



Laughlin Town Advisory Board

December 11, 2018

MINUTES

Board Members:	James Maniaci – Chair, Present Kathy Ochs – Vice Chair, Present Stephanie Bethards, Present via conference phone	Gina Mackey, Present Vacant
Secretary:	Tammy Harris, (702) 298-0828 tammy.harris@clarkcountynv.gov	
Town Liaison:	Dr. Brian Paulson, (702) 298-0828 bkp@clarkcountynv.gov	

I. Call to Order by James Maniaci, Invocation led by Pastor Doug Westly, Pledge of Allegiance by Chair James Maniaci.

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

II. Public Comment - None

III. Approval of Minutes for November 13, 2018. (For possible action)

Moved by: Kathy Ochs
Action: Approved 4-0

IV. Approval of agenda for December 11, 2018, and hold, combine or delete any items (For possible action)

Moved by: Gina Mackey
Action: Approved 4-0

V. Informational Items

1. Receive a report from Lt. Jeff Hewes with Metro Police regarding activity and statistics during the past month and other area crime concerns. (For discussion only)

Officer Troy Nicol provided the November report.

November 2018 Statistics:
 Calls for Service: 320
 Traffic Citations: 529
 DUIs: 2
 Battery Domestic Violence Arrests: 11
 Bookings: 56
 Juvenile Citations: 2

Citations NRS 482: 1

Vice Chair Ochs commented on the increase of domestic violence.

2. Receive a report from Nevada Highway Patrol regarding activity and statistics during the last month and other public safety concerns. (For discussion only)

Sergeant William Dice provided the November report and is the new Nevada Highway Patrol sergeant. He introduced himself and provided a brief history of his career and personal life.

Citations: 586

Arrest: 15

DUI: 8

Vice Chair Ochs asked for a written monthly report.

3. Receive a report from Clark County Fire Department regarding calls for service during the past month and other fire prevention issues. (For discussion only)

Chief Trent Jenkins provided the 2018 November report.

Station 85 ran 68 calls, 60 of those were medical.

Station 76 ran 154 calls, 103 of those were medical.

Total calls for Laughlin in November 2018 were 222.

4. Receive a report from Greg Turner with Clark County Water Reclamation District regarding the status of the water system. (For discussion only)

Report provided by Greg Turner.

Laughlin Water Reclamation Facility (LWRF) had an average of 1.72 million gallons per day producing clean water returned to the Colorado River. Flow decreased 290,000 gallons per day from this time last year.

Sewer Service Complaints: None

Odor Complaints: None

Call Before You Dig: 27 tickets received for November 2018

Regarding an update on the rehab projects at the treatment plant, Chair Maniaci commented that there is not any more work going down at the number 2 pumping station, and asked "what was that all about?"

Mr. Turner said there was some rehab work at the lift station on number 2 and it's near completion. Chair Maniaci asked what the cost was. Mr. Turner said he didn't have that information and would get back to him with the information.

5. Receive a report from Chaunsey Chau-Duong with Big Bend Water District regarding the status of the water system. (For discussion only)

Report provided by Chaunsey Chau-Duong.

Diversions: November 2018: 287 acre feet

2018 total diversion: 3,635 acre feet

No major reports of leaks or complaints.

Mr. Chau-Duong followed up on a question from a few months ago when the board asked about the water infrastructure for Laughlin's Southland area. After researching the service rules and talking to the Planning Department, the onus is on the developer to fund the cost of any new design and construction of water facilities. This is done for a variety of reasons – first to protect the Water District and second to protect the rate payers. A perfect example is the Apex water system in North Las Vegas, he said.

At this time, there is not any proposed development from an entity to develop in the Southland area. Mr. Chau-Duong said if you know of any interested parties, they should get ahold of the Water District.

Without any idea of what is to be built, the Water District cannot accurately size the system. The Water District would not know if a 10 million gallon or 20 million gallon tank was needed, so without knowing what type of entity/industry would be developing the area, the Water District would not know what type of water infrastructure would be needed.

Jordan Bunker will be Chauncey's replacement during the time Mr. Chau-Duong is in Carson City for the legislative session.

