

BILL NO. 91-49

ORDINANCE No. 3606

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS; AMENDING TITLE 14, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 30, OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1983 EDITION, TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGE IS COMPUTED; DELETING SECTION 40 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER IN ITS ENTIRETY TO ELIMINATE THE BILLING CHARGE; AMENDING SECTION 160 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF THE SURCHARGE FROM \$2.56 TO \$2.51 PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT; AMENDING SECTION 210 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO PROVIDE A GRADUATED SCHEDULE FOR THE INCREASE OVER THE SUCCEEDING FIVE YEARS IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS IS COMPUTED; PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.

Sponsored by: Summary: Increases rate per equivalent residential unit for sewer service charges and occupancy fees for sewer connections.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 30, of the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.04.030: The charge rate per ERU for a particular user shall be as given below:

User	Annual Charge per ERU	11-1-91	7-1-93
Domestic strength users	[\$ 87.00]	<u>\$116.80</u>	<u>\$138.80</u>
High strength users			
Bottlers	[123.00]	<u>165.12</u>	<u>196.20</u>
Dairies	[114.00]	<u>153.04</u>	<u>181.92</u>
Restaurants with			
garbage grinders	[164.00]	<u>220.16</u>	<u>261.60</u>
Laundries	[115.00]	<u>154.40</u>	<u>183.48</u>

SECTION 2: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 40, of the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is hereby deleted in its entirety.

SECTION 3: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 160, of the

1 Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is
2 hereby amended to read as follows:

3 14.04.160: There is established and imposed upon the customers
4 of the City's sewage disposal system, effective as of [Septem-
5 ber 1, 1990,] July 1, 1991, a surcharge in the amount of two
6 dollars and [~~fifty-six~~] fifty-one cents per equivalent residen-
7 tial unit. Each customer shall pay to the City annually, as his,
8 her or its proportionate share of the service charge due from the
9 City to Clark County pursuant to Clark County Ordinance No. 730,
10 an amount equal to two dollars and [~~fifty-six~~] fifty-one cents
11 multiplied by the number of equivalent residential units charged
12 to such customer. The surcharge shall be billed annually to each
13 customer of the City's sewage disposal system, including those
14 whose properties are hereafter connected thereto, at the same
15 time as the customer's regular sewer charge and shall apply to
16 the calendar year in which it is billed; provided, however, that
17 the amount of such surcharge may hereafter be adjusted from time
18 to time to reflect any change effected by Clark County in such
19 service charge pursuant to Section 4(B) to 4(D), inclusive, of
20 Clark County Ordinance No. 730.

21 SECTION 4: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 210, of the
22 Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is
23 hereby amended to read as follows:

24 14.04.210: Subject to the annual evaluations provided for in
25 Section 14.04.220, on and after July 1, 1983, connection fees
26 within the City shall be determined as follows:

27 (A) User's class is determined.

28 (B) According to ERU schedule the number of ERU's for
29 the user is determined.

30 (C) The occupancy fee for sewer connections is calcu-
31 lated by multiplying the number of ERU's, com-
32 mencing on:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

- (1) [November 1, 1988, by five hundred seventy-five dollars;] November 1, 1991, by one thousand one hundred dollars;
- (2) [July 1, 1989, by six hundred dollars;] July 1, 1993, by one thousand two hundred dollars.
- [(3) July 1, 1990, by six hundred twenty-five dollars;
- (4) July 1, 1991, by six hundred fifty dollars; and
- (5) July 1, 1992, by six hundred seventy-five dollars.]

SECTION 5: If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase in this ordinance or any part thereof, is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this ordinance or any part thereof. The City Council of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.

SECTION 6: All ordinances or parts of ordinances, sections, subsections, phrases, sentences, clauses or paragraphs contained in the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada,
 . . .
 . . .
 . . .
 . . .
 . . .

1 1983 Edition, in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

2 PASSED, ADOPTED AND APPROVED this 19th day of September,
3 1991.

4 APPROVED:

5
6 BY *Jan Laverty Jones*
7 JAN LAVERTY JONES, MAYOR
OK 9-26-91 RAW

8 ATTEST:

9 *Kathleen M. Tighe*
10 KATHLEEN M. TIGHE, CITY CLERK

11 The above and foregoing ordinance was first proposed and
12 read by title to the City Council on the 7th day of August,
13 1991, and referred to the following committee composed of
14 Councilmen Hawkins Jr. and Nolen
15 for recommendation; thereafter the said committee reported
16 favorably on said ordinance on the 19th day of September, 1991,
17 which was a rescheduled meeting of said Council; that at said
18 rescheduled meeting, the proposed ordinance was read by
19 title to the City Council as amended and adopted by the following
20 vote:

21 VOTING "AYE": Councilmen, Adamsen, Higginson and Mayor Jones

22 VOTING "NAY": Councilmen Nolen and Hawkins Jr.

23 ABSENT: NONE

24 APPROVED:

25
26 BY *Jan Laverty Jones*
27 JAN LAVERTY JONES, MAYOR
OK 9-26-91 RAW

28 ATTEST:

29 *Kathleen M. Tighe*
30 KATHLEEN M. TIGHE, CITY CLERK
31
32

SEE SECOND AMENDMENT

FIRST AMENDMENT

BILL NO. 91-49

ORDINANCE No. _____

THE FIRST AMENDMENT WAS VERBALLY DISCUSSED AT RECOMMENDING, BUT NOTHING WAS PROPERLY PUT IN WRITING; THEREFORE, TECHNICALLY, THE SECOND AMENDMENT IS REALLY THE FIRST AMENDMENT FOR WRITTEN PURPOSES.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

SEE FIRST AMENDMENT

* BILL NO. 91-49

ORDINANCE No. _____

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS; AMENDING TITLE 14, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 30, OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1983 EDITION, TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGE IS COMPUTED; DELETING SECTION 40 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER IN ITS ENTIRETY TO ELIMINATE THE BILLING CHARGE; AMENDING SECTION 160 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF THE SURCHARGE FROM \$2.56 TO \$2.51 PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT; AMENDING SECTION 210 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO PROVIDE A GRADUATED SCHEDULE FOR THE INCREASE OVER THE SUCCEEDING FIVE YEARS IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS IS COMPUTED; PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.

Sponsored by: Summary: Increases rate per equivalent residential unit for sewer service charges and occupancy fees for sewer connections.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 30, of the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.04.030: The charge rate per ERU for a particular user shall be as given below:

Table with columns: User, Annual Charge per ERU (10-1-91, 7-1-93). Rows include Domestic strength users, High strength users (Bottlers, Dairies, Restaurants with garbage grinders, Laundries).

SECTION 2: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 40, of the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is hereby deleted in its entirety.

