00 p.m., Council Chambers,  
2250 Las Vegas Boulevard North,  
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89030

**CALL TO ORDER**

**Chairman King** called the meeting to order at 4:02 P.M.

**VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW**

**City Clerk** Jackie Rodgers confirmed compliance with Open Meeting Law

**ROLL CALL**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Chairman Melvin King (Arrived: 4:01 P.M.)  
Vice Chairman Esmeralda Villeda (Arrived: 4:10 P.M.)  
Member Eva Simmons (Absence)  
Member Steve Swaney  
Member Kathy Hendricks  
Member Crystal Hunsaker  
Member Jimmy Vega  
Member Tyrone Jones  
Member Dee Golightly  
Member Ida Zeiler (Attended Remotely)  
Member Patricia Armstrong  
Member Al Greer  
Member Dewayne Noble

## **STAFF PRESENT**

City Manager Ryann Juden  
Sr. Director Economic Dev. and Government Affairs Jared Luke  
Deputy City Attorney II Adrian Viesca  
City Clerk Jackie Rodgers  
Chief Deputy City Clerk Cherry Lawson  
Deputy City Clerk II Daisy Rivera  
Deputy City Clerk II Isabel Rodriguez

## **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - BY INVITATION**

Led by **Member Greer**

## **PUBLIC FORUM**

**Chairman King** opened the meeting to receive public comments. No comments were received from the public.

## **AGENDA**

1. North Las Vegas Charter Committee Regular Meeting of April 29, 2024. (For Possible Action; Recommendation – Approve)

**MOTION:** *Committee Member Swaney moved and Committee Member Armstrong seconded the motion approving the agenda as presented.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**  
AYES: 11  
NAYS: 0  
ABSTAIN: 0

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

2. North Las Vegas Charter Committee Regular Meeting Minutes of March 25, 2024. (For Possible Action; Recommendation – Approve)

**MOTION:** *Committee Member Hendricks moved and Committee Member Greer seconded the motion approving the Consent Agenda as presented.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**

AYES: 11  
NAYS: 0  
ABSTAIN: 0

### **BUSINESS**

3. Presentation by City Staff on Questions 1 and 2 on the Primary Ballot in June, 2024.  
(For Discussion)

**Government Affairs Specialist Kandice Townsend** provided a PowerPoint Presentation on the two (2) questions that will appear on the June 11, 2024 Primary Election Ballot. Questions were asked by the members and City staff responded to questions posed related to this ballot initiative.

#### **ACTION: DISCUSSION ONLY**

4. Discussion by Committee Members and Staff to Consider Potential Changes to the City's Charter. (For Possible Action; Recommendation – Approve)

Topic that was discussed as a potential change to the City's Charter 1) Residency Requirements of Executive Staff. After much discussion, **Chairman King** asked for a motion keep the same language within the City Charter.

**MOTION:** *Committee Member Greer moved and Committee Member Vega seconded the motion to keep the language the same as it currently is within the City Charter.*

#### **ACTION: APPROVED**

AYES: 11  
NAYS: 1 (Jones)  
ABSTAIN: 1 (Jones)

**Deputy City Attorney II Adrian Viesca** asked **Member Jones** for his reasoning for voting Abstention on the item. **Member Jones** stated that he does not agree with the item or motion. **Mr. Viesca** suggested that **Member Jones** vote Nay, as opposed to Abstention.

**Chairman King** began introducing another topic of discussion for the Committee's consideration related to increasing the size of the City Council. **Dr. Juden** explained the nature of the actions that occurred during the last legislative session related to this topic. He explained the nature of adequate representation as a resident of North Las Vegas in relation to the number of residents served the each elected official. He then compared neighboring jurisdictions to the North Las Vegas in terms of the number of elected officials, and the number of citizens represented by the elected.

[4:54 P.M.] **Mr. Luke** interjected and requested that **Chairman King** reopen Item No. 4

in order to continue the discussion on this item, as the Committee had taken a vote previously on Item No. 4.

**Dr. Juden** suggested that Item No. 4 remain open, that he would speak with the Clerk if she had any concerns, that a record would be created as he did not wish to preclude the Committee from having this discussion. He suggested that **Chairman King** reopen Item No. 4 as it appears as though the vote was taken.

**MOTION:** *Vice Chairwoman Villeda moved and Committee Member Swaney seconded the motion to reopen Item No. 4 to continue the discussion.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**

AYES: 12

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

After much discussion, **Dr. Juden** suggested the members reach out to Council Members and asked them how they feel about increasing the number of council members. That, if they do not respond, the members would have the response that they need to go forward.

