



MINUTES

Reno City Charter Committee Hybrid Meeting

**Reno City Hall, 7th Floor Caucus Room
1 East First Street Reno, NV 89501
Monday, June 10, 2024
5:30 p.m.**

Members:

Austin Brown (Ward 5), Chair
Dennis Green (At-Large), Vice Chair
Alexandra Pipitone (Mayor)
John Marshall (Ward 1)
Stacey Shinn (Ward 2)
Zachary Khan (Ward 3)
Margo Piscevich (Ward 4)

Tess Opferman (Senate Majority)
Lilith Baran (Senate Majority)
Ronda Clifton (Senate Minority)
Edward Coleman (Assembly Majority)
Peter Larsen (Assembly Majority)
Miranda Hoover (Assembly Minority)

Staff Liaison: Nic Ciccone

A. Introductory Items

A1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Brown, Green, Pipitone, Marshall, Shinn, Khan, Piscevich, Opferman, Clifton.

Absent: Baran, Coleman, Larsen, Hoover.

Reno City Clerk, Mikki Huntsman, stated Reno City Charter Committee Member, Lilith Baran, was present starting at 5:35 p.m.

A2. Public Comment – This item is for either public comment on any action item or any general public comment and is limited to no more than three (3) minutes for each commentator.

Ms. Huntsman stated for members of the public wishing to attend the meeting and wish to provide public comment could preregister using the link, <https://links.reno.gov/CharterCommittee-06-10-24>

No other public comment registered.

A3. Approval of the Agenda (For Possible Action) – June 10, 2024

Member Shinn moved to approve the June 10th, 2024, Reno City Charter Committee Meeting Agenda. Member Green seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Members Coleman, Larsen, and Hoover absent.

A4. Approval of the Minutes (For Possible Action) – May 6, 2024

Member Green moved to approve the May 6th, 2024, Reno City Charter Committee Meeting Minutes. Member Clifton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Members Coleman, Larsen, and Hoover absent.

A5. Staff Liaison Report – Item for general announcements and informational items only. No action may be taken on this item.

Mr. Ciccone stated this was the last meeting before meeting with the City Council and would be assisting the Committee through the business items.

B. Business Items

B1. Discussion and potential approval of the Reno City Charter Committee's Final Report to present to the Reno City Council (For Possible Action)

Mr. Ciccone stated on July 24th, 2024, he would be presenting the general Bill Drafts to request ideas and receive the Reno City Council's feedback. He stated they would not make an action or vote on the Bill Draft Request (BDR) at that time. He stated on July 29th, 2024, the Committee would meet with the Reno City Council and present their recommendations along with the final report for the Reno City Council to accept or deny but they would not make an action or vote on the Bill Draft Request. He stated on August 14th, 2024, the Reno City Council would decide what Bill Draft Requests they would like to move forward with.

Reno City Charter Committee Member, Margo Piscevich, asked Mr. Ciccone what would happen if the Reno City Council does not want to go forward with the BDRs presented by the Committee. Mr. Ciccone stated if they did not accept the BDRs; the Committee was allowed to find a separate representative for the BDRs.

Reno City Charter Committee Chair, Austin Brown, asked Mr. Ciccone how many BDRs the City of Reno received. Mr. Ciccone stated the City of Reno received about two BDRs.

Reno City Charter Committee Member, Stacey Shinn, asked Mr. Ciccone if there were other BRDs that Mr. Ciccone would be suggesting. Mr. Ciccone stated the discussion would be based on ideas and discussions from staff and other committees. Ms. Shinn asked Mr. Ciccone to confirm the stages

previously stated. Mr. Ciccone confirmed the previously stated meeting timeline that will take place with the City Council.

Mr. Ciccone stated he attempted to make the language clear regarding terms and was open to feedback regarding the amended language. He stated there were no other changes.

Ms. Piscevich asked Mr. Ciccone about the Vacancy Section of the request since it seemed to have a conflict with Section 2. She was concerned they were inconsistent. City of Reno Assistant City Attorney, John Shipman, stated he believed Section 1 referred to appointments. Ms. Piscevich stated she believed Section 2 also referred to appointments. Mr. Shipman stated Section 1 referred to appointments and Section 2 referred to special elections. Ms. Piscevich asked Mr. Shipman if an individual would be in the position for 100 days versus 160. Mr. Shipman stated if there was 100 days left it would proceed to an appointment. Ms. Piscevich asked why it was in Section 1 if it was an appointment. Mr. Shipman stated there had to be an appointment mechanism. Ms. Piscevich stated it did not make sense, but she would accept it. Mr. Shipman further explained the appointment mechanism and that if it was less than 180 days the position would not want to be left open. Ms. Piscevich asked Mr. shipman if Section 1 was regarding appointments within 180 days. Mr. Shipman stated it was and for Municipal judges. Ms. Piscevich stated this was also stated in another section and was not clear.