6. Receive a report from Will Douglas with University of Nevada Cooperative Extension regarding the status of programs and upcoming activities. (For discussion only)

Will Douglas spoke about the 4-H Club and said there are approximately 100 students enrolled. Kids can enroll at any time throughout the year. There are 10 volunteers, plus an 11th grader who is also a teacher's assistant with the gardening class and a science teacher's assistant at the high school, who teaches with the guidance of a high school teacher. She continues to learn as she exercises her leadership skills.

Classes that are offered in part include:

Robotics - design, construction, operation, and application of robots

Gardening

Dance

Herpetology - the study of amphibians

Drones

In Searchlight, 4-H members meet every other Thursday with a current membership of 16 students enrolled. This is something new for Searchlight youth since 4-H has not previously been established in the community.

Future classes will include a fit & healthy class.

Mr. Douglas advised that on Saturday, January 26, 2019, at 1:00 p.m. at the Laughlin Library, there will be a free workshop regarding radon in Clark County. All are welcome to come learn what radon is and how to test for it. Free radon test kits will be provided.

Gina Mackey asked if there was a charge for the workshop. Mr. Douglas said the workshop was free to the public along with the free radon test kits for your home.

7. Receive a report from Jackie Mazzeo with Laughlin Chamber of Commerce regarding current and

upcoming events. (For discussion only)

Jackie Mazzeo, Executive Director, said the Christmas Mixer will be Thursday, December 13th at the Aquarius starting at 5:00 p.m. Santa will be in attendance and everyone will receive a free gift. The cost is \$10 with all proceeds benefiting Feed a Family for the holidays.

The 5K Walk n Roll will be held March 2, 2019 with registration beginning after January 1, 2019. The event will include rolls from Cinnabon, lunch, and activities for the kids.

8. Receive a report from Richard deClercq with Parks & Recreation regarding the status of programs and upcoming activities. (For discussion only)

No report

Contact Info: Richard deClercq, Program Supervisor, (702) 298-3413

9. Receive a report from Laughlin school system regarding the status of programs and upcoming activities. (For discussion only)

No report

10. Receive a report from Tanya Brown-Wirth with Laughlin Library regarding current and upcoming activities. (For discussion only)

No report

11. Receive a report from Azaria Williams, Family Care Consultant, Alzheimer's Association, to facilitate a support group for those who are caregivers of someone with Dementia/Alzheimer's and offer awareness and education. (For discussion only)

Azaria Williams presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding the Alzheimer's Association and its many services. She pointed out the help and support that is provided through the Alzheimer's Association.

For a copy of the presentation, contact the Town Manager's Office.

12. Receive a report by Dennis Harper, Vice President, 8 minute Energy Renewables, regarding solar development interest in Laughlin. (For discussion only)

Dennis Harper postponed his report until the January 15, 2019 LTAB meeting.

13. Receive a report and update from Tom Minwegan, Clark County Water Reclamation District's Clean Water Team, on proposed water rates. Clark County Water Reclamation District is proposing changes to its Service Rules related to sewer use, access and charges. The rates and charges impact capital improvements that currently include 62 projects representing a \$1.4 billion investment over the coming 15 years. Comments accepted on-line at rates@cleanwaterteam.com until December 14, 2018. Board of Trustees public hearing at 10:00 a.m. on December 18, 2018 in Commission Chambers at 500 South Grand Central Parkway, Las Vegas, Nevada. (For discussion only)

Tom Minwegan provided a PowerPoint presentation to explain the proposed changes to wastewater services, showing the history of the rates from 2008 to the present and the increase that would be

phased in over a 10-year period. Mr. Minwegan explained what will be proposed to the Board of County Commissioners in early 2019.

Vice Chair Kathy Ochs noted the December 18, 2018 board meeting and Mr. Minwegan said that it is on the agenda but will not be held until early 2019. She also asked a better explanation for the universal rates and how that benefits Laughlin.

Vice Chair Ochs asked about rural grants. Mr. Minwegan said, due to universal rates, it makes it harder to get the grants.

For a copy of the presentation, contact the Town Manager's Office.

14. Announcements of upcoming neighborhood meetings and County or community meetings and events. (For discussion only)

None

A 15-minute break beginning at 2:35 p.m. resumed at 2:50 p.m.

15. Receive thoughts from current town board members as to their experiences from serving as Laughlin's first elected town board.

Stephanie Bethards:

"I think we made a lot of progress and I think we all worked very well together. I'm looking forward to what happens the next two years. I've enjoyed sitting next to you guys."

