

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-second Session
February 22, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 3:33 p.m. on Wednesday, February 22, 2023, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Edgar Flores, Chair
Senator James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair
Senator Skip Daly
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Lisa Krasner

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Policy Analyst
Heidi Chlarson, Counsel
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Nancy Paulson, City Manager, Carson City
Stephen Wood, Carson City
Jason Woodbury, District Attorney, Carson City
Jennifer Berthiaume, Nevada Association of Counties
Mary Walker, Douglas County; Lyon County; Storey County

CHAIR FLORES:

We will open the meeting with a presentation by Carson City.

NANCY PAULSON (City Manager, Carson City):

Carson City, a consolidated municipality, was established in 1969 by consolidating Ormsby County and Carson City into one municipal government to

avoid duplication of services. The population of Carson City is approximately 57,000, like Lyon County and Elko County. However, it is only 146 square miles, making it the smallest county in Nevada.

City powers are contained in the Carson City Charter in addition to all the powers granted to a city or a county in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS).

The City is governed by a five-member board of supervisors: Mayor Lori Bagwell, Supervisors Stacey Giomi, Maurice White, Curtis Horton and Lisa Schuette. They represent the City's four wards. Although the supervisors are elected at-large, they must reside in the ward they represent.

Carson City has a council-manager form of government in which the board is the policy-making arm and the city manager is the administrative and operational arm. The city manager is appointed by the board of supervisors and is responsible for appointing the deputy city manager and eight department directors.

The City has five city offices and the courts which are run by elected officials. They include the Sheriff's Office, District Attorney, Assessor, Treasurer, Clerk-Recorder, First Judicial District Court, and Justice and Municipal Courts.

The City's population increased by 20,000 during the 20 years from 1982 to 2002. While the population is not growing as fast as it did in those 20 years, the City continues to grow and is inching its way to the 60,000 mark. Based on its growth management policy and the build-out of all available property, it is estimated that the City's maximum population could be approximately 76,000.

Many people think of Carson City as a retirement community. The age distribution among the various age groups is: aged 60 and over, 28 percent; 40 to 59, 24 percent; 20 to 39, 25 percent; and, 0 to 19, 22 percent. The City wants younger generations to stay and raise their families here.

The two largest sources of general fund revenue are property taxes at \$29 million and consolidated tax at almost \$43 million. Those two sources account for 74 percent of general fund revenues.

Approximately \$38 million, or 50 percent of the City's budget, is spent on public safety: fire, sheriff, juvenile probation and detention, and alternative

sentencing services. The next largest budget category at 25 percent is general government which includes the treasurer, assessor, finance, information technology and human resources. Eight percent is spent on culture and recreation, 7 percent on the courts and 3 percent each for health, public works and landfill.

Salaries and benefits account for 76 percent of general fund expenditures which have remained constant in the 24 years I have been in Carson City. The City's main function is providing services to the public. The City has approximately 677 full-time employees with 483 of those paid from the general fund.

Last year, the City finalized a strategic plan for the next five years that sets priorities and outlines where the City should focus its energy and resources. The City's six strategic goals are economic development, efficient government, organizational culture, quality of life and community, safety and sustainable infrastructure.

In 2014, while recovering from the recession and recognizing the need to stimulate economic development, the Board of Supervisors approved a levy of an 18 percent sales tax for public infrastructure projects. The City has been able to leverage that revenue source to secure significant amounts of federal and State funding. Seventy percent of the money for the South Carson Complete Streets Project, finished at the end of 2020, came from federal and State funds.

East William Street is the next corridor to be improved. In addition to the \$2 million in federal appropriations the City was awarded for this project, it was also selected as a recipient of \$9.3 million in Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity grant funds from the U.S. Department of Transportation. This is one of the most competitive grant programs in the Country. This project was 1 out of 90 projects awarded across the Country. This is a testament to the success of the South Carson Street Complete Streets Project. The City received approximately \$7.5 million in Transportation Investment Generating Economy Recovery grant funds for that project.

