

for additional detail.

Mr. Allswang said these items have been on the books to be addressed by the County for 10 plus years and the issues with the roads are ready to be cleaned up. The transportation element and the accompanying map set a frame work for future rights of way and sets the width and the design of the street. If a road is on the transportation element, it must be built and dedicated to the standards shown on the transportation element.

Chair Mackey opened up the public hearing to the audience.

Robert Bilbray, representing RB Industries and as a property owner, addressed item #40 and requested the board remove the item from the element. He also addressed the improvements and speed limit on West Casino Drive stating he would give the right of way on any of his properties necessary to straighten out the curves on the road and increase the speed limit. Mr. Bilbray spoke on behalf of Jim Shaw from Emerald River Reality, saying Mr. Shaw would be cooperative in respect to moving the alignment to keep the speed up.

Mr. Bilbray asked the board to consider making James Bilbray Parkway a through street intersecting with Casino Drive. The road right now is designed as 60 feet and it should be designed as an 80 foot. He also addressed flood control and drainage in the area of the marina and lagoon.

As there were no other comments from the public, Chair Mackey closed the public hearing. Chair Mackey then opened the discussion to the board members.

James Maniaci inquired about the current rights of way and land. Jason Allswang said they would not be reducing the right of way, but eliminating the need for people to dedicate to the wider right of way standard. If there was additional property that would not be used, individual property owners could apply for a vacation to get that property back.

Mr. Maniaci voiced his concerns and opinions for each of the seven items.

Kathy Ochs asked for some clarifications starting with #36 and moving on to #38 and #40. Her concerns include the cost during the initial bid on the Needles Highway to the new bridge alignment and also questioned if increasing the width from collector 80' to arterial 100' would increase the cost of the potential bridge project. Mr. Allswang said there could be an additional cost but increasing the width from an 80' to a 100' foot would benefit the roadway, giving extra width for additional future construction.

Nile Smith expressed annoyance with the antiquated tele-conference equipment. He said he was in agreement with Ms. Ochs and Mr. Maniaci on item 40, saying removing it was not the answer. He also stated he was not a fan of giving up rights of ways.

Kathleen Whitehead inquired if the bridge will move forward. Mr. Allswang said he does not know the outcome of the bridge. The board can make their recommendations on any of the transportation element changes.

Chair Mackey commented on the road names for the Emerald River location.

Vice Chair Ochs said at this point the board needs to formulate motions and requested that each item be broken down separately into individual motions. The board was in agreement to vote on

each of the seven items.

Item #34 – James Maniaci motioned to approve the item. Motion passed 5-0.

Item #35 – Kathy Ochs motioned to deny the item. Motion passed 5-0.

Item #36 – Kathy Ochs motioned to deny the item. Motion passed 5-0.

(Mr. Bilbray spoke of concerns for item #37 and suggested to not make any changes.)

Item #37 – James Maniaci motioned to deny but withdrew his motion after additional discussion. Kathy Ochs motioned to approve. Motion passed 5-0.

Item #38 - Kathy Ochs requested Chair Mackey to re-read the letter from James Shaw addressed to Dr. Brian Paulson that was provided at the May 14, 2019 LTAB meeting.

Chair Mackey read the following letter:

RE: Changes to the Transportation Element of the Clark County Comprehensive Master Plan

Dr. Paulson --

As Real Estate Advisor to, and on behalf of, various owners of the Emerald River Project in Laughlin, the purpose of this correspondence is to respectfully request that the Laughlin Town Advisory Board NOT take action on the May 14th Transportation Element Agenda Item VI.1 submitted by Comprehensive Planning. As highlighted herein, the background and planning information provided is totally inadequate for reasonable understanding and decision-making regarding the Transportation Element changes requested by Clark County Public Works. In that context, it would seem appropriate for the Town Board to request that Comprehensive Planning and/or Public Works present more detailed information at a future public meeting, to allow full understanding before any action is taken. In my absence, I ask that this correspondence be read and submitted into the record of the May 14th Town Board Meeting.