Kathy Ochs:

"Having served on this board from 2000-2008, then being off it for a number of years, then coming back in 2013. I understand we are now officially elected, I don't see a whole lot of difference. There have been decisions we made that the Board of County Commissioners have agreed with us and ones they have done the opposite.

"The one thing that is a bit troublesome and annoying is the Secretary of State filings that we must now adhere to and they're quite angry if you miss something by one day or something like that. We are now required whether we are running for President of the United States or Laughlin Town Advisory Board to submit financials. If you miss them, the fines are \$100 a day or \$5,000 for not doing your disclosure. If you write a letter to the Secretary of State they are well apprised of Laughlin and they immediately excuse it, but it seems like there wouldn't be such harsh penalties for missing some of those since that is new, and that is something we haven't done.

"I think the next two years will be interesting. There are a lot of things that have legs under them now that we are going to be seeing in the future. I would just caution everyone and the community that those things that seem relatively simple and those things that have gone along simply in the past, it doesn't mean that they're not become very difficult in the future. We just basically gave legs to several things.

"My belief is this board is going to start seeing coming up in the next two years. We're going to see resort hotels definition come before us again, which was a large thing that cut this community in half. I also believe we are going to start seeing rumors and things about incorporation, I think those are coming to us again. I don't think either of those things are wise. However, I do think they are coming, if not in the next two years, then certainly after that."

Gina Mackey:

“Mine is not as complicated and detailed as Kathy’s. Basically, I’m very thankful and it’s been really an experience of a lifetime to be able to witness first-hand great things that have developed in our town. Like the lagoon dredging, the upcoming river park and many others. It has been an exciting time to be a part of this community and among the advisory board. I’ve been really lucky to be able to have people around me that really care about this town, its residents, and a shining upcoming future.

“And I’m grateful for the time spent, the knowledge gained, and the opportunity for all the new endeavors that will come to light for this town. I want to thank the Town Manager, Brian Paulson, and his great staff, Chairman Jim Maniaci, Vice Chair Kathy Ochs, Stephanie, and the short time we had here with us, Bruce Henry. It’s been a pleasure. Thank you.”

James Maniaci:

“It seems as if it was only yesterday that five of us began our two-year terms as the first elected Laughlin Town Advisory Board. And it has been an honor to serve as the Chair. I want to thank Kathy Ochs, Gina Mackey, Stephanie Bethards, and Bruce Henry for also serving. Because of my background, I knew a lot about government in Laughlin, but I continued to learn. It also has been an experience in which I have seen our members grow into their positions.

“Since Laughlin is governed by 15 policy-setting, Las Vegas-based local service entities, the importance of you electing your advisory board is ever so critical. We saw the need for more facilities to make Laughlin a better place for you and I. Thus, this board asked the Clark County Commission and two of its subsidiary agencies to begin the work on filling the missing link of our water and sewer services on South and West Casino Drive, along with the converting that two-lane bumpy, hilly, narrow path into a smooth four-lane, divided boulevard as nice as its northern 2.24 miles.

“This board asked for water and sewer services basic design plans to be done for the Laughlin Southland.

“This board fully supports our ‘doctor-senator’ in his efforts to ameliorate the blight caused by the lack of the sale of about 3 square miles in the center of our community called Mohave Station.

“This board envisions improvements to Bruce Woodbury Drive, among other streets, including the Needles Highway.

“This board’s vision also includes flood control of the Bridge Canyon being tied into the Hiko Springs Dam Reservoir, which one might call Laughlin’s Dry Lake.

“The job of the incoming board, as I see it, will be to continue to push these and other projects by continuing to find resolutions to each problem that occurs.

“We don’t have to envision the Laughlin Lagoon. It is coming back to life as work is underway by a top-notch contractor doing the dredging which will result in a future park with its first feature, I believe, being 2,000 feet of public beach between the Marina and the Colorado River levee. The contractor hopes to be out of the water by New Year’s Day.

“Our aquatic gem is unique not only to Clark County but also to all of Nevada and the Colorado River.

“People are just as important as projects. There are three persons who stand out in my mind as being crucial to the immediate past and the bright future of Laughlin. With our Governor-elect Steve Sisolak as our County Commissioner, having kept the door open to the lagoon project, from the very beginning, it would have been almost impossible to local residents to have overcome the obstacles encountered at each step to clean, and keep it clean. This is especially notable given his,

shall we say, unfortunate beginning in his relations with Laughlin residents. So I say ‘Thank You, Steve.’