The City uses the dig-once approach with these large projects which include critical improvements to its aging water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure, and putting overhead power lines underground. So, roads are only torn up once because road funding is valuable.

The East William Street Complete Streets Project is estimated at \$21.3 million and will stretch from Carson Street westward to the I-580/William Street interchange on the east side of Carson City. In addition to utility infrastructure improvements, the project will provide roadway, bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements, as well as beautification improvements. East William Street is one of the City's primary commercial corridors. This project is 53 percent federally funded—21 percent comes from infrastructure tax and 24 percent comes from utility funds. The design is 60 percent complete, and construction will start in early 2024.

Another important infrastructure project is the Quill Water Treatment Plant upgrade located on the west side of Carson City at the base of the mountains. The City relies on this plant to treat water from Kings Canyon Creek, Ash Creek and the historic Marlette Lake Water System. However, due to the changes in regulatory standards and the water quality coming from those sources, our 30-year-old system is not capable of treating all that available water. By updating this plant's infrastructure and water treatment capabilities, the City will make greater use of all available surface water and continue to meet the demand for drinking water safely and promptly well into the future.

The City has secured federal funding for its water utility fund of \$1.5 million from federal appropriations and \$3 million from the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act of 2021 to supplement \$1 million in water use fees and \$7 million from the issuance of bonds for a total of \$12.5 million. This project design is 60 percent complete with construction to start in the fall.

A new combined fire station, emergency operations center and backup dispatch station will be constructed in east Carson City. This project was identified by the Board of Supervisors, City staff and the public as the No. 1 priority in the City's strategic plan. The funding for this project consists of \$3.1 million from the general fund and the ambulance fund, \$2 million from federal appropriations, \$4.3 million from ARP funds and \$8.1 million from the issuance of bonds for a total of \$17.5 million. This project design is 10 percent complete, and construction starts in early 2024.

Recognizing the lack of affordable housing choices in Carson City, property was identified on the east side of town for development of affordable workforce housing. The City is providing the land at no cost and has partnered with the developer to construct 160 units of affordable housing. The development,

Sierra Flats Apartments, is intended to house seniors and families whose incomes do not exceed the 60 percent median growth income in Carson City.

This project is funded through private activity bonds, Home Means Nevada housing initiative funds, the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program and HOME Investment Partnerships Program funds. Phase 1 is under construction with 40 units dedicated to senior housing and the other 40 for family housing. Phase 2 is set to begin at the end of 2023 and will provide an additional 80 units for family housing.

When the City started getting ARP funding in August 2021, the Board of Supervisors approved its plan of expending those funds. This includes services to address mental health and substance abuse treatment, crisis intervention, and other behavioral health and homelessness issues.

In recent years, Carson City has seen a significant increase in its homeless population. The most recent count from 2022 was 69 unsheltered individuals; however, the actual number is probably closer to 200. The Carson City Housing Plan Committee was created to develop a comprehensive Housing Plan with the goal of assisting the Carson City homeless population in transitioning from being unsheltered to sheltered.

The Housing Plan consists of three phases to assist individuals in obtaining independent and permanent housing. Phase 1 is "Survive" which focuses on street outreach services designed to build relationships and provide low-barrier access to safe shelter. Phase 2 is "Stabilize," focusing on short-term housing and access to wraparound services. Phase 3 is "Thrive" which provides transition to independent and stable housing.

The City began implementing this Plan last month by awarding program funds to various entities, proposing a two-year program that supported one of the phases of the Housing Plan.

If you want to get out and enjoy the outdoors, Carson City has some impressive recreational facilities. Ross Gold Park, a neighborhood park in south Carson City, has new tennis courts and a universally accessible playground. The City's outdoor recreation program offers snowshoe and kayak day trips to Lake Tahoe with all equipment and transportation provided. There are almost 100 miles of trails with amazing views. By the end of the Summer 2023, the Capitol to the

Tahoe Rim Trail is expected to be complete. It will add ten additional miles connecting Carson City to the Tahoe Rim Trail and create international connectivity with the Carson City Trail System; a person will be able to walk from the steps of the Capitol all the way to Canada.

