

# MOUNT VERNON CITY COUNCIL

## 2025 Meeting Minutes Analysis

Mount Vernon Civic Integrity Project (MVCIP)

Analysis Date: February 2026 | Source: Official Meeting Minutes – City of Mount Vernon Website

### 1. Meeting Summary

The Mount Vernon City Council held 33 total meetings in calendar year 2025:

Meeting Type	Count
Regular Meetings	22
Special Meetings	10
Statutory (Organizational) Meeting	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>33</b>

*Note: The May 14, 2025 Regular Meeting minutes contain a clerical error where the date field reads "[INSERT DATE]" instead of the actual date. The March 26, 2025 minutes also contain an error, reading "WEDNESDAY 26" instead of "MARCH 26."*

### 2. Vote Tally Verification

All 33 meetings include recorded roll-call vote tallies (Aye/Nay/Absent/Abstain) for every legislative item voted upon. No meeting is missing vote documentation.

### 3. Attendance Record

#### 3a. Absences from Meetings

Council Member	Absences	Details
<b>Poteat</b>	7	Regular: Feb 26, May 14, Jun 25, Aug 13; Special: Aug 14, Nov 6, Jan 13
<b>Browne</b>	6	Regular: Mar 26, Apr 9, Aug 13; Special: Jun 30, Jul 28; Statutory: Jan 2
<b>Thompson</b>	1	Special: Jun 3
<b>Boxhill</b>	0	—
<b>Gleason</b>	0	—

#### 3b. Remote Attendance (Via Zoom)

Council Member	Remote	Details
<b>Poteat</b>	4	Special: Jan 27, May 19, Aug 25, Dec 18
<b>Browne</b>	1	Special: Dec 18
<b>Thompson</b>	1	Regular: Dec 10

<b>Gleason</b>	1	Regular: Apr 9
<b>Boxhill</b>	0	—

## 4. Total Votes Taken

**Total votes across all 33 meetings: 497**

This includes all roll-call votes on legislation, resolutions, consent agendas, and motions to adjourn.

Outcome	Count	Percentage
Passed (Adopted/Approved)	487	98.0%
Defeated (Denied)	2	0.4%
Other (Procedural/Motion to Adjourn)	8	1.6%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>497</b>	<b>100%</b>

Only 2 items out of 497 were defeated in all of 2025. Both occurred at the August 13 Regular Meeting, when only 3 members (Thompson, Boxhill, Gleason) were present. One was a unanimous Nay (TMP-1474), and the other was a 2-1 vote with Gleason casting the lone Nay (denied, despite 2 Aye votes, because it required a majority of the full council, not just those present).

## 5. Individual Voting Records

Council Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent	Total	Yes %
<b>Thompson</b>	492	1	1	3	497	<b>99.6%</b>
<b>Poteat</b>	356	0	2	139	497	<b>99.4%</b>
<b>Boxhill</b>	489	3	5	0	497	<b>98.4%</b>
<b>Gleason</b>	482	9	6	0	497	<b>97.0%</b>
<b>Browne</b>	388	4	10	95	497	<b>96.5%</b>

"Yes %" is calculated as Yes votes divided by total votes cast (Yes + No + Abstain), excluding votes missed due to absence. This measures how often a member voted in the affirmative when they were actually present and voting.

## 6. All Nay Votes Cast

Only 14 total Nay votes were cast across all 497 votes in 2025, by only 4 of the 5 council members. Poteat and Thompson cast a combined 1 Nay vote between them all year.

Council Member	Nay Votes	Details
<b>Gleason</b>	9	Apr 9 (Regular), Apr 23, Jun 25, Aug 13, Dec 10, Jun 30 (Special), Dec 18 (Special, 2 votes)
<b>Browne</b>	4	Mar 12 (Regular), Apr 23, Jun 25, Jul 9
<b>Boxhill</b>	3	Feb 26 (Regular), Aug 13, Nov 12
<b>Thompson</b>	1	Aug 13 (Regular) — the unanimously denied TMP-1474

Poteat	0	—
--------	---	---

## 7. All Abstentions

21 votes had at least one abstention. Abstentions were distributed as follows:

Council Member	Abstentions
Browne	10
Gleason	6
Boxhill	5
Poteat	2
Thompson	1

## 8. Unanimity Analysis

Category	Count	Percentage
Fully Unanimous (all present voted Aye)	462	93.0%
Near-Unanimous (1 dissent or 1 abstain)	30	6.0%
Split Votes (>1 dissent/abstain)	5	1.0%
<b>TOTAL WITH ANY DISSENT</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>7.0%</b>

## 9. Patterns and Observations

### 9a. Extreme Voting Uniformity

93% of all votes were fully unanimous with zero dissent. When present, council members voted Yes between 96.5% and 99.6% of the time. Two members — Poteat and Thompson — cast a combined total of 1 Nay vote out of 852 votes cast between them. This level of lockstep agreement across an entire legislative year is highly unusual for any elected legislative body.