“This brings us to Dr. Brian Paulson, our experienced and wise town manager, whom the commissioner supported for the job. Thank you, Brian, for your wise counsel and guidance that show your love of Laughlin.

“The third person is one who I wish everyone would recognize for being another of Laughlin’s unique gems. Robert Patrick Bilbray looks far beyond the horizon while juggling the up-close realities. He has connections at all levels, an unequaled knowledge of people and institutions that lays foundations, and builds the walls and roofs of so many efforts that one is hard-pressed to list them. One of those visions was to use public-private partnerships through special improvement districts in which the property owners within those districts pay the bonds for the improvements, then annual levies as needed, to maintain them. Much of the infrastructure in Laughlin was built by this method. Thank you, Bob.

“A big huggable thank you to my wife Sunny for being the earthly pillar of my life. God bless America, God bless Laughlin, and God bless you all.”

16. Announce Laughlin Town Advisory Board is accepting nominations for the 2019 Laughlin Citizen of the Year, with nominations closing on **December 28, 2018**. Nomination forms are available at the Laughlin Library, Community Resource Center, Spirit Mountain Activity Center, the Laughlin Town Manager’s Office, or on the Clark County website at <http://www.clarkcountynv.gov/administrative-services/laughlin/Pages/default.aspx>.

Nomination forms must be turned into the Laughlin Town Manager’s Office, Laughlin Regional Government Center, 101 Civic Way, Laughlin, NV, 89029, by **December 28, 2018**, 5:00 p.m. Only nominations utilizing the nomination form will be accepted.

The Laughlin Citizen of the Year Award is given annually in honor of the late Jim Edwards and is intended to recognize and thank the outstanding citizen of Laughlin who has given his/her private time and effort to help local government make Laughlin a better place to live.

It is expected that the 2019 Citizen of the Year recipient will be announced and honored at the **Tuesday, February 12, 2019** meeting of the Laughlin Town Advisory Board at 1:30 p.m. (For discussion only)

Chair Maniaci read the announcement.

VI. Planning & Zoning: None

VII. General Business:

1. Discuss status, cost/benefit, and feasibility of third Laughlin bridge project in relation to other Laughlin capital project needs, and recommend possible reallocation of existing project design and construction funds. (For possible action)

Chair Maniaci stated that the public discussion will start with those in favor of the bridge and ending with those opposed. He asked that their name and address be stated and that each person would have three minutes to speak.

Jackie Mazzeo, Bullhead City, Arizona, resident and employee in Laughlin, representing Laughlin Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors and staff

“The Laughlin Chamber supports the completion of the second bridge linking southern Clark County and Bullhead City. Another bridge is long overdue to accommodate current/future traffic needs. The bridge project is nothing new; the bridge has been in the works for many years. The site selection linking Needles Highway and the Bullhead City Parkway followed years of discussion, studies, environmental research, and inter-governmental negotiation. Saying that one side of the river is benefitting more than the other is wrong and is short-sighted. For critics to suddenly come out of the woodwork and try to block the project at this phase is disingenuous. Further delaying the bridge would only add to the cost that some critics say they are trying to hold down.

“At a time when Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is asked to use its funds wisely, the critics are asking RTC to throw away all the money that has already been spent on this project. They are telling RTC to essentially pay for a dead bridge and either spend the money on a new site and new project or nothing at all. The new bridge is just not a new way for Laughlin residents to get to retail areas in Bullhead City. Even more importantly for the Chamber, it is an economic development project opportunity to move people from and through Bullhead City and Fort Mohave to Needles Highway, where people have a choice. They can go east and patronize the area with the largest businesses along Casino Drive or they can continue north and patronize the many small businesses in Laughlin’s true residential and downtown area. Also the opponent sees this as a political opportunity to move backwards. The Laughlin Chamber of Commerce sees this as an economic development opportunity to move our community forward.”

Barbara Pape, Bullhead City, Arizona, resident

“I am a military mom and this bridge is a connection to the Veterans (VA) clinic here. This will save the people the cost of gas. People that are on military budgets and can only afford this connection to the VA clinic. Please approve this bridge. Thank you.”