CHAIR FLORES:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 16.

SENATE BILL 16: Revises various provisions of the Charter of Carson City.
(BDR S-350)

STEPHEN WOOD (Carson City):

The Carson City Charter Review Committee began its work in February 2022 to consider potential changes to the Charter submitted by Carson City residents and City staff. The seven members of the Committee are Carson City residents appointed by the Board of Supervisors, the Mayor, the Assemblyman from District 40 and the Senator from District 16. After deliberations at three meetings, the Committee submitted a list of five suggested changes to the Board of Supervisors. The Board approved those changes with a slight amendment, and those changes are before you today in the form of S.B. 16.

We have submitted the minutes of each Carson City Review Committee meeting: February 24, 2022 (Exhibit C); April 12, 2022 (Exhibit D); and May 17, 2022 (Exhibit E); and the minutes of the Board of Supervisors meeting on July 21, 2022 (Exhibit F).

Senate Bill 16 is Carson City's only bill submitted to the Eighty-second Session.

JASON WOODBURY (District Attorney, Carson City):

Senate Bill 16 proposes five amendments to the Carson City Charter.

Carson City is divided geographically into four political wards of equal population. Following a census or any time when the population of any single ward exceeds that of any other ward by 5 percent or more, the Carson City Clerk must realign the wards to equalize the population. The realignment must then be approved by the Carson City Board of Supervisors. The Charter imposes a deadline of January 1 of every general election year for completion of that process.

In 2021, that deadline became problematic for Carson City because the Clerk cannot begin the ward realignment process until after the legislative statewide redistricting process is completed. If the redistricting process is completed early enough, the January 1 deadline is not a problem. However, if the redistricting process pushes back toward the end of the calendar year, that makes it difficult and potentially impossible for the Clerk to complete the ward realignment process by the January 1 deadline.

For example, in 2021, due to the timing of the redistricting process, the Carson City Board of Supervisors had to schedule a meeting on the last business day of the year to ensure the realignment was approved by the January 1 deadline. It is not hard to imagine a circumstance in which the redistricting process is delayed for a significant period through legislative stalemate or potential litigation. That means the ward realignment process would not be completed by the January 1 deadline.

In our research on the issue, we were not able to locate the origin of the January 1 deadline. We did not find that deadline in any other city charter or statutory provision. It appears to be unique to Carson City.

The first proposal in section 1 of the bill would remove the January 1 deadline and extend it to the first day of the nonjudicial candidate-filing period. This would bring Carson City in line with NRS 293.209, which imposes a deadline to realign election districts on the first day of the filing period for nonjudicial candidates.

The terms of the members of the Carson City Board of Supervisors expire at noon on the Sunday preceding the first Monday in January four years after their election. However, newly elected supervisors do not assume office until midnight of the first Monday in January following their elections. Read together, these provisions create a 12-hour gap in which the terms of the existing supervisors have expired, but the newly elected supervisors have not yet assumed office. The second proposal in section 2 of S.B. 16 would eliminate that gap by changing the term expiration of the outgoing supervisors from noon to 11:59 p.m.

The third proposed change in section 4 of the bill is a grammatical correction.

The Carson City Charter establishes the ordinance adoption process for the Board of Supervisors. That process requires the Board to review an ordinance at two separate meetings before adoption. The process also requires publication of the proposed ordinance after the first reading and then again before the ordinance becomes effective. The *Nevada Appeal* is used for the City's legal publications.

At times, this process becomes problematic because the Board meets on the first and third Thursday of every month. Some months have a fifth Thursday which extends the time the board can bring back the ordinance for a second reading. Additionally, the *Nevada Appeal* publishes only twice a week on Wednesday and Saturday. Those publication deadlines can create a delay of a few days before the proposed ordinance is published. The combination of these 2 minor delays can create a situation where it is difficult and sometimes impossible to meet the 45-day deadline for adoption of an ordinance.

The fourth proposal in section 5 of S.B. 16 would change the deadline from 45 days to 60 days from the initial publication to the time when the ordinance may be finally adopted. This would give the City another meeting as a cushion to work with to ensure all meeting publication deadlines and requirements are met.