On Friday May 10th I first became aware of the subject Agenda item for “possible action” at the Tuesday May 14th Town Board meeting and, notwithstanding the stated legal posting, it’s my understanding that many others in Laughlin had the same short notice. Further, the three pages of background and factual information submitted is limited to brief descriptions of the requested changes, with NO indication of the origin, analysis, justification or implications for the Community and affected private property owners. It is noted that ALL requested changes involve 100’ Arterial and/or 80’ Collector ROW designations, possibly based on anticipated future traffic flows. Therefore, definitions of those designations and change-specific details of the analysis and conclusions for each Change would be very helpful. It is curious to note that all but one requested change maintain or reduce Laughlin planned road ROWs, while the planned access road ROW to the proposed/challenged new bypass bridge is increased.

Notwithstanding the above, Change # 38 directly affects Emerald River and immediately raises the following questions:

- 1. Why is an “Un-named Road” indicated, when it was dedicated, along with two other interior roads, in 2006 as Emerald River Parkway, Emerald Ranch Parkway and River Vista Circle (Book/Instr. 20060612-0005043)?*
- 2. What is the implication and reasoning for removal of the “Collector” designation?*

3. *Change # 36, reduces Casino Drive ROW from 100' Arterial to 80' Collector designation from Highway 163 to the southern boundary of Harrah's, presumably to reflect existing road improvements. While the remainder of Casino Drive from Harrah's to Needles Highway is currently an 80' ROW with a 100' Arterial planning designation, does it remain that way?*

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard on this matter, and I look forward to becoming more informed in the future.

James Shaw

Emerald River Realty

Nile Smith voiced concerns with Emerald River and said he did not see a need to make any changes at this time. According to Mr. Allswang, if changes were requested at a later date, the property owner could do a transportation element amendment.

Mr. Bilbray said he spoke with Mr. Shaw and asked to identify the roads and according Mr. Bilbray; Mr. Shaw would not want any changes and would not support the proposed changes.

Item #38 - Kathy Ochs motioned to deny and asked for clarification for Emerald River street names by the property owner. Motion passed 5-0.

Ms. Ochs said taking the bridge element out, but including the Southland area for future development, would cause her to oppose reducing the width. Nile Smith also voiced opposition to reduction in the width.

Item #39 – James Maniaci motioned to deny. Motion passed 5-0.

Kathy Ochs said item #40 would be an addition and not a change since currently there is not a road at that location.

Kathleen Whitehead voiced concerns on whether the second bridge was going to be built and what that would mean for item #40 and would the road still be built even though there may not be a bridge. Mr. Allswang said this road does not exist and the construction of this road would depend on the building of the bridge.

Nile Smith said he is conflicted on this item of possibly building a new road when the existing roads are not kept up with the repairs needed.

Robert Bilbray asked why this is being done when it will increase the price on the Nevada side. He recommended not changing the item.

James Maniaci motioned to deny and then withdrew his motion.

Ms. Ochs provided additional information on the future proposed road.

Item # 40 – Kathy Ochs motioned that the un-named road be designated as an 80' (+) collector, between Needles Highway and the new bridge alignment. Motion passed 5-0.

Mr. Allswang clarified with the board that their recommendations will be going to the Planning Commission on June 4, 2019. The recommendations from the Planning Commission will go to the Board of County Commissioners on July 17, 2019. The BCC will have the final approval.

- VI. General Business: None
- VII. Public Comment:
- VIII. Next Meeting Date: June 11, 2019
- IX. Adjournment: 3:20 p.m.

These minutes are in draft form and will be formally approved at the June 11, 2019 meeting. Any corrections to these minutes will be reflected in the meeting minutes of the July 9, 2019, meeting.

To listen to the audio recording of the Laughlin Town Advisory Board go to:

<http://www.clarkcountynv.gov/administrative-services/laughlin/Pages/LaughlinTownAdvisoryBoard.aspx>