Fred Doten, Laughlin resident

“I became a citizen of Laughlin in 2005 and have been quite involved with the community ever since. I would like to preface my comments by stating that I am speaking as a Laughlin resident and a past chair of the Laughlin Town Advisory Board. I am not speaking as a representative of any organization that I am a member of or any business I may be associated with. My specific comments are as follows:

“The discussion of having a third bridge has been on-going as long as I have lived here. The LEDC was a supporter of having a third bridge. Their position as well as that of other organizations and businesses was that the Laughlin Bridge is inadequate and is incapable of meeting the needs of our community and our tourism business.

“The new bridge has been in the planning phase for several years and the previous three LTAB boards have been active in supporting the construction of a third bridge. I don't understand why this board would try to change a course of action this late in the game. The construction of the bridge at its proposed location will be a significant factor in the development of the Southlands and bringing in visitors who will be traveling the proposed Interstate 11.

“The Mohave School District located their new fieldhouse at a site convenient to the new bridge to allow visiting athletic events an easy access to the Casino Drive hotels and entertainment. This fact will impact the growth of Laughlin in a very positive way.

“To date, a significant amount of time and money has been spent conducting studies, getting government funding, and coordinating the activities of multiple agencies. Why would any sane person feel it necessary at the eleventh hour to state that a bridge was not necessary?

“As a final point, the LTAB is the community's voice to the County. Except for this board meeting, there has not been a request for comments from Laughlin citizens nor any briefings as to why a change of direction is required. To pursue an evaluation of a project this late in, the game does not reflect positively on the LTAB or the management of Laughlin. I also find it unbelievable that the president of the LEDC, who is against the bridge, can be the chair of the LTAB and conduct an analysis as an unbiased participant. I firmly believe any member of the LEDC who sit on this LTAB abstain for voting or participating in any discussions on the construction of the new bridge.

“I request a copy of my comments be incorporated in the minutes of this meeting.”

Daniel Vanderloop, Laughlin resident representing the Laughlin Economic Development Corporation (LEDC)

“At this time, the LEDC does not support the moving forward with the bridge funding and construction. The position of the LEDC remains essentially the same today as it was on November 13, 2018. The statement read by the LEDC Vice President, Martin Knauss, is correct that no written agreement was signed in 2013. There was an agreement signed in 2004.”

Mr. Vanderloop read the statement that was presented at the November 13, 2018 LTAB by Martin Knauss:

November 13, 2018

Martin Knauss, 3826 Duke of Earl Court, representing Laughlin Economic Development Corporation

BHC – Laughlin Bridge

At this time LEDC does not support moving forward with the bridge funding and construction as presented by Mr. Lueck.

- *Current estimated construction costs have increased to \$56.3 MM*
- *Clark County (RTC) portion potentially available is \$32MM*
- *BHC portion is \$3.7MM*
- *Federal Funding is \$18.5MM*
- *Resulting in a shortfall of \$2MM*
- *A total of \$5MM of Ft Mohave Dev Fund monies were dedicated in the past and have been mostly spent. The funds are NOT included in the above estimated construction cost.*

The cost/benefit is skewed. In 2013 an agreement was discussed to shift more cost to BHC as the bulk of the benefit is towards the business/residential and sales tax base for BHC and Mohave County. No agreement was reached between the jurisdictions.

A 2010 public survey by the Mohave Daily News showed only 26% of Laughlin residents at the time supported the Parkway location. This is currently the only viable location based on federal agencies input.

So again, at this time, LEDC does not support moving forward with the bridge funding and construction.

Until an agreement between jurisdictions can be made to appropriately share the cost of the bridge this delay is warranted.

RTC funds would be better used to improve Casino Drive from Harrah's to Needles Highway and/or other Laughlin improvements.

Niles Smith, Laughlin resident

“A lot of good comments made here today. It’s hard to get things said in three minutes time. I think the big question here is the disproportionate financing we first found out about last month. LEDC spoke last month against it and sent a representative this month against it. It’s clear that Bullhead thinks they need a bridge, and they’re right, Bullhead needs a bridge. It’s clear that Laughlin thinks the bridge is too expensive and the financial aspect is disproportioned.

“But if you go back to the original agreement which is still in effect today that was pointed out by the last speaker, that bridge project is broken up in five phases. You’re at phase three, which is the planning and design stage, you wanting to move into phase four which is the construction phase.