This change is modeled after the Las Vegas City Charter, which has allowed an ordinance to be adopted up to 60 days after its first publication. Additionally, we have proposed eliminating the requirement that an ordinance be published before becoming effective and replaced it with the requirement that the ordinance must be published no later than 14 days after adoption. This will allow the City to attend to urgent matters, such as were experienced with the COVID-19 situation, without having to resort to an emergency ordinance process which allows for less notice to the public.

The fifth proposed change is reflected in section 6 of the bill and a conforming change is reflected in section 2 of the bill. Under the existing charter, if the office of mayor becomes vacant, the mayor pro tempore, who is also a supervisor, becomes acting mayor. However, the supervisor does not actually assume the office of mayor and still holds his or her seat as a supervisor. This process created a problem for Carson City a few years ago when the mayor passed away. The mayor pro tempore became acting mayor, but no one could be appointed to fill that supervisor seat because he was still legally a supervisor

and therefore there was no vacancy. As a result, the board was forced to operate for several months with only four members until the former mayor's term expired.

The problem could have been worse because the Charter could allow that situation to last for two years or longer, depending on the timing of the mayor's vacancy. The proposed change would allow the mayor pro tempore to assume the office of mayor for the duration of the unexpired term of the former mayor. This would create a vacancy in the office of supervisor which could then be filled and allow the board to function with full representation. The proposed change is modeled after the city charters of Sparks and Boulder City that have used this process since 1975 and 1996, respectively.

Sections 7 through 9 of S.B. 16 make conforming changes to statutes, and section 10 would make it effective upon passage and approval.

SENATOR KRASNER:

Section 1 of the bill, section 1.060 of the Charter, subsection 3, states that Carson City would realign districts whenever there is reliable evidence. What would be considered reliable evidence?

MR. WOODBURY:

I do not have an answer for you. To my knowledge, as long as I have been in Carson City, outside of the census process, the Carson City Clerk has never realigned ward boundaries. The only situation I can imagine that occurring is through an annexation process.

SENATOR KRASNER:

I understand what you are saying. However, you are asking us to change the law to allow Carson City to realign wards based on reliable evidence. I cannot decide what determines reliable evidence. Reliable is a new word in this part of NRS.

Section 1 of the bill, section 1.060 of the Charter, subsection 4, states that realigning the boundaries could happen any time "in any year in which a general election is held during the period beginning 30 days immediately preceding the first day." If you have reliable evidence, could you do this every two years?

MR. WOODBURY:

Yes, if there is reliable evidence.

SENATOR KRASNER:

We do not know what reliable evidence is.

MR. WOODBURY:

I do not know what that is because that process has never been engaged. I will address the issue with the Carson City Clerk to provide that information to you.

SENATOR KRASNER:

Does Carson City need approval from the Legislature if it were to do this based on reliable evidence? It could be every two years.

MR. WOODBURY:

The Carson City Board of Supervisors would have the authority to realign the wards of Carson City without legislative approval.

SENATOR DALY:

You do not have ward-only votes for supervisor—everybody runs citywide?

MR. WOODBURY:

That is correct.

SENATOR DALY:

That is fine. Many other jurisdictions have gone to the ward-only voting. Carson City is small; supervisors act as the city council and county commissioners at the same time.

The question is regarding the 5 percent difference, which is not uncommon. It is in the City of Sparks Charter, and Senate District 16 gets that information from the State Demographer. A variety of other agencies get updates on population. I do not have an issue with that. However, if everyone is running for election citywide, the timing of realignment does not make much difference unless it is being done to exclude someone from a district. That would never happen if other provisions prevented that.

MR. WOODBURY:

I do not have any additional information. For purposes of an election, the only thing the wards pertain to is the fact that a supervisor must live in the ward to run for that ward's seat. It is an at-large election for candidates.

SENATOR DALY:

If realignment were done in an election year, could you draw a sitting Legislator out of his or her district? Think about ensuring that could not happen.