SECTION 3: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 160, of the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is

1 hereby amended to read as follows:

2 14.04.160: There is established and imposed upon the customers
3 of the City's sewage disposal system, effective as of [Septem-
4 ber 1, 1990,] July 1, 1991, a surcharge in the amount of two
5 dollars and [~~fifty-six~~] fifty-one cents per equivalent residen-
6 tial unit. Each customer shall pay to the City annually, as his,
7 her or its proportionate share of the service charge due from the
8 City to Clark County pursuant to Clark County Ordinance No. 730,
9 an amount equal to two dollars and [~~fifty-six~~] fifty-one cents
10 multiplied by the number of equivalent residential units charged
11 to such customer. The surcharge shall be billed annually to each
12 customer of the City's sewage disposal system, including those
13 whose properties are hereafter connected thereto, at the same
14 time as the customer's regular sewer charge and shall apply to
15 the calendar year in which it is billed; provided, however, that
16 the amount of such surcharge may hereafter be adjusted from time
17 to time to reflect any change effected by Clark County in such
18 service charge pursuant to Section 4(B) to 4(D), inclusive, of
19 Clark County Ordinance No. 730.

20 SECTION 4: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 210, of the
21 Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is
22 hereby amended to read as follows:

23 14.04.210: Subject to the annual evaluations provided for in
24 Section 14.04.220, on and after July 1, 1983, connection fees
25 within the City shall be determined as follows:

26 (A) User's class is determined.

27 (B) According to ERU schedule the number of ERU's for
28 the user is determined.

29 (C) The occupancy fee for sewer connections is calcu-
30 lated by multiplying the number of ERU's, com-
31 mencing on:

32 (1) [November 1, 1988, by five hundred seventy-

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

five dollars;] October 1, 1991, by one thousand dollars;

(2) [July 1, 1989, by six hundred dollars;] July 1, 1993, by one thousand one hundred dollars.

[(3) July 1, 1990, by six hundred twenty-five dollars;

(4) July 1, 1991, by six hundred fifty dollars; and

(5) July 1, 1992, by six hundred seventy-five dollars.]

SECTION 5: If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase in this ordinance or any part thereof, is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this ordinance or any part thereof. The City Council of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.

SECTION 6: All ordinances or parts of ordinances, sections, subsections, phrases, sentences, clauses or paragraphs contained in the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada,
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

1983 Edition, in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

PASSED, ADOPTED AND APPROVED this ____ day of _____,
1991.

APPROVED:

By _____
JAN LAVERTY JONES, MAYOR

ATTEST:

KATHLEEN M. TIGHE, CITY CLERK

The above and foregoing ordinance was first proposed and
read by title to the City Council on the ____ day of _____,
1991, and referred to the following committee composed of

_____ and _____

for recommendation; thereafter the said committee reported
favorably on said ordinance on the ____ day of _____, 1991,

which was a _____ meeting of said Council; that at said
_____ meeting, the proposed ordinance was read by

title to the City Council as first introduced and adopted by the
following vote:

VOTING "AYE": _____

VOTING "NAY": _____

ABSENT: _____

APPROVED:

By _____
JAN LAVERTY JONES, MAYOR

ATTEST:

KATHLEEN M. TIGHE, CITY CLERK

SEE ASTERISK

BILL NO. 91-49

ORDINANCE No. _____

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS; AMENDING TITLE 14, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 30, OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1983 EDITION, TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGE IS COMPUTED; DELETING SECTION 40 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER IN ITS ENTIRETY TO ELIMINATE THE BILLING CHARGE; AMENDING SECTION 160 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF THE SURCHARGE FROM \$2.56 TO \$2.51 PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT; AMENDING SECTION 210 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO PROVIDE A GRADUATED SCHEDULE FOR THE INCREASE OVER THE SUCCEEDING FIVE YEARS IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS IS COMPUTED; PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HERewith.

Sponsored by: Summary: Increases rate per equivalent residential unit for sewer service charges and occupancy fees for sewer connections.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 30, of the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is hereby amended to read as follows:

14.04.030: The charge rate per ERU for a particular user shall be as given below:

Table with columns: User, Annual Charge per ERU (10-1-91, 7-1-93). Rows include Domestic strength users, High strength users (Bottlers, Dairies, Restaurants with garbage grinders, Laundries).

SECTION 2: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 40, of the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is hereby deleted in its entirety.

SECTION 3: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 160, of the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is

1 hereby amended to read as follows:

2 14.04.160: There is established and imposed upon the customers
3 of the City's sewage disposal system, effective as of [Septem-
4 ber 1, 1990,] July 1, 1991, a surcharge in the amount of two
5 dollars and [fifty-six] fifty-one cents per equivalent residen-
6 tial unit. Each customer shall pay to the City annually, as his,
7 her or its proportionate share of the service charge due from the
8 City to Clark County pursuant to Clark County Ordinance No. 730,
9 an amount equal to two dollars and [fifty-six] fifty-one cents
10 multiplied by the number of equivalent residential units charged
11 to such customer. The surcharge shall be billed annually to each
12 customer of the City's sewage disposal system, including those
13 whose properties are hereafter connected thereto, at the same
14 time as the customer's regular sewer charge and shall apply to
15 the calendar year in which it is billed; provided, however, that
16 the amount of such surcharge may hereafter be adjusted from time
17 to time to reflect any change effected by Clark County in such
18 service charge pursuant to Section 4(B) to 4(D), inclusive, of
19 Clark County Ordinance No. 730.

20 SECTION 4: Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 210, of the
21 Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, is
22 hereby amended to read as follows:

23 14.04.210: Subject to the annual evaluations provided for in
24 Section 14.04.220, on and after July 1, 1983, connection fees
25 within the City shall be determined as follows:

26 (A) User's class is determined.

27 (B) According to ERU schedule the number of ERU's for
28 the user is determined.

29 (C) The occupancy fee for sewer connections is calcu-
30 lated by multiplying the number of ERU's, com-
31 mencing on:

32 (1) [November 1, 1988, by five hundred seventy-

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

- five dollars;] October 1, 1991, by one thousand dollars;
- (2) [July 1, 1989, by six hundred dollars;] July 1, 1993, by one thousand dollars.
- [(3) July 1, 1990, by six hundred twenty-five dollars;
- (4) July 1, 1991, by six hundred fifty dollars; and
- (5) July 1, 1992, by six hundred seventy-five dollars.]

SECTION 5: If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase in this ordinance or any part thereof, is for any reason held to be unconstitutional or invalid or ineffective by any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity or effectiveness of the remaining portions of this ordinance or any part thereof. The City Council of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause or phrase thereof irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared unconstitutional, invalid or ineffective.

SECTION 6: All ordinances or parts of ordinances, sections, subsections, phrases, sentences, clauses or paragraphs contained in the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada,

. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .

1 1983 Edition, in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

2 PASSED, ADOPTED AND APPROVED this ____ day of _____,
3 1991.

4 APPROVED:

6 By _____
7 JAN LAVERTY JONES, MAYOR

8 ATTEST:

9 _____
10 KATHLEEN M. TIGHE, CITY CLERK

11 The above and foregoing ordinance was first proposed and
12 read by title to the City Council on the ____ day of _____,
13 1991, and referred to the following committee composed of

14 _____ and _____

15 for recommendation; thereafter the said committee reported
16 favorably on said ordinance on the ____ day of _____, 1991,

17 which was a _____ meeting of said Council; that at said
18 _____ meeting, the proposed ordinance was read by

19 title to the City Council as first introduced and adopted by the
20 following vote:

21 VOTING "AYE": _____

22 VOTING "NAY": _____

23 ABSENT: _____

24 APPROVED:

26 By _____
27 JAN LAVERTY JONES, MAYOR

28 ATTEST:

29 _____
30 KATHLEEN M. TIGHE, CITY CLERK

RECEIVED

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION 7 11 37 AM '91

CITY CLERK

PASTE CLIPPING HERE

SECOND AMENDMENT
BILL NO. 91-49
ORDINANCE NO. 3606

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS; AMENDING TITLE 14, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 30, OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1983 EDITION, TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGE IS COMPUTED; DELETING SECTION 40 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER IN ITS ENTIRETY TO ELIMINATE THE BILLING CHARGE; AMENDING SECTION 160 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF THE SURCHARGE FROM \$2.54 TO \$2.51 PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT; AMENDING SECTION 210 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO PROVIDE A GRADUATED SCHEDULE FOR THE INCREASE OVER THE SUCCEEDING FIVE YEARS IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS IS COMPUTED; PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.

SPONSORED BY: xxx
SUMMARY: Increases rate per equivalent residential unit for sewer service charges and occupancy fees for sewer connections.

The above and foregoing amended ordinance was first proposed and read by title to the City Council on the 7th day of August, 1991, and referred to the following committee composed of Councilmen Hawkins Jr. and Nolen, for recommendation; thereafter the said committee reported favorably on said amended ordinance on the 19th day of September, 1991, which was a RESCHEDULED meeting of said City Council; and that at said RESCHEDULED meeting the proposed ordinance was read by title to the City Council as amended and adopted by the following vote:

VOTING "AYE" Councilmen: Adamsen, Higginson, and Mayor Jones

VOTING "NAY" Councilmen: Nolen and Hawkins Jr.

ABSENT: NONE
COPIES OF THE COMPLETE ORDINANCE ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 10TH FLOOR, CITY HALL, 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.
PUB: September 28, 1991
Las Vegas Review-Journal

STATE OF NEVADA)
COUNTY OF CLARK)

SS:

TERINA L CHAPLIN, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That she/he is a legal clerk for the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL and THE LAS VEGAS SUN, daily newspapers regularly issued, published and circulated in the City of Las Vegas, County of Clark, State of Nevada, and that the advertisement, a true copy of which is attached, was continuously published in the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL or THE LAS VEGAS SUN for a period of ONE insertions from the period of SEPTEMBER 28, 1991 to SEPTEMBER 28, 1991, on the following days:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1991

Signed:

Terina L Chaplin

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

30th day of Sept, 1991

Maria C. Therien
Notary Public

MARIA C. THERIEN
Notary Public-State of Nevada
CLARK COUNTY
My Appointment Expires May 11, 1994

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

CITY CLERK

AUG 26 11 13 AM '91

RECEIVED

PASTE CLIPPING HERE

* BILL NO. 91-49
 AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS; AMENDING TITLE 14, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 30 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1983 EDITION, TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGE IS COMPUTED; DELETING SECTION 40 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER IN ITS ENTIRETY TO ELIMINATE THE BILLING CHARGE; AMENDING SECTION 160 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF THE SURCHARGE FROM \$2.56 TO \$2.51 PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT; AMENDING SECTION 210 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO PROVIDE A GRADUATED SCHEDULE FOR THE INCREASE OVER THE SUCCEEDING FIVE YEARS IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS IS COMPUTED; PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.
 SPONSORED BY: xxxx
 SUMMARY: Increases rate per equivalent residential unit for sewer service charges and occupancy fees for sewer connections.
 At a City Council meeting August 7, 1991
 BILL NO. 91-49 WAS READ BY TITLE AND REFERRED TO RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE: Councilmen Hawkins Jr. and Nolan
 COPIES OF THE COMPLETE ORDINANCE ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 10TH FLOOR, CITY HALL, 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.
 PUB: August 22, 1991
 Las Vegas Review-Journal

STATE OF NEVADA)
COUNTY OF CLARK)

SS:

TERINA L CHAPLIN, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That she/he is a legal clerk for the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL and THE LAS VEGAS SUN, daily newspapers regularly issued, published and circulated in the City of Las Vegas, County of Clark, State of Nevada, and that the advertisement, a true copy of which is attached, was continuously published in the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL or THE LAS VEGAS SUN for a period of ONE insertions from the period of AUGUST 22, 1991 to AUGUST 22, 1991, on the following days:

AUGUST 22, 1991

Signed:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

22nd day of Aug, 1991

Maria C. Therien
Notary Public

MARIA C. THERIEN
Notary Public-State of Nevada
CLARK COUNTY
My Appointment Expires May 11, 1994

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES

MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

AGENDA

City of Las Vegas

CITY COUNCIL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS • 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE

*Old
3606*

ITEM

ACTION

VI. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

BILLS ELIGIBLE FOR ADOPTION AT THIS MEETING

- 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS.

Committee: Councilmen Hawkins and Nolen

First Reading - 8/7/91

First Publication: R-J - 8/22/91

Recommending Committee - 8/19/91
HELD IN ABEYANCE UNTIL THE 9/3/91
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING

City Council - 8/21/91
No action taken

Recommending Committee - 9/3/91
HELD IN ABEYANCE UNTIL THE 9/16/91
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING

City Council - 9/4/91
No action taken

Recommending Committee - 9/16/91
**ADOPTION AT THE 9/19/91 CITY
COUNCIL MEETING AS PER FIRST
AMENDMENT.**

ADAMSEN - BILL ADOPTED as per Second Amendment - Motion carried with Hawkins and Nolen voting "NO"

Clerk to proceed with second publication

NOTE: COUNCILMAN HAWKINS requested Second Reading of BILL and made a motion to ADOPT as First Amendment with an annual service charge of \$116.00 and a \$1500 connection fee -- FIRST AMENDMENT WAS NEVER VOTED ON.

NOTE: COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN Made a motion amending Councilman's Hawkins motion that the Annual Rate be \$119.00 and the Sewer Connection Fee be \$1100 - the motion carried with Hawkins and Nolen voting "NO".

CITY MANAGER BILL NOONAN wanted to make sure the Bill that was being adopted was with the figures recommended in Option 1 - rate increase of \$119.31 effective on November 1 in lieu of October 1 and the new Connection Fee would go to \$1,100 and then would be increased to \$1,200 in 1994 as would the rate increase to \$141.31.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN stated he was referring to Option 1 in his motion.

NOTE: Verbatim transcript made part of Final Minutes.