“That agreement specifically states that there are three things that you must approve. Everybody has to agree that the last phase was successful and you have to have a new agreement or an amendment agreement to move on the next phase and this is where you’re at.

“Before you begin construction you have to have a new agreement or amend the original agreement. I think this is an opportunity to revisit this financial imbalance with Bullhead who needs a bridge supporting five percent of the cost and the other 95 percent cost falling on the other side of the river. I think this is what upsets people here. For the Laughlin residents themselves, this is effectively a bypass of the business district, not specifically, but it depends on the traffic. This bridge was planned and designed in 2004, 14 years ago, and was based on a concept of population growth that just hasn’t quite materialized.

“It might be a good time to step back and take a good look at the plan, the design, and the cost and make sure it applies to what today’s needs are. The voice of Laughlin has to come from this board. A lot of people are affected by this. We like to see this right before it goes any further. We also have to take into consideration our friends at the Avi and Fort Mohave. They will be affected by this. Currently, when you look at it from Laughlin’s point of view, I think it can be remedied, but I think the point of view now is best described by an old statement.”

Bruce Henry, Laughlin resident and past LTAB member

“Originally when I saw this a month ago, I said there was no way. Then I saw this breakdown that was provided and I kind of changed my tune a little bit, but there is a couple of questions I have and I know the current structure is for four lanes but it mentions here in the minutes at the LTAB meeting April 30, 2013 that they were talking about a two-lane bridge. Is that a two-lane bridge both ways, or a two-lane bridge on the same side? I don’t know where that change in the phase and if it was to go back to that, would that change the overall cost? I assume it would.

“I was originally worried about the cost from Bullhead about from the parkway, but when I did the figures it’s pretty equal. Three miles is \$18 million and a half a mile is \$3 million. The math tells me that’s pretty good. But I have no idea why that cost of the actual bridge has gone from \$18 million to \$28 million. If I was sitting up there which I was at one time, I don’t think I could vote on anything in regards to that.”

James McEwen, Laughlin resident

“I am neutral on this. As the last gentleman said, I was questioning the four lane vs. two lanes proposal also since I read something in I believe it was the *Laughlin Nevada Times*. The original design was two lanes and wouldn’t reach a four lane until 2041. That’s a lot of time for expansion. “A couple of things in favor of the bridge – one would be we have community mutual response agreements between the fire department. I’m not sure but possibly other public services in Bullhead City. Having that bridge would decrease the response time. Getting back-up for fire or back-up ambulance possibly into the Laughlin area. So from that point of view the bridge is a benefit to Laughlin. Also another thing that would make the bridge a benefit is having a roadway down in that area, I believe that would increase the possibilities of development in the future in Laughlin.

“On the down side, as Niles mentioned, was possibly taking away some business from Laughlin that haven’t developed yet, commercial business. People would be more likely to drive into Bullhead for some of their business. I’m not sure how much of that would happen since most of the business now is more now I think a lot more spur of the moment here purchases rather than long term purchases. We haven’t developed that, maybe with the other increased population that would develop.”

Chair Maniaci now turned the discussion over to the LTAB asking Stephanie Bethards to speak.

Stephanie Bethards’ comments:

“So my first thought process is the funding, which is absolutely crazy. We have other things to do. I think the location is not beneficial to us. Without keeping my time I would have to vote no completely.”

Kathy Ochs’ comments:

“I wanted to basically address some of these issues here, out of curiosity Dr. Paulson is this financial breakdown at the back of the room for the audience?”

Dr. Paulson responded yes to the question.

“If any of you have gotten a copy of this you can kind of go through some of this with me. Now we heard it proposed and I was one of the individuals that looked at the disparity of the finances and said ‘wow’, that’s really not fair in my opinion. But I wanted to break it down in financial terms because our LEDC came forward and said they did not want to endorse a second bridge or maybe I guess now it’s a third bridge, anyway shape or form and felt it was unwise for this board to do so and so when they made that statement was read and said the funds would be better used for building an infrastructure from Casino Drive from Harrah’s to Needles and the Southlands. And when they said infrastructure, it would be water, power, phone, and sewer.

“Now we today just heard from Chaunsey with the Water Department, and we just heard from the attorney with the sewage treatment facility. They both told us here today that in no way, shape, or form could money we have allocated towards the bridge be diverted to that type of infrastructure, either in the Southlands or along Casino Drive because it is up to the individual property owners to form an SID to do that.