MR. WOOD:

We would be happy to do additional research into the Charter, see if there is anything existing and get back to you.

CHAIR FLORES:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 16 and open the hearing on S.B. 20.

SENATE BILL 20: Revises provisions relating to the process for filling a vacancy in a board of county commissioners. (BDR 20-393)

JENNIFER BERTHIAUME (Nevada Association of Counties):

Senate Bill 20 addresses the issue of vacancies on local boards of county commissioners. When a vacancy occurs on a board of county commissioners, the Governor appoints a person of the same political party as the most recent holder of the vacant office. However, no requirement exists for consultation or coordination with local government.

Senate Bill 20 amends NRS 244.040 to allow a board of county commissioners to establish a process via ordinance to fill vacancies occurring on the board. If a board of county commissioners chooses not to create an ordinance process, then the Governor would appoint someone to the vacant position, reverting to the existing process.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

This is an intriguing bill. I want to make sure I understand. A board of county commissioners could install a process by ordinance to select a county commissioner to a vacant seat without going to the Governor.

MS. BERTHIAUME:

That is correct.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

That gives me some qualms because some of the smaller boards have only three members. If one member resigns, with a three-member board it could be difficult to choose the third one without going to the Governor. I would like to see this amended so the Governor is engaged in some way if there is an ordinance process.

Through an ordinance process, there could be a stacked board. It could be a couple of years before the voters have proper representation. A five-member board would not be such a problem, but a three-member board in a small rural community could be a train wreck. We have all seen boards too one-sided which is why someone would resign. The two remaining members would do whatever they want.

I met with you and your director but after looking at the bill, I am apprehensive about the language. There should be some oversight with those smaller boards.

SENATOR DALY:

My view is similar to my colleague from Eureka. Smaller boards have potential issues. Does this bill only address county commissions?

Ms. BERTHIAUME:

Yes, only county commissions.

SENATOR DALY:

As written, S.B. 20 is like a blank check to the county. It can put whatever it wants into its selection process—no minimums and no limits. I do not have a problem with the appointment, perhaps there should be a population cap for smaller counties to address that concern.

An ordinance could be adopted, but there should be a process prescribed in the ordinance such as: minimum qualifications; possibly allowing overlapping districts, different districts or different political parties; an application process with time limits; an interview in a closed meeting with the selection done in a public meeting. These are just a few things that could be in an ordinance.

The only thing I am comfortable giving you is the ability to make the appointment and not have to go to the Governor. However, there must be some guidelines that are not different in 16 counties. I say 16 because there is

a different process in Carson City's Charter for filling vacancies to the equivalent of a county commissioner.

MS. BERTHIAUME:

We will take your comments into consideration.

CHAIR FLORES:

What is the rationale and logic of the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) in moving forward with this bill? What is the process now when there is a vacancy on a county board of commissioners? Is there transparency, and who is involved in it? Is that the preferred method versus allowing the creation of an ordinance and rules? Were there meetings to engage in this conversation? Is there going to be public participation?

It would be helpful for the Committee to understand what is happening now versus what you are hoping this bill will accomplish later. Could you walk the Committee through some of those conversations?

MS. BERTHIAUME:

The Governor makes the appointments. This year, Governor Joe Lombardo appointed a Lyon County commissioner, and the Eureka County Commission has a vacancy. Former Governor Steve Sisolak made five appointments from 2019 to 2022. The only consideration is for the same political party. In those instances, I do not know whether there was consultation with the local government.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I have been involved in this process for a long time, including my own seat. I had to vacate a county commission seat when I was elected to the Assembly. At that time, it was an unwritten rule that the party of whoever was vacating the seat submitted three recommendations to the Governor. However, he did not have to appoint someone from those three. That is not in statute. If we are going to deal with this, we need guidelines in the process. If a member leaves a three- or five-member board, the voters have no say in the process.

Eureka County has been in that process for about six weeks. Its three-member board has been functioning with two members. I heard one of the members say he was going to quit. I agree that we need a process, but it must be clearer. I do not like a board being able to create an ordinance and say this is how we

are going to fix it next week. I realize it is all public process with a hearing to adopt the ordinance. In these small counties, nobody is paying attention to the ordinance, and nobody goes to the public hearing.

