

Assembly

397

MINUTES OF MEETING COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS, ASSEMBLY, 55TH LEGISLATIVE SESSION, APRIL 8, 1969

Present: Smith, Branch, Dini, Hilbrecht, Bryan Hafen, Getto,
and Lingenfelter.

Absent: Mello, Wood.

Chairman Smith opened the meeting and said that the main purpose of the meeting was for some in-talking and consideration of AB 783 which provides for creation of a consolidated municipality in Clark County.

Chairman Smith said that he regretted the morning session in that no motion was made to refer the bill back to the committee. He said that it is one of the things that happen in the stress of rush which should be avoided.

City Manager Clay Lynch was asked to comment on the bill. He said he carried a message from the Mayor and Council. They believe the people within the City of North Las Vegas should have a separate right to vote on the question. They do not believe a general vote is proper way to find what the people want in that Valley.

City Commissioner Wesley G. Howery of Las Vegas asked if the bill called for a vote in the overall.

Chairman Smith said that the bill was introduced by the committee and provides for an overall vote. He said that a study of the Reno-Sparks merger vote indicated that people vote their conviction regardless of community, in the main. This was made clear by the Reno-Sparks comparative vote patterns. Chairman Smith said that this bill is an "all or none" measure. He said that there are 200 unincorporated towns in the valley who are ready to petition for another charter which would create a third municipality.

Las Vegas Mayor Oran K. Gragson was introduced and asked to comment on the bill. He said that in the 8 years that he has been in office he has felt that there was an urgent need for consolidation. Mayor Gragson distributed excerpts from the Public Administration Service report on local government in Clark County. A copy is attached to these minutes. From it he quoted one line as follows: "There can be no disputing that from the standpoint of what constitutes a logical and reasonable municipal service area a single city in the valley is the answer." He said there would be no objection to North Las Vegas having a separate poll on the bill but he said what would be done about all of the people in the unincorporated areas. He said that as the area has continued to grow it has only strengthened his feeling that this need is imminent and the longer postponed the more difficult. "If we don't do something now, are problems will increase. The longer we wait, the harder it is to accomplish."

City Manager Clay Lynch said that he objected to the excerpt Mayor Gragson had chosen from the Public Administration Service report in that he too could excerpt portions from it that indicate

there would be no dollar savings from consolidation. He said that another section of the report supports the annexation by North Las Vegas of one section and the annexation by Las Vegas of another section.

Assemblyman Branch, for the benefit of the committee, stated that he knew of an instance in the State of New Mexico where two communities, Las Vegas and West Las Vegas, successfully merged. However, the merger was effected only after both communities had voted an agreement to do so.

City Comptroller Harold Laird of Las Vegas circulated to the committee a Consolidation Study that had been made to reflect the changes in financial status that would occur if Las Vegas, Winchester and Paradise were consolidated. A copy is attached. He said that whereas this study does not include North Las Vegas it nonetheless indicates the results that accrue from consolidation.

City Commissioner Howery of Las Vegas said that he felt the committee should give further study to annexation of the unincorporated towns into the incorporated cities rather than complete consolidation.

City Manager Clay Lynch of North Las Vegas said that he had copies of a Resolution stating the Nevada Municipal Association's stand in regard to consolidation. This resolution states that "before changes in the charters of Nevada cities shall have been made, the approval of the affected cities' governing bodies and/or electorate shall have been obtained."

City Manager A. R. Trelease of Las Vegas said that he felt the consolidation was necessary and vital to the logical growth of the area.

Chairman Smith excused the interested parties from the committee meeting and thanked them for their participation.

Assemblyman Paul May as a representative of the area affected by AB 783 was allowed to remain and he secured for the committee a map of the area indicating the communities that would be affected by the bill.

Chairman Smith told the committee that it is clear to those living in Clark County that something is going to have to be done. The problems are great. He said that with regard to dividing up the vote he felt the bill offered the more logical manner to vote on this measure.

Assemblyman Hilbrecht said that in this bill we are talking of three entities. There is Las Vegas, there is North Las Vegas, and there is a third factor including the unincorporated areas. This third factor is the reason why the services in North Las Vegas and Las Vegas are in jeopardy and the tax base in both is incapable of supporting them. He said that the gaming people on the "strip" (which is outside the incorporated cities) recognize this inequity and have indicated that they favor this approach. It would be much preferable to the creation of another

artificial city. These businesses are not carrying their fair share of the cost of government. The only fair way to vote is to erase the political subdivisions and let them vote in the overall.

Chairman Smith read figures to show the rate variances between city-located property and strip hotels. As an example, the Mint Hotel in Las Vegas----

The discussion was interrupted by the appearance of Senator Titlow who urged the committee to reconsider their action on SB 178 which had been indefinitely postponed. Senator Titlow introduced Frank Daykin to comment on the bill. It was developed that the town board form of government was put on the books 4 years ago and that the initiative petition was put on the books two years ago. Senator Titlow urged that SB 178 would allow election in the first instance of the town board members instead of appointment or forcing use of the initiative petition.