**Chairman King** asked whether there is a recommendation from the Committee to either reject or accept adding an additional City Council seat.

**Committee Member Golightly** referenced the City Charter and its incorporation in 1971 commenting on the population totals then as well as of this day. He presented an argument for increasing the number of City Council seats due to the increase population totals in North Las Vegas. **Dr. Juden** responded providing historical context to the comment posed and asked would it be best to take the Council from being part-time to full-time before adding additional Council Members.

**Committee Member Jones** referenced **Member Golightly** comments related to the incorporation in 1971 along with the population totals of the community at that time to present day. He asked **Dr. Juden** why the additional two (2) seats cannot be added to the City Council. Each ward is based on the number of constituencies, of the number of constituents residing in each ward (approximately 75,000 per ward), he asked how members of the community are fully represented by the elected officials. He asked what the detriment is to adding two (2) seats than not to Council. **Dr. Juden** replied to **Member Jones**' concerns, stating that much of the response is based upon numbers—what is too much or too little?

**Member Jones** referenced the 2023 Legislature Session stating he was there. That, this matter was never brought forward through the Charter Committee. Now, that it is before the Charter Committee, the Committee will make the recommendation to the City Council for a bill draft resolution that would address this matter. He asked **Dr. Juden** if his statement was correct. **Dr. Juden** confirmed **Member Jones**' explanation, with context added.

**Chairman King** asserted a Point of Information for a Point of Clarity the City of Las Vegas has what number of Council Members. **Dr. Juden** replied stating there are a total of six (6) Council Members. **King** inquired as to the number of constituents Las Vegas Council represents. **Dr. Juden** stated 107,000. **Chairman King** stated that if we were modeling after Las Vegas Council, then North Las Vegas would not be able to reach that threshold of considering an additional council member until it reaches approximately 500,000 in population of residents.

**Dr. Juden** replied stating that is the question that **Committee Member Golightly** asked—what is the appropriate ratio? That which, he does not know, as that is a community question. However, this is the appropriate forum for those conversations to take place. He discussed his reasoning why he mentioned Civil Rights. The comments made during the legislature were that is a very difficult threshold to meet and match. He continued stating if we are trying to preserve the integrity, that if the reason for adding this is one of Civil Rights, that becomes problematic. It is a policy question where an appropriate amount should be determined.

**Committee Member Zeiler** stated that she does not believe that this is the time to be adding additional Council Members. That, as a Latina in the community, she is concerned with the validity of the census. There is the fact that adding more Council Members also means every single committee and commission in the city adds more people as well. So it has a domino effect that is pretty dramatic that we would be asking our constituents to take on. The money has to come from somewhere to pay for this.

**Committee Member Greer** stated he appreciate the data that city of North Las Vegas has grown, but so has the whole valley grown over the last few years. When you look at the growth, that and I would probably be in, more understanding or more liking if this was something that was targeted towards all the city agencies, but just to come in and say, well, North Las Vegas needs to do this when Las Vegas and Henderson has also grown. Boulder City may be the only community that has not exploded in growth; as it has a controlled population. He asked why the focused has shifted only to North Las Vegas. He stated he agrees with **Committee Member Zeiler** stating now is not the time. Perhaps revisiting this in the next two to four years. He continued stating that whatever happens with North Las Vegas should occur with its City Council, not up north.

**Committee Member Jones** replied stating that discussion is a dead issue, as it occurred in the last legislative session. He inquired of **Dr. Juden** asking whether North Las Vegas has surpassed Reno in growth. **Dr. Juden** stated yes by 20,000. **Jones** asked and answered the make-up of the Reno City Council, stating four Council Members and the Mayor. He drew community size comparisons between Las Vegas, Henderson and Reno, as well as the City of Reno's efforts to set aside the at-large council position.

**Committee Member Jones** stated that the Chairman does not want any research on the topic, no further discussion; only a vote to move on. **Chairman King** addressed **Member Jones** stating that the Committee is addressing the issue now at this time. The motion and vote that was entered was to reopen the item for discussion. The vote is open to the

Committee, and what it suggests or recommends. **Chairman King** asserted a Point of Privilege to allow **Committee Member Hunsaker** to comment.

**Committee Member Hunsaker** asked whether this is an issue of money to increase the number of Council Members, as she referenced **Committee Member Zeiler** comments of a domino effect. She also asked how the City would handle such an issue should the city begin to shrink in size, like Detroit Michigan. **Vice Chairwoman Villeda** asked if she could add to the questions posed by **Member Hunsaker** asking what the cost is to add Council seats or to make our Council full-time.