“So the initial proposal that was given to us, let’s put towards shovel ready projects that we have like building the infrastructure which is important to the growth and the development of Laughlin. I understood that but we were just told here today that will not happen. If we do not build this bridge that money that is already allocated is not going towards that, which I also tend to believe that would be good development as well. My issue and the reason I proposed looking at a different location, yes our chamber director said \$5 million from the RTC funds were put forward to the initial phase for the study and development of sites, but let me draw your attention to the fact that the federal funding for this process for this bridge is \$18 million.

“Now if you go with construction cost only, we see that the bridge as proposed is \$28 million. We go to total roadway construction and you see it in two different places, the Bullhead City roadway cost which is at \$3.1 million and you see total County roadway cost at \$15.8 million. So let me help you understand why it is that number.

“It is that number because the federal government with their grant at \$18.5 million did a deminimus study and found the best location for their federal funding that they could support and provide us that funding of \$18.5 million was at the current location. So what I proposed in the last board meeting we not let the opportunity to have a bridge go away. We now know we can’t put those funds towards other things that we were hoping that could develop. But if we took a look at the \$5 million survey, things were not available then when that survey was done.

“Laughlin Ranch Road did not go through. In addition, there was not a suspension bridge that was studied. Those are things I realize if we did another study we would be losing \$4 million. I’m telling you the math. I’m a business owner and I have to work on that. The math, I’m letting \$18.5 million of federal funding dictate the rest which I have at \$39 million. I’m not saying we don’t need another bridge, I think we do. I think it would help both communities, I personally would benefit from it. But I’m just looking at it, the construction roadway cost, just on the Laughlin side at the current location, is \$18.95 million. Now I’m not saying it won’t cost something to build a road, what if just said \$3 million, which is what it is costing to build a road on the Bullhead side, so if we absorb that as well. I think there would be a better location that is more economically responsible for this board to look at.

“The numbers don’t lie from the estimates that we have. I think it’s wise of this board to consider a different location. We let that federal money dictate where this will be. And if we did away with that federal grant and chose our location, the other things could go forward, the saving, it’s only a \$15 million difference. So that’s a variance of \$3 million. I don’t think it’s wise.

“I do believe there needs to be another bridge. I do not believe if we divert funds that are allocated for the bridge; we are not going to get what we thought we could, in other words we are not going to be able to go in and put that money towards waterlines, sewer lines from Casino Drive to Needles Highway, or develop the Southlands. Those were things that were put out, to take the money from the bridge and put it here. We can see that’s not going to happen, that takes property owners and development schedules to be done. That’s my position on the bridge. I just felt you needed to look at it possibly a different way.”

Dr. Paulson added for clarification that they couldn’t use water reclamation and Big Bend for design unless funded by the property owner or developer. RTC funding has to be used, not for water rec design or infrastructure, but for road only. So RTC monies could be used for the road but not water and sewer.

Gina Mackey’s comments:

“My thoughts are that this idea was brought up a very long time ago during a different time period that no longer carries the ideology that Laughlin encompasses today. What might have been beneficial to Laughlin on a convenience level for the residents no longer applies.

“The financial responsibilities Laughlin is being asked for are not only unfair but the monies could be spent on enhancements for our town that are more relevant to our community, like utilities for Casino Drive and footprints for medical services, etc. Furthermore, I find no official recent executed financial documentation with respect to the building cost. I can tell you as a REALTOR, without a signed contract, you don’t have a deal. Whereas we have already spent shy of under \$5 million from the Fort Mohave funds. Mohave funds on this project on the design elements that we would have to dismiss. This money is earmarked for the benefit of our community here in Laughlin and not Arizona or any other state for that matter.

“I took an oath as an elected town advisory board member to serve our community to the best of my ability, and honestly I can say I cannot support this project. We’ve had so many challenges here in

this community and it would be nice if we could at least preserve our integrity and utilize these funds in which they were intended for and that is the well-being and enhancement in the town of Laughlin, its residents, and its business interests. Thank you.”

Chair James Maniaci’s written comments:

“In discussing a government-funded project, the first question that should be asked is: ‘Is this a proper function of this government?’ If the answer is yes, you ask, ‘Why do we need to do this, or why should we not do this?’ If the answer is that the project should proceed, you determine which agency should lead and how to proceed.