(10:31 to 10:59 & 11:06 to 11:08)

TO:
The City Council

FROM:
Terri A. Williams
Terri A. Williams
Deputy City Attorney

SUBJECT:
Bill No. 91-49: Increases Rate Per Equivalent Residential Unit for
Sewer Service Charges and Occupancy Fees for Sewer Connections

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND

The services of CWC-HDR, Inc. were recently retained to conduct a sewer user charge study in order to determine whether or not the financing of the expansion and subsequent operating cost increases at the City's Water Pollution Control facility will require increases in the sewer service charges and the occupancy fees for sewer connections and, if so, to what extent. That study has now been completed and it recommends a two-step schedule of increases with respect to both the sewer service charges and the occupancy fees for sewer connections commencing October 1, 1991, and subsequently increasing again on July 1, 1993.

FISCAL IMPACT

The additional revenue that will be generated by the proposed increases approximates, and will be applied to the payment of, the annual debt services on the revenue/general obligatory bonds that the City will issue in order to finance the construction of an expansion of its wastewater treatment plant.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

Agenda Item

VI.A.1.

CITY OF LAS VEGAS
SEWER RATE INCREASE FOR FACILITY UPGRADE COSTS
RATE INCREASE EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 1991

OPTION #1

Description	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Operating expenses	10,095,039	10,890,285	14,617,786	15,711,852	16,891,414
Additional debt service cost on future bonds		5,358,100	5,358,100	5,358,100	5,358,100
Other debt service	6,010,840	6,009,340	6,006,441	6,017,508	6,029,498
Clark county AWT charges	395,248	405,129	415,257	425,639	436,280
Capital recovery	3,302,000	3,302,000	5,052,425	5,052,425	5,052,425
Total costs	19,803,127	25,964,854	31,450,009	32,565,524	33,767,717
Sewer service fees	18,950,385	21,261,428	25,839,104	26,733,069	27,659,572
Connection fees	4,826,983	5,843,200	6,607,200	6,848,400	7,099,200
Interest earned on investment of bond proceeds	767,845	1,656,400	1,500,500	138,500	0
Other income	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Total income	24,550,213	28,766,028	33,951,804	33,724,969	34,763,772
Net Income	4,747,086	2,801,174	2,501,795	1,159,445	996,056

	Increase	
New rate	119.31	29.2%
Incremental increase in FY 1994	141.31	18.4%
New connection fee	1,100.00	76.0%
Incremental increase in FY 1994	1,200.00	9.1%

CITY OF LAS VEGAS
SEWER RATE INCREASE FOR FACILITY UPGRADE COSTS
RATE INCREASE EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 1991

OPTION #2

Description	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Operating expenses	10,095,039	10,890,285	14,617,786	15,711,852	16,891,414
Additional debt service cost on future bonds		5,358,100	5,358,100	5,358,100	5,358,100
Other debt service	6,010,840	6,009,340	6,006,441	6,017,508	6,029,498
Clark county AWT charges	395,248	405,129	415,257	425,639	436,280
Capital recovery	3,302,000	3,302,000	5,052,425	5,052,425	5,052,425
Total costs	19,803,127	25,964,854	31,450,009	32,565,524	33,767,717
Sewer service fees	18,950,385	21,261,428	25,343,612	26,220,456	27,129,211
Connection fees	4,826,983	5,843,200	7,157,800	7,419,100	7,690,800
Interest earned on investment of bond proceeds	767,845	1,656,400	1,500,500	138,500	0
Other income	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Total income	24,550,213	28,766,028	34,006,912	33,783,056	34,825,011
Net Income	4,747,086	2,801,174	2,556,903	1,217,532	1,057,295

Increase

New rate	119.31	29.2%
Incremental increase in FY 1994	138.31	15.9%
New connection fee	1,100.00	76.0%
Incremental increase in FY 1994	1,300.00	18.2%

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 1

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

MAYOR JONES

Now go to Recommending Committees. Item 1 is Bill 91-49. Councilman Hawkins?

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Well, as you know, Your Honor, we've had some press on this and I'm sure that's why they're all here. But we've taken a lot of time and there's been a lot of effort expended to -- do what we all want to do and that's the right thing, for the best for the community. And hopefully we don't have any opposition but the recommendation was made by Councilman Nolen and myself to approve what we sent out of Recommending. And that would be to . . .

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

I -- have a question on it, Councilman. I've got before me a priority memo that has two options on it. And I assume that that's been distributed to the rest of the Council.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

Yes.

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

Yes, sir, it was.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

And -- it doesn't mention the option that came out of Recommending Committee.

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

That was before -- That memo was before . . .

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

This was done before?

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

. . . Recommending Committee, . . .

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

Alright. Has the rest of the Council been briefed? . . .

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

. . . which was direction. Remember, you asked that . . .

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

Have they been briefed?

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

. . . staff make our recommendations before your Committee met.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

Has the rest of the Council been briefed as to the recommendation that came out of Recommending Committee?

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

Yes, sir, they have.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

Thank you.

MAYOR JONES

Councilman Adamsen or Councilman . . .

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 2

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN Well, Your Honor, procedurally, I believe it'd be appropriate . . .

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Let -- me ask that . . .

MAYOR JONES You're not done here?

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS No, I'm not done. Let --

COUNCILMAN NOLEN Have it read first.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Yeah, let's have the Bill read.

MAYOR JONES Alright.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN That's -- what I was just going to point out, the procedure. That we'll have the Bill read, they will make their motion. It'll either be approved or fail and then we will take appropriate action.

ROY WOOFER, CITY ATTORNEY Bill No. 91-49, an ordinance relating to the sewer service charges and occupancy fees for sewer connections; amending Title 14, Chapter 4, Section 30, of the Municipal Code of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, 1983 Edition, to provide for an increase in the annual charge rate per equivalent residential unit upon which the sewer service charge is computed; deleting Section 40 of said Title and Chapter in its entirety to eliminate the billing charge; amending Section 160 of said Title and Chapter to reduce the amount of the surcharge from \$2.56 to \$2.51 per equivalent residential unit; amending Section 210 of said Title and Chapter to provide a graduated schedule for the increase over the succeeding five years in the annual charge rate for equivalent residential unit upon which the occupancy fees for sewer connections is computed; providing for other matter properly relating thereto and repealing all ordinances and parts of ordinances in conflict herewith.

MAYOR JONES Thank you.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS My motion's . . .

MAYOR JONES I would just like to make the comment although I fully understand Councilman Hawkins' position and his attempt to look out for the residents of the City of Las Vegas, that considering the information provided to us by staff that the penalty that is placed against new residents does not seem to be compensated by a large enough reduction in the overall fees, which would only amount to \$3.00 a year . . .