**Dr. Juden** replied stating that if this was based on current City Council Members, and the city were to add two more part-time Council Members, the city would have a fiscal note that would be attached to this bill during the legislative session for over \$1M. That amount includes salary and benefits. That, by ordinance increases, as we are pegged by the West S&P Index. In addition to salary and benefits, we would also have to factor in support staff as well as constructing offices for Council Members. Those figures increase annually.

He continued and responded to the second question related to Detroit's population, stating North Las Vegas would not. He related the discussion to it being a policy situation that can be based upon numerical format per [X] number of residents, as an example. He explained that when considering the City Charter, the view should be with a purpose at looking at more robust, generalized policies and thoughts. An appropriate construction of this could be that Council has the ability to increase or decrease the number of City Council members. That would allow them to take away if there was a time where they needed to take away a seat; however, there are laws that protect their ability to do that for political reasons. Governments does not tend to shrink, if ever. He continued to explain what the effects on the current Council Members would be who were elected as a part-time elected official, stating there may be some policy concerns with making part-time Council Members full-time. He drew comparisons with that of elected legislative officials who are also part-time, our legislature is purposely designed in the 1864 Constitution to be weak.

**Committee Member Hendricks** stated that the Charter Committee can meet to discuss this matter that even if there is no movement right now, it does not mean that it is a closed issue. Now, is not the time to address the issue, that the matter can be discussed with the Council Members to see whether they have increased workloads etc.

**Committee Member Swaney** stated that currently our Council Members are doing a great job. North Las Vegas is going; however he does not know if this is a matter of population totals. That until someone like [Mr. Kessler] looks at our wards and suggest that the city have six wards as opposed to four, that is when there needs to be some discussion on the matter. He does not believe that the Council has complained over the amount of residents it represents, as he feels as though they are doing a great job and does not believe that the wards should be increased at this time.

**Committee Member Armstrong** asked why there is a need, and what the urgency behind this matter is. She feels as though a conversation should be had with the Council so that

they can openly express their opinions on the matter. She is at a loss on this item.

**Committee Member Vega** referenced the number of constituents that other communities represent and stated that the number of constituents that North Las Vegas Council represents is in line with other communities. He asked whether the Council has voiced any true concerns over the need to add to the council. **Dr. Juden** replied stating some of those same questions that were posed by **Committee Member Armstrong** were brought up during the legislative session as to whether there were examples or lack of representation by the Council. There were questions of urgency and whether the city see any issues. The City felt it was in many ways of, victory to at least bring it back for conversation like we are having now, as this is more robust than any conversation that was had at the legislature. The legislature is not the forum for this discussion. It goes to **Vega's** question as to why now, is there some impetus that is created it.

**Dr. Juden** stated there was never one presented on the record. Also, during his tenure of City Manager, he has never received any public comment that they could not reach their council member. He feels as though Council Members are very responsive, and had never received an email indicating that anyone could not reach a member of council.

**Committee Member Jones** stated that he has heard Members state that there is no need, but that he has not heard from the Members why adding members would be a detriment. He questioned why this matter is being discussed as he was not informed of it on the agenda. **Dr. Juden** replied stating the agenda [Item No. 4] is *Discussion by Committee Members and Staff to Consider Potential Changes to the City Charter*. There is no secret about the item being on the agenda, as conversation have been had about this matter. **Member Jones** stated that he has not had any conversation on the matter. **Dr. Juden** indicated that **Member Jones** did testify during the legislative session, and thereby having a conversation on the matter. **Jones** rebuffed stating that was then. His concern is who requested the item on the agenda for discussion this day. He is concern that residents are unaware of the item being on the agenda so that they can provide input.

**Dr. Juden** stated that this agenda was noticed and was posted in a public place. The agenda material link was sent to each Committee Member. The agenda has a business item on it that you yourself, in the last legislative session testified that you were not given the opportunity to have a conversation about changes to the agenda or changes to the charter. In many ways requested this item at the last legislative session during your very own testimony about the Charter Committee, and your experiences on the charter Committee. The broad business item that is on this agenda allows any Committee Member to bring any potential change to the charter. In essence, **Member Jones** was apprised of the item on the agenda by the very nature of the discussion during the legislative session.

**Committee Member Jones** recounted his testimony during the legislative session as he continue to dispute having knowledge of the item on the agenda. He indicated that he was referring to a Hearing Master. He also stated that the city administration put for that item that he did not testify on the item. He stated what he testified to, and what he actually said on the record was that the city put forth only one agenda item for the Charter Committee to

debate or discuss. **Dr. Juden** stated that was the reason why the city, then, played a video for all the members of the legislature to see what actually happened during that Charter Meeting. One item was put forward by the City of North Las Vegas, as we had an item for the Charter Committee to consider.