“The answer to each question often contains several elements. Such as, the last official action by a Nevada government was February 26, 2016, when the Clark County Commission transferred \$5 million from the Fort Mohave Valley Development Fund general account to its capital improvement account. The LTAB asked that of the County Commission on April 30, 2013; the motion was for the final design and construction of the bridge.

“That action was based on a 10-page agreement signed on Oct. 19, 2004, among Clark County, Bullhead City, and the Southern Nevada Regional Transportation Commission, which is the lead agency.

“That first agreement required separate written agreements or amendments to the original agreement, for each of the five phases. Except for the initial agreement signed some 14 years ago, none of the required agreements have been adopted by the trio of governing bodies, at least that we have been able to find. This board's charter is to seek to improve the quality of life for our citizens, in Laughlin Township. Yes, at times that will involve cooperative efforts with governments outside of the township, Clark County, and Nevada. And those efforts are best when based on the Bible's ‘Golden Rule’; that is, ‘Do to others as you would have them do to you.’

“Laughlin's history has seen far too little of this benign principle in our half-century. This proposed bridge project continues efforts to siphon our citizens' money for a project for which Nevada interests will pay dearly – about 97 % of the costs and receive very little, less than three percent of the benefit.

“Given this one-sided relationship, the proposed bridge with its unbeneficial lack of proper agreements, with its unbalanced division of costs, with its unbeneficial growing cost, and with its unbeneficial present location, is not acceptable to me.”

Chair Maniaci moved that the Laughlin Town Advisory Board requests the Clark County Board of Commissioners to have the Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada immediately halt all unencumbered spending on this proposed bridge project, for which the design costs were paid from the Fort Mohave Valley Development Fund.

Gina Mackey seconded the motion. Motion passed upon a voice vote 3-1. Kathy Ochs voted nay.

The Chair moved to ask the two Nevada Commissions to reprogram those funds to other similar projects in Laughlin that will have a more beneficial and positive affect to provide services that will make life in Laughlin better for its residents.

Gina Mackey seconded the motion. Motion passed upon a voice vote 3-1. Kathy Ochs voted nay.

2. Review, discuss, and approve 2019 Laughlin Town Advisory Board meeting dates, and take any action deemed appropriate. (For possible action)

Meeting dates:

**LAUGHLIN TOWN ADVISORY BOARD
2019 MEETING DATES**

January	15	29
February	12	26
March	12	26
April	09	30
May	14	28
June	11	25
July	09	30
August	13	27
September	10	24
October	08	29
November	12	<i>*26 Cancelled</i>
December	10	<i>*31 Cancelled</i>

November 26th Week of Thanksgiving - **Cancelled**

December 31th New Year's Eve - **Cancelled**

After a brief discussion, Gina Mackey moved to approve the meeting dates as presented. Vice Chair Kathy Ochs seconded the motion. Motion passed upon a voice vote 4-0.

3. Nominate and appoint eight (8) members for Citizen of the Year Review Committee.
(For possible action)

Gina Mackey and James Maniaci provided their selections for the Citizen of the Year committee. Kathy Ochs and Stephanie Bethards will provide their recommendations at a later date.

Gina Mackey submitted her nominations:

Andrea Anderson

Robert Anderson

James Maniaci submitted his nominations:

Mike Willis

Cleo Weir

Kathy Ochs submitted one of her nominations:

Kathleen Whitehead

Chair Maniaci moved to approve the nominations for the Citizen of the Year committee, seconded by Kathy Ochs. Motion passed upon a voice vote. 4-0.

VIII. Public Comment:

Glen Uecker asked about an appointee.

Bruce Henry announced he was officially appointed as the alternate for the Community Development Advisory Committee, or CDAC.

Kathleen Whitehead provided an update on the Cancer Relay for Life. It went very well and she believed over \$50,000 was raised during the event. Last year, \$30,000 was raised. Officer Nicol was Miss Relay and raised a lot of money, and would like to say thank you.

Kimberly Cronhamn expressed her concern about the intersection at Needles Highway and Bennett

Drive.

IX. Next Meeting Date: January 15, 2019

X. Adjournment: 3:50 p.m.

***These minutes are in draft form and will be formally approved at the January 15, 2019 meeting.
Any corrections to these minutes will be reflected in the meeting minutes of the February 12, 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>