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 3

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

That's -- fine. Let me say, I guess we should start from the beginning. In the original proposal, that we're all very familiar with, it went from \$87 and somewhere in -- the neighborhood of from 124 to ending up to be 147. It was the recommendation of the Recommending Committee, myself and Councilman Nolen, that we table that and we asked that the experts go back and bring to us what would be equitable for the people that live here today. What is their fair share. We're not talking 15 years from now. And -- the experts brought back those numbers, which I really don't understand why in this priority memo here that that study that we tabled in the Recommending Committee and that came before the Council and we tabled on our last meeting did not end up in here and that what was sent around was what was basically proposed at first less the 60, 6.8 million that the City's not going to use, where we found a way to save money. But the recommendation was from the experts. It wasn't Frank Hawkins that created it. It was them saying this is a fair share and that fair share would be distributed amongst everybody equally. Now I know there are some concerns about saving \$400 for the developer, or not really the developer, to the homeowner. But the majority of the people that buy homes in the City of Las Vegas are the people that already own homes in Las Vegas. And -- to say that \$3.00 a month, for some people . . .

MAYOR JONES

No -- . \$3.00 a year. It's \$3.00 a year. -- It is not \$3.00 a month saving. And I think that needs to be on the record.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

But -- Go ahead.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

Thank you. I've got to say something. First off, I -- question the use of the word penalty. I don't think that sewer connection fee, regardless of what it says, we can assess the word penalty for the sewer connection fee. That's a fee. That's all it is. It's not a penalty fee. We're not penalizing anybody. We're just saying, hey, pick up your fair share of -- things that were, for the new home buyer, things that were paid for by the existing person that's been here all these years and paid for the expansion. Paid for all these things that have gone on that allows the capacity to serve them that is there now. This allows them to come in and build new homes. If we had not had the rate payer today paying for those expansions, we couldn't expand anyway. So there would be no new homes

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 4

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

or no new sewer connection fees to consider. So I don't think that we're penalizing anybody. I think we're strictly saying you're going to pick up a -- bigger piece of the pie, a fairer piece of the pie.

MAYOR JONES

I --

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

I think when you look at \$3.00 a year, it may not mean too much to -- yourself or -- myself. Three dollars a year isn't. But there's a lot of people out there, the people that specifically that Frank and I represent, that \$3.00 a month means a hell of a lot to them.

MAYOR JONES

Year.

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON

Year.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

And --

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

Well, \$3.00 a year. It means one hell of a lot to them. They're on fixed income and -- they have no way of getting anymore dollars. And you start, you -- take a dollar away from them here and a dollar away from them there. That's still money out of their pocket. And I -- think to -- feel some obligation to an as-yet unnamed constituent that may or may not buy a home in the City of Las Vegas and let that obligation override the obligation that we have to the people that live here right now is wrong. And I -- don't believe that it's unreasonable to -- expect a \$1,500 connection fee, to -- get our user rate down to \$116 rather than what's being proposed.

MAYOR JONES

I -- think that we need to further expand this. That -- staff has also advised us that in making the payments on the bond by affecting our cashflow, which the -- other alternative by the fees, is also in consideration. And that you have to remember that North Las Vegas does not pay sewer connection fees. So with the proposal of upping the charge, we're also subsidizing North Las Vegas. I would think that, there's no question that we're going to raise the sewer connection fee. The question is how much we raise it. What message that gives. And what the mitigating benefits of raising it from \$1,100 to \$1,500. And if the differential only provides a savings of \$3.00 a year, affects our ability to make our bond payments, and allows us to subsidize North Las Vegas, I think that needs to be taken into consideration.

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 5

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

But, Mayor, I don't think that's the case. And I know Councilmen Adamsen and Higginson are waiting patiently. And one of Councilman Adamsen's defenses was that it's going to deter -- home builders from building in the City of Las Vegas. Well, we all know that that's not true. And -- the other concern is that the County's already raised their rates. And I've talked to three of those County Commissioners, they're going to raise their rates again. And what, another concern by Councilman Adamsen was that what if our -- growth rate slows down. Well, if that's the case, we come back and raise the sewer rate. I don't think that that's a problem. But to say that we should do all these things for the future and what if and what if. Well, we're not at what if now.

MAYOR JONES

So you'd just like to jump it up now. Before we go any farther, maybe someone from staff would like to give their recommendations and speak to this? I see Rosemary's . . .

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Or do we . . .

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

Well, the only thing I wanted to clear up, Councilman Hawkins, is the direction we thought we had and that was, as I remember the one Recommending Committee -- meeting, that we would go back, because we didn't have exact figures as to the impact of what that 6.8 million dollars would do to the rate base because we had just done that on Friday before the Monday Recommending. Direction was to go back and run that through the computers and see what that did to the rate. That's where we found the rate went down before the dollar or \$120 per year and brought it down to the 119. I, you know, I didn't remember any other direction to go back and -- change it. I thought we were supposed to present those numbers to you and then let you decide what to do from that point forward.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Well, that's -- not what the experts brought back. And -- it's what . . .

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

No, that's true. That is true. And that's as a result of . . .

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Okay. Alright. And what -- I asked, and what -- all of our concern was at that meeting, what was doing what was fair and equitable and what was best for Las Vegas now today.

MAYOR JONES

We did come back with a reduction in the rate as compared to what was presented by the

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 6

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

consultant due to the negotiating efforts on the part of staff.

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY MANAGER Yes, Mayor. That's correct. That happened after the rate study was done by the experts.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Right.

MAYOR JONES Further comments?

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN Oh, many comments.

MAYOR JONES Oh, I thought -- there might be.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN I would like to personally thank Councilman Hawkins for putting words in my mouth.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS No problem.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN I don't know that if in fact I said the things he said I said. In our discussions there are different scenarios that need to be laid out. We are talking about an increase of \$3.00 a year. And we're talking about a concept instead of raising the sewer connection fee from \$575 to 1,100, we're talking about the possibility of raising it from \$575 to 1,500. There is a very significant difference there. To effect a \$3.00 a year change, to charge someone who like myself may buy a house in the future . . .

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS No, will buy a house.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN No, no. Someone like myself . . .

MAYOR JONES Don't put words in his mouth again.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN . . . who may buy a new house in the near future, you're saying that that person would have to pay \$400 additional sewer connection fee in order to effect a \$3.00 a year savings. Well, using my calculator, it's going to take me approximately 130 years to realize a break even point for living in my house by paying a \$400 connection fee by having a \$3.00 a year less of a sewer bill. We are talking about approximately \$10 a month. We are also talking about the viability and stability of our revenue stream to finance the bonds. This is not a question of increased capacity. This is a question of ammonia nitrates and phosphorous removal that is contributed equally by every section of this City, of the people that currently live here. If there's 500,000 people or 5,000,000 people, the Federal and State EPA says we will remove these contaminates from the water being

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 7

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

discharged into the Las Vegas Wash. That is my argument, Your Honor.

MAYOR JONES

Thank you.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Thank you. Just to comment on that -- from what the experts . . .

MAYOR JONES

I think he said -- Your Honor. That was my thank you.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

I understand what he said. I did say Your Honor.