After that, it was repeatedly asked by staff if there were any other thoughts or ideas that Committee Members had to change the Charter, and none were provided. He stated that any Committee Member is able to view from the city's website. It is a video of this Committee Member Meeting, which you were in attendance. He apologized stating that it is his hope that the intent of this agenda item [discussion] was received differently than intended. The City provided the item that was requested by **Member Jones**, that which the Committee is discussing related to changes to the Charter.

**MOTION:** *Chairman King moved the previous question, and Committee Member Swaney seconded the motion to end the debate on Item No. 4.*

**Committee Member Zeiler** asked for clarification of a nay vote of the motion. **Chairman King** stated the motion was to end the debate on Item No. 4 out of respect for time.

**Committee Member Noble** requested clarification if no one else has any other questions. **Chairman King** replied stating that all others have provided comments, and therefore, ending the debate on the item so that the Committee can move to potentially vote on the item of discussion. **Member Noble** stated that you are cutting off other comments that any other may have.

**Committee Member Hendrix** questioned the apportionment of the Wards that City Council represents, and how that was determined. **Dr. Juden** asked for clarification of her question. **Member Hendrix** asked whether there are more residents in one ward as opposed to the others. **Dr. Juden** explained that will happen due to the new communities being built in North Las Vegas. Once the census occurs, the City is required to do a reappropriation to ensure that all areas are equal. At this time, all wards are equal based on the last census count. The census of 2030 will take into account the Village of Tule Springs. **Member Hendrix** stated that as of now, this does not appear to be an issue.

**Chairman King** asked **City Clerk Jackie Rodgers** whether the Committee can move forward with voting on the motion. **Dr. Juden** issued a caution to the Chair stating that while you can ask other questions after previous questions been called, if there are other comments from the Committee, it might be appropriate for Members to voice their comments.

**Dr. Juden** continued stating that although he and **Member Jones** have had conversations about this in multiple forums, he does not want that to dissuade anyone from asking questions.

**Chairman King** restated the motion.



**MOTION:** *Chairman King moved the previous, and Committee Member Swaney seconded the motion to end the debate on Item No. 4.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**

AYES: 12

NAYS: 0

ABSTAIN: 0

**Chairman King** asked for a motion with regard to this item either to suspend or end any further talks of expanding the City Council to one or more seats. Or is there a motion to dive further into a conversation at a later point in time.

**MOTION:** *Committee Member Golightly moved and Committee Member Jones seconded to continue conversation to the next Committee Meeting.*

**ACTION:** **APPROVED**

AYES: 8 (Swaney, Hendricks, Hunsaker, Vega, Jones, Golightly, Armstrong and Noble)

NAYS: 4 (Zeiler, Villeda, King, and Greer)

ABSTAIN: 0

**Chairman King** stated with this item returning for further discussion, he requested from staff numerical values that could provide the Committee with further information on this subject matter. Also to include expanding the City Council with the fiscal impact is for that or the fiscal impact or and the fiscal impact of making, current City Council Members full time.

**Vice Chairwoman Villeda** asked those Members that voted nay and want to speak about this subject again to make sure that Members provide, our **City Manager and Dr. Ryann Juden** the type of information it need on the subject so that the Committee can make an educated decision at the next meeting. That way, the Committee ensure that it is a subject that is addressed, and not have extended the conversation on the subject.

**Member Hendrix** suggested that the Council attend the next meeting to address questions posed by the Members regarding this subject matter. **Committee Member Armstrong** stated she agrees with the suggestion by **Member Hendrix** so that the Members can speak with them regarding the two issues, complaints, or demands of meeting with constituents that they may be experiencing.

**Dr. Juden** stated that having the Council attend could result in an Open Meeting Law violation. He suggested members of the Committee contact the members personally, and report back to your colleagues on how those conversations went. He also indicated that Members can email Council if they chose to. There could be the representative for the Council. In fact, if they don't get back to you, you probably have part of your answer.

### **STAFF COMMENTS**

**Mr. Luke** provided a status update on the Charter Committee's webpage stating that the meetings are currently listed on the webpage, but that the IT Department is working on the meeting link. **Chairman King** thanked **Mr. Luke** for the updates.

### **COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

No report was provided by the members.

### **PUBLIC FORUM**

**Chairman King** opened the meeting to receive public comments. No comments were received from the public.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Chairman King** adjourned the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 5:53 P.M.

### **CERTIFICATION**

I certify that the foregoing are true and correct minutes of the City of North Las Vegas Charter Committee Regular Meeting held on April 29, 2024. I further certify that a quorum was present.

---

Jackie Rodgers, City Clerk