Reno City Charter Committee Member, Ronda Clifton, stated the section referred to otherwise provided circumstances.

Ms. Piscevich stated she believed the verbiage was stated twice and did not understand the need. She stated the word “shall” instead of “must” should have been used since it was the legal word. Mr. Shipman stated in Chapter 0, “must” was used in worst case scenario.

Mr. Ciccone stated “must” expresses a requirement when the subject was a thing whether the verb was active or passive. The subject was a natural person, and the verb was in the passive voice or only a condition precedent and not a duty as opposed. He stated “shall” imposed a duty to act.

Ms. Piscevich stated she believed the verbiage should be changed to “shall”.

Mr. Shipman stated he was agreeable to it being changed.

Member Piscevich moved to approve the Reno City Charter Committee Final Report to present to the Reno City Council with the amendment of Section 2’s language being changed from “must” to “shall”. Member Opferman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Members Coleman, Larsen, and Hoover absent.

Mr. Ciccone asked if there was discussion needed about amendment 2, 3, and 4. No discussion made.

Member Clifton moved to approve the Reno City Charter Committee Final Report to present to the Reno City Council with the amendments 2, 3, and 4 presented. Member Piscevich seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Members Coleman, Larsen, and Hoover absent.

B2. Discussion and potential direction regarding the Reno City Charter Committee Chair's presentation to the Reno City Council at the Concurrent Reno City Council and Reno City Charter Committee meeting scheduled for July 29, 2024 (For Possible Action)

Mr. Brown stated there was not reference material for this item.

Mr. Ciccone stated the item referenced how the Committee would like the Chair or Presiding Officer to present the report to the City Council.

Mr. Brown stated Reno City Charter Committee Vice Chair, Dennis Green, would be taking point on the presentation.

Ms. Piscevich asked if it was required for the whole Committee to attend the meeting. Mr. Ciccone stated it was a joint concurrent meeting.

Mr. Brown stated he was agreeable to PowerPoint and the way the report was laid out.

Ms. Piscevich asked for clarification on the dates of the meetings. Mr. Ciccone and Mr. Brown clarified the meetings that needed to be attended by the Committee. Ms. Piscevich asked if the July 24th, 2024, meeting was open to the public. Mr. Ciccone stated it was.

Mr. Ciccone stated the City of Reno received two BDRs based upon population.

Ms. Shinn stated she believed it was unique for the City of Reno to be able to present BDRs to the legislature.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Green if there was anything he needed for support on the presentation. Mr. Green stated the attendance of the Committee was appreciated and for them to ask questions regarding changes.

Ms. Shinn stated she wanted to discuss expectations for the Committee on how they want to see things progress in the legislature, for example a possible lobby day. She stated she wanted to know what Members wanted to contribute to the

session.

Reno City Charter Committee Member, John Marshall, asked if there was a request made for an amendment allowing the Charter to give the City of Reno a BDR for Charter Committee Bill. He stated this would allow for the City Council to not have to choose between various legislative needs and the Charter recommendations. Mr. Ciccone stated at the previous session there was a bill to allow all cities in the State of Nevada to do the above scenario, however, the bill was put to the side due to the session feeling there were too many BDRs. Mr. Ciccone stated the Committee could do it but wanted to make sure they were aware of the history.

Ms. Shinn asked if the request was for municipalities to have an extra BDR specifically for their Charters. Mr. Ciccone confirmed.

Ms. Piscevich asked why the Committee could not request again. Ms. Shinn stated in her opinion it would not be going within the City of Reno route and would be better to find an independent legislator to represent.

Mr. Marshall stated he was concerned about timing and feared the City Council would not approve any of the Charter proposals due to other priorities.

Ms. Clifton asked if there was any historical references to the Charter Committee pushing to have their own BDR approved separately. Mr. Ciccone stated the Charter Committees across the state were set up differently. He stated due to smaller cities being only able to present one BDR the request for a separate Charter BDR was presented. He stated it had made discussion at the legislator, but he was not aware of any City being able to do this in the State of Nevada.

Ms. Piscevich asked if there was a recommendation by the Charter that if the City of Reno did not choose to represent, was there a way to push it to the legislator. Mr. Brown stated that would be when the Committee found an independent representative. Ms. Piscevich stated that she believed every Charter Committee should have the right to have some say.