MAYOR JONES

No, no, no. He said Your Honor. You said thank you. Just checking.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Your Honor. I understand what Councilman Adamsen's saying but --. The -- concern that I have is just the fair share of the people that live here and what is their fair share. That's all I asked, that's all we asked as a Council, for the experts to do. What is the fair share of the people living here. Now once this is cleared up, supposedly this is going to carry us for 15 years before EPA comes back and mandates some others, something -- else for us to do. So, . . . wait --

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

Well, there -- is a pending issue and that's toxicity.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Okay. Well, that's -- what the experts say. I'm just telling you what they said. You were at the meeting. But my concern is, so he's saying that these people that are already paying their fair share should also pay their fair share plus for 15 years.

MAYOR JONES

It's, I think we're confusing this issue. The fact is that the -- monthly rate is going to go up. The question is is it going to go up an extra \$3.00 a year, are you going to save them an extra \$3.00 a year by adding on an -- extra \$400 sewer connection fee . . .

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Let me ask our . . .

MAYOR JONES

It's not a question of what's going up or not.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Let me ask our -- Finance Director a question. He was in the meeting that -- I had with -- the experts and I -- understand that this is his, or staff's recommendation. Explain to me and to the people here why we did not go with the recommendation of the \$1,500 for the connection fee? That would have lowered the rate to \$116 and still, from what the experts

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

said and what they brought back; and if they're here, I'd like them to come up too; that would have provided the same dollar amounts necessary that we need in our pool. Now if there's a difference, please explain it to me.

MARVIN LEAVITT, DIRECTOR
FINANCE & COMPUTER SERV.

First of all, there is an almost infinite number of combinations you could derive on this rate that's in between the rate and connection fees. When -- I look at this issue, it appears to me that we're looking at something based on the stability of the revenue stream to pay off the bonds. We are talking about, and you just approved just a minute ago, starting the process for borrowing \$60,000,000, which is going to be a general obligation of the City. It's discussed being a general obligation and not even specifically upon the rate structure of the sewer system. This is going to be a general obligation of the City. It appears to me that there needs to be some type of a give and take between how much is assessed against the rate and how much is assessed against connection fees. Now obviously, when a large amount of the money to pay off the debt comes from connection fees, we are dependent on the growth in the community to pay off an existing debt. So obviously if that growth does not materialize, then the source that we had planned on to pay off that debt is no longer available to us. It seems to me that it is more conservative and would be viewed better by the bond community, by the rating agencies, and those who need to look at this debt that if we, especially considering the fact that what we're doing is adding additional treatment and not constructing additional facilities, it would be --. The way everyone would look at it, would be better to -- have the rate at a reasonable level and then combine that with an increase in the connection fee rather than having a small increase in the, smaller increase in the rate and be heavily dependent on, upon connection fees. That combined with the North Las Vegas situation essentially is the reason that I made a recommendation that I felt that the \$119 rate coupled with the connection fee of \$1,100 going to a \$141 rate in fiscal year '94 combined with a connection fee of \$1,200, I thought would be the most fair combination. And I might add that -- we ran a lot of them. We ran a lot of different combinations as we were looking at this process. And in the end that appeared to me at least to be the fairest combination that we could come out with.

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 9

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Well, why not the \$1,500 connection fee?

MARVIN LEAVITT, DIRECTOR FINANCE & COMPUTER SERV. The \$1,500 connection fee, as I indicated, my -- personal opposition to that is we are issuing debt the payment of which is going to be based upon new growth at the very time that we're in a recession.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Now, it -- was my understand that, from some people, that we were more concerned about what the heck the County was doing and because their rate is \$1,100, we didn't want to supersede that.

MARVIN LEAVITT, DIRECTOR FINANCE & COMPUTER SERV. That's obviously another concern. You know, anything that puts us in, at a disadvantage to other sections of the community, I would think would also be a concern. Although that's maybe not the primary one.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS So now, let me ask you a question. If and when in the next, in the near future the County raises their connection fee to \$1,600. Alright? Do we then come back and raise ours?

MARVIN LEAVITT, DIRECTOR FINANCE & COMPUTER SERV. I don't . . .

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS It is not our intent to do that but . . .

MAYOR JONES That's not the issue, no.

MARVIN LEAVITT, DIRECTOR FINANCE & COMPUTER SERV. I -- don't think there'd be any justification for ours to, for us to increase ours.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Well, the -- recommendation's on the floor.

MAYOR JONES I'd just like you to one more speak to on the 1,500 connection fee. At the 1,100 connection fee, the rate will be \$119 . . .

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS 116.

MAYOR JONES -- 119. At the 1,500, what will the rate be?

MARVIN LEAVITT, DIRECTOR FINANCE & COMPUTER SERV. At 1,500 the rate is \$116.31, as opposed to 119.

MAYOR JONES Motion's on the floor. Is there further discussion?

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON I haven't said anything.

MAYOR JONES I noticed.

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON Which is unusual, isn't it? You know, I sat here and trying to listen to the debate because frankly when I walked in the door I

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

hadn't decided where I was. And if the question that's before us is fairness, I guess I'm not convinced that \$3.00 is unfair. I think that's -- the bottomline. Perhaps we could use some of that dollars that we saved this morning, \$150,000 on the bid, and create a fund that would provide 50,000 residents the \$3.00 necessary, if -- required, to -- cover that.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

I -- would -- definitely approve that.

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON

I think we could, you know, if -- there's some people that have some real struggles with the \$3.00 a year, perhaps there's ways within the community to assist them with the \$3.00. But I have just one concern that I'd like to mention, concerning as someone said, these people are unnamed constituents. Well, that's not true. Some of them are, I know a lot of their names. They are moving out into my district and they're moving out into Arnie's district. And they're moving from district to district. They're moving within the districts. They are, these are Las Vegas. As Councilman -- Hawkins said, a lot of the folks who are buying new residences or new homes in our Valley are Las Vegas themselves. And, so they aren't unnamed people. It's a balance question. If you raise connection fees, you can have lower annual sewer bills. If you have higher annual sewer bills, you can lower connection bills. And I think staff's run enough models to come up with some, I think what's a fair newer rate versus a \$3.00 difference. The \$3.00 difference strikes me as not being an unfair situation. And I think if -- the question of fairness is before us, then I agree with that. And, of course, if you're basing it on the future, which there was some concern about, you know, we're basing all this on the future with our shortage of water, I think it's a much more risky venture for the selling of our bonds is to rely on a higher increase in connection fees. Because we don't know what's going to happen in the future because of the water issue. We don't know what our growth rate is going to be. And I think if we're relying on higher connection fees to me the obligation to sell the bonds, I think that's a much more risky venture than the \$3.00 per year increase in the sewer bill.

MAYOR JONES

Thank you. I think, Councilman Nolen . . .

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON

So now everybody knows how I feel.