SENATOR DALY:

There is no requirement for the Governor to communicate or do anything else other than the appointee must be in the same political party. There must be other considerations. The person would have to meet county commission rules, such as live in the district and be a registered voter. There are other qualifications, but that is where it gets vague. What constitutes a suitable person? Suitable is not defined.

You can get some basic information from almost any of the city charters on how they fill vacancies, so you do not have to start from scratch. That way there will not be 16 different rules on how to do this; all the counties would be in line, and it would create transparency. People would have a better idea about the requirements to apply. More people might apply, and there would be a broad base of applicants to choose from.

MARY WALKER (Douglas County; Lyon County; Storey County):
Douglas County, Lyon County and Storey County support S.B. 20.

This bill originally came out because Lyon County had a vacancy when one of its members ran for election in the Assembly. The Lyon County Commission went for months with only four members, which was difficult.

The process in law is the Governor appoints. The county does not get involved. There is no participation from the community because it is not an open meeting. Yet, someone who is hundreds of miles away will be appointing a person to represent the community. There is a big disconnect.

Cities can appoint their members when there is a vacancy. It is the same with school districts. This bill would put counties on the same plane as governing boards of other jurisdictions.

More than anything, we would like to see a faster process open to the public with community applications. We want to ensure we are picking the right representative. When someone makes a decision on important local government issues without it being a public decision, without talking about it in public before

the community, in front of the newspapers, it is almost the opposite of open government. Instead, we have a closed process where one person is making that decision without any Open Meeting Law considerations. We would like to open that process up to the public.

CHAIR FLORES:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 20 and open the hearing on S.B. 21.

SENATE BILL 21: Revises certain classifications based on populations. (BDR 20-391)

MS. BERTHIAUME:

Senate Bill 21 proposes to amend NRS 244 to adjust population thresholds from 45,000 to 52,000 to reflect the results of the 2020 U.S. Census, last addressed by the Legislature in 2011 on a much larger scale.

This bill is much narrower in scope but intends to address some matters affecting rural counties. Specifically, this would allow rural counties to continue business operations in a manner consistent with lower population density. The intent of this bill would allow these counties to continue to serve the public efficiently while maximizing public resources with the continued level of public service their communities have come to expect.

Section 1 of the bill allows counties under the 52,000 population cap to combine or separate county offices. Sections 2, 3, 8 and 12 adjust requirements for appraisers of real property. Sections 5, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18, 19 and 21 are permissive, giving smaller counties the ability to do such things as have less restrictive standards for manufactured homes and create planning commissions. In addition, our proposal maintains the definition of rural for these counties.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Some counties are on the edge. Did you reach out to Elko County? Would it want to be in there over the 52,000 cap? Should the cap be 54,000?

MS. BERTHIAUME:

All NACO member counties were consulted in the creation of S.B. 21. As of the last census, Elko County was just over the 52,000 threshold. It did not have an issue with this bill.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 22, 2023
Page 16

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

It did not have an issue and did not want to be rolled down to the lower threshold. It is about 1,500 people. That is fine.

SENATOR DALY:

Which counties are above 45,000 but below 52,000?

Ms. BERTHIAUME:

That would be two counties, Douglas County and Nye County.

Ms. WALKER:

Douglas County supports S.B. 21.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank. Signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Government Affairs
February 22, 2023
Page 17

CHAIR FLORES:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 21. This meeting of the Senate Committee on Government Affairs is adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Suzanne Efford,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 16	C	6	Stephen Wood	Carson City Charter Review Committee Minutes February 24, 2022
S.B. 16	D	6	Stephen Wood	Carson City Charter Review Committee Minutes April 12, 2022
S.B. 16	E	6	Stephen Wood	Carson City Charter Review Committee Minutes May 17, 2022
S.B. 16	F	6	Stephen Wood	Carson City Board of Supervisors Meeting Minutes July 21, 2022