### 9b. Poteat: Near-Perfect Alignment

Pro Tempore Poteat cast zero Nay votes all year (the single highest "Yes" rate among members who were present for a substantial number of votes). He voted Yes on 356 of 358 votes cast (99.4%), abstaining only twice. His 7 absences and 4 remote attendances were all from Special Meetings or meetings where he was the only absentee.

### 9c. Thompson: Maximum Agreement

Acting Pro Tempore Thompson had the highest raw Yes count (492) and missed only 1 meeting all year (the June 3 Special Meeting). His single Nay was part of the unanimous rejection of TMP-1474 at the August 13 meeting. He abstained only once. Thompson is the most reliable "Yes" vote on the council.

## 9d. Gleason: The Most 'No' Votes

Councilperson Gleason cast the most Nay votes (9) and was the only member to cast Nay votes at Special Meetings (3 times). She was never absent from any meeting and had 100% attendance (attending remotely once). While 9 Nay votes out of 497 is still a 97% Yes rate, Gleason represents the most independent voice on this council. Notably, her Nay votes were still outvoted every time except for the 2 denied items at the August 13 meeting.

## 9e. Browne: Council President Pattern

Council President Browne had the most abstentions (10) and 4 Nay votes. Browne's abstentions and Nay votes never changed the outcome of any vote. She had 6 absences, including from the Statutory organizational meeting on January 2.

## 9f. Legislation Virtually Never Fails

Only 2 out of 497 votes were defeated — a 99.6% passage rate. Both defeats occurred at the same meeting (August 13) when only 3 of 5 members were present. When all 5 (or even 4) members are present, no legislation was defeated in all of 2025. This suggests that legislation is either pre-negotiated before reaching the floor, or that council members feel obligated to support whatever is put before them.

## 9g. Special Meeting Attendance Patterns

Special Meetings show a notably different attendance pattern. Poteat was absent from 3 of 10 Special Meetings and remote for 4 others — meaning he was physically present at only 3 of 10 Special Meetings. Browne was absent from 2 Special Meetings. This suggests Special Meetings may be called with less advance notice or at less convenient times, potentially affecting democratic participation.

## 9h. No Effective Check on the Executive

Given the context that council candidates often run on the same ticket as the mayor and are backed by the same PAC, the data is consistent with a council that functions as a rubber stamp rather than an independent legislative body. Key indicators:

- 93% unanimous voting rate across 497 votes
- 99.6% passage rate for all legislation
- Two members (Poteat, Thompson) cast a combined 1 Nay vote out of 852 votes cast
- Zero legislation defeated when 4 or more members present
- The most "independent" member (Gleason, with 9 Nay votes) still voted Yes 97% of the time
- No recorded instance of legislation being significantly amended or sent back to committee based on dissent

## 9i. Clerical Issues in Minutes

Several clerical errors were noted in the official minutes: the May 14 meeting has "[INSERT DATE]" instead of the actual date; the March 26 meeting header reads "WEDNESDAY 26" instead of "MARCH 26"; and one vote at the August 13 meeting (TMP-1474, unanimously denied) lacks an

"Aye:" field since no members voted in the affirmative. These errors, while minor, suggest the minutes may benefit from more rigorous quality control before finalization.

## 10. Methodology

This analysis was conducted by programmatically parsing the full text of all 2025 Mount Vernon City Council meeting minutes (12,290 lines) from the City's website ([www.cmvny.gov](http://www.cmvny.gov)).

Every "Aye:/Nay:/Absent:/Abstain:" vote block was extracted and each council member's vote was recorded. Attendance was manually verified against every Roll Call/PRESENT/ABSENT line in the source document.

All counts were cross-checked for consistency.

The one vote block without an "Aye:" line (TMP-1474, August 13, unanimously denied) was identified and added manually.

The 8 votes classified as "Other/Unknown" outcome are procedural votes (primarily motions to adjourn) that passed unanimously but did not use the standard "adopted" or "approved" keyword.