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 11

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

Just a very brief final comment, Your Honor. First off, I think some of the comments that have been made are certainly appropriate and I believe they reflect the true feelings of the individuals that made them. I think though when you talk about people buying houses interdistrict, back and forth, and buying and selling, whatever. We're talking about a different caliber of people than -- most of the people Frank and I represent. Most of the people that Frank and I represent are not the ones that are out buying these homes and moving back and forth because they don't have the dollars. And they're the ones that we're trying to help and trying to protect and trying to take care of. I think certainly all citizens are concerned about the -- fairness of the rate. The problem is -- those folks are on a fixed income. Those folks who have no hope in the future of getting any additional dollars into their annual budget, are the ones that we're going to hit the hardest. But, you know, I -- can count to three and I've already done that. So I think we're not going to prevail on this. I do have one comment. And, of course, I think one of the things I've been concerned about for many years is the method of collection of this. We collect it on an annual basis, a one-time deal. We have made some arrangements for people to pay it periodically but we, when they do that, we tack on a \$5.00 fee for that. One of things I'd ask staff to look into is if this, regardless of how this goes today, is we look at possibly finding a way, rather than as you suggest, Councilman, subsidizing some folks with respect to payment of their bills which I think would be a dangerous precedent to set. Once we start subsidizing anybody, then we have a hard time closing that door to -- everyone. Would be to take a look at possibly setting up, without charge, a method of payment that would be more compatible to the lower and fixed income people, like on a monthly basis, when they have it. Because it's hard to keep it for the end of the year. Or it's hard to keep it quarterly or what have you. I know it does cost us to collect it that way but certainly I'd like for us to look at that.

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON

Well, I -- would concur with that. I know I get complaints from my constituents as well that they get this annual bill, lump, and as they're trying to budget their lives, believe me, it's not only folks living in their districts that have struggles with getting one big bill at once. It's throughout the City

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 12

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

and I think we ought to look at some way we can structure that to allow at least an alternative for other people.

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

We are doing that and the Department has been asked to look at a quarterly billing system that is very similar to what the County is currently doing, or has just started to do. We think that certainly has some merit and as the bills do increase, we think the quarterly procedure is something we should look at and look towards implementation.

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON

I'd like -- let me make just -- one more comment and then I promise I'll be quiet. You know, I feel like everybody else. I wish we didn't have to raise the sewer fees. I wish we didn't have before us this item. I wish we didn't have to pass it on to the constituents who live in Las Vegas. Unfortunately the Federal Government has mandated cleaner water coming out of our sewer treatment facility and in order to get that cleaner water, we have to raise the sewer fees to build the facilities. And I just think that what we have before us is an item that all of us wish wasn't here and that the, by doing that; and we're all trying to make sure that everybody is taken care of. We're all trying to make sure it's fair. And my only point was I don't think the \$3.00 difference is going to make that big of a difference.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

And in addition too, Your Honor, there's just one small item that needs to be brought out and that is everybody that sits up here also pays this yearly sewer fee.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

And in closing comment, I'd like to say to everybody out there that the Council has -- really done their best with what we've got to save everybody as much money as we can. And either way it goes, it's going to be better for you than what the experts first brought to us. And with that, we all tried to save all of us some money and -- accomplish the goal that -- EPA has required also. With that, I would call for the motion.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

I would ask for clarity. What's, what is the motion and . . .

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON

Thank you.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

. . . and is it, is the motion appropriate inasmuch as this has been amended. What amendment is this to Ordinance 91-49?

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 13

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

ROY WOOFER, CITY ATTORNEY First of all, I mean, I didn't hear the original motion. I mean, I'd like it restated.

MAYOR JONES Councilman Hawkins, restate your motion.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS The motion was to follow the recommendation that -- came from the Recommending.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN Recommending Committee? Which was what?

MAYOR JONES Recommending Committee said that they wanted the \$1,500 hookup fee.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN And the \$116.

MAYOR JONES That's what came out of Recommending.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS And 16.

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY MANAGER Right. Which is -- the \$116 annual service charge and the 1,500 connection.

ROY WOOFER, CITY ATTORNEY Yes. That'd be appropriate to be acted upon at this time.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN The question is is that an amendment to the original Bill 91-49 that was presented, and if so, what Amendment is that? Is this First Amendment?

ROY WOOFER, CITY ATTORNEY First Amendment.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN Okay. So the proper motion would be to follow the recommendation of the . . .

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Recommending Committee.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN . . . Recommending Committee and adopt Bill 91-49, First Amendment. Is that your motion?

ROY WOOFER, CITY ATTORNEY That is correct.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS That's the motion.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN And, Your Honor, at this time I would like to offer an amendment to the motion; that the Amendment be that the Annual Rate be 119.00, Sewer Connection Fee be \$1,100.00.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Then I'd say we vote on the first motion and see if it passes and then come back to his amendment.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN Procedurally you vote on the amendment.

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 14

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

COUNCILMAN NOLEN We have to vote on the amendment. He made an amendment.

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Okay.

MAYOR JONES All in favor.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN Of the amendment?

MAYOR JONES Of the amendment.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN Aye.

MAYOR JONES Aye.

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON Aye.

MAYOR JONES All opposed?

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS Aye.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN Aye.

MAYOR JONES The motion carries, the amended. (Motion approving amendment carried with NOLEN and HAWKINS voting "no")

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER Could we have a clarification on that? Was that 119.31? .31?

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN Yes, yes.

MAYOR JONES 119.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN .31.

MAYOR JONES So now do we need to vote on the other one or not?

COUNCILMAN NOLEN Yeah, now you need to vote on the -- . That amendment -- passed. Therefore, it'll be, the appropriate motion now would be to adopt Bill 91-49 Second Amendment, as amended.

MAYOR JONES Yes.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN Your Honor, at this point I would move that we approve Bill 91-49 Second Amendment.

MAYOR JONES All in favor.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN Aye.

COUNCILMAN HIGGINSON Aye.

MAYOR JONES Aye. All opposed?

COUNCILMAN NOLEN Aye.

CITY COUNCIL MINUTES
MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 19, 1991

Page 15

TRANSCRIPT -- REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. RECOMMENDING COMMITTEES

ITEM 1. BILL NO. 91-49 - INCREASES RATE PER
EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT FOR SEWER SERVICE
CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEE FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS

COUNCILMAN HAWKINS

Aye.

MAYOR JONES

Motion's approved. (Motion to approve amended Bill carried with NOLEN and HAWKINS voting "no")

DISCUSSION RESUMED:

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

And, Your Honor, if we could, could we go back to Bill 91-50, not 91-50.

CITY MANAGER NOONAN:

49.

MAYOR JONES

It's 91-49.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

91-41, for clarification.

MAYOR JONES

49.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

91-49. Bill?

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

Madam Mayor, we want to clarify for the record exactly what the motion was. There was some -- recommended changes that staff had made in the Bill that was presented and we want to be sure we know what Council approved. Option 1 that was presented by staff was the rate increase of 119.31 effective on November the 1st in lieu of October 1st, which was in the consultant's original study and was presented. Also, the new connection fees would go to \$1,100.00 and then would be increased to \$1,200.00 in 1994, as would the rate increase to 141.31. We want to make sure it was Option 1 is what Council did adopt. And effective November 1st.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

Yes. I was referring -- to Option 1 as outlined in priority memorandum.

COUNCILMAN NOLEN

For the record, Your Honor, when I voted against the passage of the Bill, it was my understanding that Option 1 was what I was voting against.