Branch moved the committee reconsider SB 178.
Motion seconded.
Motion unanimously passed.

Branch moved Do Pass SB 178.
Dini seconded.
Motion unanimously passed.

Senator Titlow and Mr. Daykin were excused.

Chairman Smith completed the comparison of tax appraisal by showing the the Mint Hotel in Las Vegas situate on approximately one acre of land was appraised at \$2,250,0000 whereas the strip hotel situate on over 23 acres was appraised at \$1,250,000.

He said that AB 783 would be printed by tomorrow. He urged the committee members to give the bill due deliberation and be prepared to take action on it.

The meeting adjourned.

EXCERPTS FROM PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SERVICE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT
IN CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

PAGE 70

City Consolidation

A consolidation of the three cities in the Las Vegas Valley into one major city, coupled with the annexation of all intervening and surrounding urban areas would achieve the benefits of annexation described above and, at the same time, avoid the necessity of many joint powers and cooperative agreements. There can be no disputing that from the standpoint of what constitutes a logical and reasonable municipal service area a single city in the valley is the answer. The Cities of Las Vegas and North Las Vegas and the adjacent developed areas are now indistinguishable other than on a map on which legal boundaries are drawn. A person knows only by city limit signs along major streets when he is leaving one and entering another. The City of Henderson is now somewhat separated by a strip of open space, but this will be true only for a few more years.

Las Vegas, Winchester & Paradise

The accompanying schedules have been prepared in an effort to reflect changes in the financial status of the three above named jurisdictions and the taxpayers of same, assuming the governments were combined, as of 1968-69. Many obstacles have arisen to make an accurate evaluation of the impact of such action difficult.

For example, the County has not as yet amended its budget for 1968-69 and we were forced to rely upon our own best estimates of pertinent expenditures. As a result, we took the projected 1967-68 figures and multiplied by 1.05 with an added amount derived by multiplying salaries by .0833 to cover insurance, retirement, etc.

Another unknown quantity is the actual amount of services provided by the County to the two towns. We hear on the one hand that they receive full city services and then again under different circumstances that they do not. An analysis of the budgets does little to shed light on the subject and, presumably, all town expenditures are merely reimbursements to the County, which incurs the expense in the first instance. If the amount actually reimbursed is any gauge of services then such services would be about one half of normal. However in combining reimbursements with revenues generated in the towns a figure very close to our own per capita expenditures is obtained.

In the absence of a better guide in preparing this report we have used various arbitrary ratios and then adjusted the final total to conform with our own per capita costs.

CONCLUSION:

Net gain to Clark County and the combined Las Vegas, Winchester, Paradise Complex is estimated to be,

Clark County	\$34,982
Las Vegas Complex	1,355,529
Total	<u>\$1,390,511</u>

At the expense of,

Taxpayers, residents, licensees, etc. in the towns of,	
Winchester	\$369,928
Paradise	636,825
Total towns	<u>\$1,006,753</u>
From the General Public, addresses unknown	383,758
Total	<u>\$1,390,511</u>

Presumably, an additional expenditure of \$1,006,753 by residents of the towns would generate \$1,355,529 which would be available for additional services or ad valorem tax reduction in the Las Vegas Complex. If this were translated into terms of tax rate the result would be .2532 on an assessed valuation of \$535,347,035. An analysis of the net result is as follows:

		.2532	
Taxpayers in:	Increased amount	Tax offset	Net increase (reduction)
Winchester	\$369,928	\$179,220	\$190,708
Paradise	636,825	338,197	298,628
Las Vegas	- -	838,112	(838,112)
Total	<u>\$1,006,753</u>	<u>\$1,355,529</u>	<u>(\$348,776)</u>

Respectfully submitted,

Harold A. Laird
Director of Finance

CONSOLIDATION STUDY
Las Vegas - Winchester - Paradise
Gain or (Loss)

5/27/68

REVENUES		GOVERNMENTS					TAXPAYERS		
		County	Las Vegas	Winchester	Paradise	Library Dist	Winchester	Paradise	General Public
Ad Valorem Taxes	(a)		2,813,649	(921,135)	(1,788,587)	(134,664)	(6,796)	37,533	
Fines & Fees	(b)			(3,000)	(9,000)		3,000	9,000	
Motor Vehicle Privilege Taxes	(b)		180,221	(47,662)	(132,559)				
Fire Protection Fees	(b)				(8,000)			8,000	
County Gaming	(b)		460,000	(185,000)	(275,000)				
Opening Balance	(b)		298,810	(182,898)	(115,912)				
Utility Franchise Fees	(c)		641,464				(222,186)	(419,278)	
Garbage Franchise Fees	(dc)	(33,250)	33,250						
Business Licenses	(de)	(108,500)	612,750				(70,671)	(133,579)	
Liquor Licenses	(df)	(261,250)	457,188				(67,795)	(128,143)	
Local Gaming Licenses	(g)	(920,000)	920,000						
Animal Licenses	(dh)	(7,600)	23,438				(5,480)	(10,358)	
Building Permits	(d)	(190,000)	190,000						
Plan Check Fees	(d)	(85,500)	85,500						
License Investigation	(d)	(114,000)	114,000						
Fines & Forfeited Bail	(ic)	(80,000)	433,596						(353,596)
Parking Fines	(k)		30,162						(30,162)
Animal Shelter Fees	(l)	24,089	(24,089)						
Gasoline Tax	(c)	(316,043)	316,043						
County Road Grant	(c)	(17,797)	17,797						
Sub Total, Gain (Loss)		(2,409,851)	7,603,779	(1,339,695)	(2,329,058)	(134,664)	(369,928)	(636,825)	(383,758)