Reno City Charter Committee Member, Tess Opferman, asked what the City structure would be if the City Council does not accept the Charters recommendations, does the Committee still receive staff assistance. Mr. Ciccone stated the bylaws accepted would allow the Committee Chair to call for a meeting for reconsideration.

Ms. Clifton stated different positions used to be able to combine into one BDR and asked if this would be possible. Mr. Ciccone stated the Legislative Council Bureau understanding was that there must be a nexus between the two requests.

Ms. Shinn stated since the job of the Committee is to propose changes to the Charter, how would they propose a Statewide statute change. Mr. Ciccone stated the previous history that was given was referencing a different Committee and he believed Mr. Marshall was requesting a section to be added to the Reno City Charter Committee for an extra BDR. Ms. Shinn stated this was not something any other city did and would then create a precedent. Mr. Shipman stated it was not superseding the statute but creating another avenue for the City of Reno to have another BDR for Charter.

Ms. Piscevich asked how many items can be in the BDR. Mr. Brown stated the Committee was including 4 items.

Ms. Clifton asked if this request could be separate from the 4 items. Mr. Brown stated this would be a 5th amendment added.

Mr. Shipman stated it would be his recommendation to open another meeting for this amendment.

Mr. Marshall stated that the City Council might not accept their recommendations due to other priorities and in that scenario the Committee could take the recommendations to the legislature in another route but also add the justification for the need of an extra BDR. Mr. Shipman stated this scenario could work and the Committee could also ask the City Council to pass the Committee with getting their own BDR. Mr. Marshall stated he was not concerned with the City Council disagreeing with the requests but was more concerned with them having other priorities placing the Charter recommendations for a later time. Mr. Marshall stated he would recommend tabling the discussion and witness what happens with the possibility of it becoming necessary later.

Ms. Shinn asked if another legislature brought the bill back, could the Committee agree to support the bill without the approval of the City Council. Mr. Ciccone stated they would be. Ms. Shinn stated she was not against more BDRs.

Mr. Brown stated Mr. Green will be the point of contact presenting the recommendations with the support of the Committee at the meeting.

Ms. Shinn asked if Mr. Ciccone would be able to discuss with the City Council the possibility of the Committee suggesting the additional BDR. Mr. Ciccone stated he could but would not be advocating for the BDRs.

Mr. Marshall stated it would be recommended to discuss this with the City Council after the joint meeting. Mr. Ciccone stated he believed it would be

recommended to discuss it at the concurrent meeting. Mr. Marshall stated there was nothing stopping with City Council from adding an amendment. Mr. Ciccone stated it would be better for the recommendation to come from the Committee and not him. Mr. Marshall stated he was not disagreeing with him but it was something the City Council could do on their own initiative.

Mr. Brown stated this was a discussion Mr. Green could present with the report.

Mr. Ciccone stated the left-over language from the amendments made state December 31st, 2023. He stated it was not a new proposal from the Committee but an amendment to the gender terms.

Member Clifton moved to approve Vice Chair Green presenting to the Reno City Council at the Concurrent Reno City Council and Reno City Charter Committee meeting scheduled for July 29th, 2024, with the assistance of the Committee if needed and to mention the discussion of an additional BDR to the Reno City Council. Member Shinn seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with Members Coleman, Larsen, and Hoover absent.

C. Board/Commission/Committee Member Reports and Announcements – Limited to items that do not appear elsewhere on the agenda. No action may be taken on this item.

None.

D. Future Agenda Items – Discussion of items for future agendas. No action may be taken on this item.

Ms. Shinn asked if there was need for discussion regarding concerns for the process during the session. Mr. Shipman stated collectively acting in concert was when open meeting law was violated.

Ms. Clifton stated after the July 29th, 2024, meeting if there were concerns a discussion would be needed.

Ms. Shinn stated if the City Council decided to accept the BDRs presented what was then the role of the Committee during the session. Ms. Opferman stated clarity was needed but was difficult to organize these concerns until the BDR was approved. Mr. Brown agreed. Ms. Piscevich stated November would be a good time to meet.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Ciccone if this was a discussion that needed to be decided at this meeting. Mr. Ciccone stated it cannot be decided at this meeting per open meeting law.

E. Public Comment – This item is for either public comment on any action item or for any general public comment and is limited to no more than three (3) minutes for each commentator.

Mr. Marshall stated he wanted to thank Chair brown and Vice Chair Green for their hard work.

F. Adjournment (For Possible Action)

Mr. Brown adjourned the meeting at 6:34 p.m.

DRAFT