MAYOR JONES

So we don't need any action on that?

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

So we don't need any further action with that clarification, do we, Roy?

ROY WOOFER, CITY
ATTORNEY

No, based on the maker of the motion explaining or clarifying, sir.

COUNCILMAN ADAMSEN

Okay. Does that give you sufficient direction?

WILLIAM NOONAN, CITY
MANAGER

Thank you, sir.

(* * * END OF DISCUSSION * * *)

/vwd

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

Aug 30 11:27 AM '95

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK

PASTE CLIPPING HERE

BILL NO. 95-53

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO SIGNS; AMENDING TITLE 19, CHAPTER 91, OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1983 EDITION, TO CLARIFY THE REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS THAT APPLY TO SUBDIVISION DIRECTIONAL SIGNS, AND TO COMMERCIAL INDUSTRIAL WALL SIGNS AND GROUND SIGNS; PROVIDING FOR PENALTIES FOR THE VIOLATION HEREOF; PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.

SPONSORED BY: Councilman Arnie Adamsen
SUMMARY: Clarifies the requirements and limitations that apply to subdivision directional signs, and to commercial industrial wall signs and ground signs.
At a City Council meeting AUGUST 2, 1995
BILL NO. 95-53 WAS READ BY TITLE AND REFERRED TO RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE: Councilmen Adamsen and McDonald
COPIES OF THE COMPLETE BILL ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 5TH FLOOR, CITY HALL, 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.
PUB: August 17, 1995
Las Vegas Review-Journal

STATE OF NEVADA))
COUNTY OF CLARK)) SS:

BARBARA CARR, being first duly

sworn, deposes and says:

That she/he is a legal clerk for the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL and THE LAS VEGAS SUN, daily newspapers regularly issued, published and circulated in the City of Las Vegas, County of Clark, State of Nevada, and that the advertisement, a true copy of which is attached, was continuously published in the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL or THE LAS VEGAS SUN for a period of ONE insertions from the period of AUGUST 17, 1995 to AUGUST 17, 1995, on the following days:

AUGUST 17, 1995

Signed: Barbara Carr

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

17 day of Aug, 1995

Peggy J. Barron

Notary Public

PEGGY J. BARRON
Notary Public - Nevada
Clark County
My appt. exp. Feb. 17, 1998



085608

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

RECEIVED

OCT 7 11 37 AM '91

CITY CLERK

SECOND AMENDMENT
BILL NO. 91-47
ORDINANCE NO. 3606

PLACE HERE

AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS; AMENDING TITLE 14, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 30, OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1989 EDITION; TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGE IS COMPUTED; DELETING SECTION 40 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER IN ITS ENTIRETY TO ELIMINATE THE BILLING CHARGE; AMENDING SECTION 160 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF THE SURCHARGE FROM \$2.54 TO \$2.51 PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT; AMENDING SECTION 210 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO PROVIDE A GRADUATED SCHEDULE FOR THE INCREASE OVER THE SUCCEEDING FIVE YEARS IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS IS COMPUTED; PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.

SPONSORED BY: xxx
SUMMARY: Increases rate per equivalent residential unit for sewer service charges and occupancy fees for sewer connections.

The above and foregoing amended ordinance was first proposed and read by title to the City Council on the 7th day of August, 1991, and referred to the following committee composed of Councilmen Hawkins Jr. and Nolen, for recommendation; thereafter the said committee reported favorably on said amended ordinance on the 19th day of September, 1991, which was a RESCHEDULED meeting of said City Council; and that at said RESCHEDULED meeting the proposed ordinance was read by title to the City Council as amended and adopted by the following vote:

VOTING "AYE" Councilmen: Adomsen, Higginson, and Mayor Jones

VOTING "NAY" Councilmen: Nolen and Hawkins Jr.

ABSENT: NONE
COPIES OF THE COMPLETE ORDINANCE ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 10TH FLOOR, CITY HALL, 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.

PUB: September 28, 1991
Las Vegas Review-Journal

STATE OF NEVADA)
COUNTY OF CLARK)

SS:

TERINA L CHAPLIN, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That she/he is a legal clerk for the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL and THE LAS VEGAS SUN, daily newspapers regularly issued, published and circulated in the City of Las Vegas, County of Clark, State of Nevada, and that the advertisement, a true copy of which is attached, was continuously published in the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL or THE LAS VEGAS SUN for a period of ONE insertions from the period of SEPTEMBER 28, 1991 to SEPTEMBER 28, 1991, on the following days:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1991

Signed: Terina L Chaplin

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

30th day of Sept, 1991

Maria C. Therien
Notary Public

MARIA C. THERIEN
Notary Public-State of Nevada
CLARK COUNTY
My Appointment Expires May 11, 1994



084150

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

CITY CLERK

AUG 26 11 23 AM '91

RECEIVED

PASTE CLIPPING HERE

* BILL NO. 91-49
 AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGES AND OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS; AMENDING TITLE 14, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 30, OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1983 EDITION, TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE SEWER SERVICE CHARGE IS COMPUTED; DELETING SECTION 40 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER IN ITS ENTIRETY TO ELIMINATE THE BILLING CHARGE; AMENDING SECTION 100 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF THE SURCHARGE FROM \$2.56 TO \$1.51 PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT; AMENDING SECTION 210 OF SAID TITLE AND CHAPTER TO PROVIDE A GRADUATED SCHEDULE FOR THE INCREASE OVER THE SUCCEEDING FIVE YEARS IN THE ANNUAL CHARGE RATE PER EQUIVALENT RESIDENTIAL UNIT UPON WHICH THE OCCUPANCY FEES FOR SEWER CONNECTIONS IS COMPUTED; PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.
 SPONSORED BY: xxxx
 SUMMARY: Increases rate per equivalent residential unit for sewer service charges and occupancy fees for sewer connections.
 At a City Council meeting August 7, 1991
 BILL NO. 91-49 WAS READ BY TITLE AND REFERRED TO RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE: Councilmen Hawkins Jr. and Nolan
 COPIES OF THE COMPLETE ORDINANCE ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 10TH FLOOR, CITY HALL, 400 EAST STEWART AVENUE, LAS VEGAS, NEVADA.
 PUB: August 22, 1991
 Las Vegas Review-Journal

STATE OF NEVADA)
COUNTY OF CLARK)

SS:

TERINA I. CHAPLIN, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That she/he is a legal clerk for the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL and THE LAS VEGAS SUN, daily newspapers regularly issued, published and circulated in the City of Las Vegas, County of Clark, State of Nevada, and that the advertisement, a true copy of which is attached, was continuously published in the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL or THE LAS VEGAS SUN for a period of ONE insertions from the period of AUGUST 22, 1991 to AUGUST 22, 1991, on the following days:

AUGUST 22, 1991

Signed:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

22nd day of Aug, 1991

Maria C. Therien
Notary Public

MARIA C. THERIEN
Notary Public-State of Nevada
CLARK COUNTY
My Appointment Expires May 11, 1994