Contributions from
Winchester & Paradise for:

Administration	(b)	(230,476)
Police Protection	(b)	(1,207,309)
Crossing Guards	(b)	(18,170)
Fire Protection	(b)	(1,616,814)
Health & Sanitation	(b)	(83,133)
Public Works	(b)	(120,000)
Parks & Recreation	(b)	(116,182)
Utilities	(b)	(48,000)
Other	(b)	(103,669)
Emergency Loan	(b)	(125,000)
Library	(a)	(134,664)
Total Revenues (Loss)		(6,213,268)

Footnotes:

(a) Ad valorem Taxes, 1968-69

Winchester,

Paradise

Total

Yield at Las Vegas rate

1.3769, Winchester

Paradise

Total

Assessed Val.

70,780,348

133,566,316

204,346,664

974,575

1,839,074

2,813,649

Town Rate

1.3014

1.3391

Library Rate

.0659

.0659

Add Town Yield

Total Yield

Yield

Town

921,135

1,788,587

2,709,722

Library

46,644

88,020

134,664

2,709,722

2,844,386

(b) Per 1968-69 town budgets.

(c) 61.7% 1968-69 City budget. Ratio of valuation of two towns to city.

(d) 95% of 1968-69 county budget. (Arbitrary)

(e) City rate estimated 150% of County rate. (Arbitrary)

(f) " " " 175% " " " "

(g) Double County Gaming.

(h) 49% 1968-69 City Budget. Population ratio 75,000 to 153,000 estimated.

(i) 5% 1968-69 County Budget. (Arbitrary)

(k) 1% 1968-69 City Budget. (Arbitrary)

(l) 1% 1968-69 City Budget.

GOVERNMENTS

EXPENDITURES		Clark County	Las Vegas	Winchester	Paradise	Library Dist.
Administration	(b)	230,476		89,561	140,915	
Police Protection	(hb)	1,990,285	(1,990,285)	434,030	773,279	
Crossing Guards	(b)	18,170		11,500	6,670	
Fire Protection	(bcb)	1,616,814	(1,604,105)	628,655	988,159	
Health & Sanitation	(b)	83,133		31,119	52,014	
Public Works	(b)			60,000	60,000	
Engineering	(tc)	181,752	(153,491)			
Streets	(tc)	657,268	(679,659)			
Traffic Engineering	(h)		(119,629)			
Parks & Recreation	(b)			15,000	101,182	
Parks	(su)	199,203	(287,841)			
Recreation	(h)		(208,677)			
Library	(v)	134,664	(134,664)			134,664
Utilities	(b)	48,000		13,000	35,000	
Electrical Department	(h)		(158,682)			
Other	(b)	103,669		56,830	46,839	
Emergency Loan	(b)	125,000	(125,000)		125,000	
Building Inspection	(sm)	230,151	(71,994)			
Adjustment	(x)	629,665	(714,223)			
Total Expenditures, Gain (Loss)		6,248,250	(6,248,250)	1,339,695	2,329,058	134,664
SUMMARY						
Total Revenues, Gain (Loss)		(6,213,268)	7,603,779	(1,339,695)	(2,329,058)	(134,664)
Total Expenditures, Gain (Loss)		6,248,250	(6,248,250)	1,339,695	2,329,058	134,664
Net Gain (Loss)		34,982	1,355,529	-	-	-

Footnotes:

(b) Per 1968-69 town budgets.

(c) 61.7% 1968-69 City budget. Ratio of valuation of two towns to City.

(h) 49% 1968-69 City Budget. Population ratio 75,000 to 153,000, estimated.

(m) 30% 1968-69 City budget. (Arbitrary)

(a) 90% 1968-69 County budget. (Arbitrary)

(t) 45% 1968-69 County Budget. (Arbitrary)

(u) 49% 1968-69 City budget, excluding capital. (Arbitrary)

(v) Library Dist. Tax yield.

(x) Adjustment based upon \$83.31 per capita General Fund expenditures of the City of Las Vegas for 1968-69, totaling \$12,747,056 and serving an estimated population of 153,000. Assuming a population of 75,000 for the two towns, comparable expenditures would be \$6,248,250.