

## LAUGHLIN INCORPORATION QUESTION

Shall the area known as the Unincorporated Town of Laughlin, excepting therefrom the Ft. Mohave Indian Reservation, a parcel of land south of the Reservation extending to the Nevada border, and the Hotel Corridor, as those areas are more specifically described in 2011 Nevada Legislature Senate Bill 262, be incorporated as the City of Laughlin?

Yes .....

No .....

### DESCRIPTION OF TERRITORY

The territory embraced in the City is hereby defined and established as follows:

1. All those portions of Township 32 South, Range 64 East; Township 32 South, Range 65 East; Township 32 South, Range 66 East; Township 33 South, Range 65 East; Township 33 South, Range 66 East; Township 34 South, Range 66 East, M.D.B. & M., which are located in the County of Clark, State of Nevada.

2. Excepting therefrom the following described land:

(a) That land referred to as the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation, approximately 3,842 acres of land, being a portion of Sections 17, 19, 20 thru 22, 27 thru 28, 30 thru 33 and all of Section 29 of Township 33 South, Range 66 East, Clark County, Nevada, and a portion of Section 5 of Township 34 South, Range 66 East, Clark County, Nevada.

(b) Further excepting therefrom Township 34 South, Range 66 East, M.D.B. & M., Clark County, Nevada.

(c) Further excepting therefrom the following described Parcels of land referred to as the "Hotel Corridor":

(1) Parcel 1. The South Half (S 1/2) of the South Half of Section 12 of Township 32 South, Range 66 East, M.D.M., Clark County, Nevada, excepting therefrom State Route 163 recorded in Book 920722 as Instrument 00564, Official Records of Clark County, Nevada, together with Parcel 1 of File 70 of Parcel Maps at Page 20, Official Records of Clark County Nevada, also together with Civic Way recorded in Book 910906 as Instrument Number 00680, Official Records of Clark County, Nevada, lying within the South Half (S 1/2) of the South Half (S 1/2) of said Section 12.

(2) Parcel 2. Section 13, Township 32 South, Range 66 East, M.D.M., Clark County, Nevada, excepting therefrom that remaining portion of Parcel 1 of File 53 of Parcel Maps at Page 53, Official Records of Clark County, Nevada, lying within the Southwest Quarter (SW 1/4) of said Section 13, more particularly described as beginning at the Northeast corner of said Parcel 1, said point being on the Southerly right-of-way line of Bruce Woodbury Drive (90.00 feet wide); thence departing said Southerly right-of-way line and along the Easterly line of said Parcel 1, South 01°08'21" West, 100.00

feet to the Northerly line of Parcel 4 as shown by map thereof recorded in File 98 of Parcel Maps at Page 17, Official Records of Clark County, Nevada; thence along said Northerly line of Parcel 4 the following 2 courses: North 89°59'51" West, 75.00 feet; North 01°08'21" East, 100.00 feet to said Southerly right-of-way and said Northerly line of Parcel 1; thence along said Southerly right-of-way line and along said Northerly line of Parcel 1, South 89°59'51" East, 75.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

(3) Parcel 3. Section 24 of Township 32 South, Range 66 East, M.D.M., Clark County, Nevada excepting therefrom Government Lots 7 & 8 of said Section 24, together with Lots 1 & 2 of File 54 of Parcel Maps at Page 79, Official Records of Clark County, Nevada, lying within the Southwest Quarter (SW 1/4) of said Section 24.

Above description taken from SB 262, Section 1.030.

### **ARGUMENT FOR PASSAGE**

A “YES” vote on incorporation provides the citizens of Laughlin the opportunity to determine the course of our own future. It has been said that the best government for the people is the government closest to the people. A “YES” vote, will allow local representatives to make the choices that affect our lives. Those who make those choices now live and work almost 100 miles away.

Most of Laughlin’s public employees do not live, shop, raise their families, or pay taxes in our community. In 2011, Las Vegas Chamber reported on salary levels; “*other government administration, judicial and legal, firefighters, parks and recreation, housing and community development, water supply, and transit all ranked 2nd in the nation; and police-other, hospital employees and sewerage employees all ranked 3rd highest nationally.*” Laughlin pays the second highest property taxes in Clark County. Assessed values in the proposed City represent approximately 50% of the Township total, the Casino District receives a far greater share of our general revenues, to cover public safety costs. According to the 2010 U.S. Census, the population of Bullhead City, AZ grew by 9,000 people. Local development was stifled and Laughlin grew by less than 300. Our schools have suffered, our property values have dropped, and many small businesses have been forced to leave.

By incorporating now, we take advantage of lowered costs and availability of talent. We have an opportunity to recruit some the best municipal executives in the Nation, to establish City departments that run daily operations. By cutting waste and increasing efficiencies, costs can be brought in line with other successful communities, like Boulder City and Mesquite. Though costs are reduced, the quality of service does not have to suffer. Many cities have actually lowered property taxes and improved services after incorporating.

By incorporating we can protect our water rights, pursue recovery of the \$5M improperly diverted from the Fort Mohave Development Fund, and assure that monies committed to development of our parks, are no longer diverted for use in the Las Vegas Valley. A “YES” vote ensures that Laughlin will have a voice on the Boards and Commissions overseeing cost containment for utilities and other essential services.

By incorporating, we will have the freedom to create a more business friendly environment. We can work to bring diversity to the local economy, create jobs that support families, and increase local prosperity; putting money back in your pocket

*The above argument was submitted by the  
Ballot Question Committee as provided for in NRS 295.121*

## **ARGUMENT AGAINST PASSAGE**

Choosing to become a new city is risky; and that is why state law requires that a proposed city be financially sound.

In business, companies manage and mitigate risks to insure profitability and make financial decisions based on factual information and not emotions. Laughlin must prove its ability to maintain the current level of services. The Legislative Commission voted to allow a vote on incorporation; but out of caution they required Laughlin citizens be informed, “that additional taxes might be required and/or services reduced if the question passed.”

The current town budget allocates 9.6 million with subsidies for services from the County and Metro amounting to approximately 21 million annually. *“Taxation projected the city could only produce annual revenue of 6.8 million.”* Counting on the consolidated tax is uncertain. Taxation then projected 11.2 million in annual expenditures.

The Nevada Department of Taxation, *“not the county,”* calculated revenues as:

Consolidated tax	3,734,807
Property tax	2,072,843
License and permits	756,100
Charges for services	55,400
Fines and forfeitures	200,000
Interest	6,000
Taxations’s projected expenditures	11,160,453
Projected deficit*	(4,335,303)

Taxation stated, “The result is an immediate budget deficit, with all revenues and beginning balances consumed in less than one year, and a significant negative fund balance at the end of the first year of operation.” No gaming revenue from the resort corridor can be counted as a revenue source. The lack of revenue leads to deficit spending from day one.

This deficit\*—means to cover the start up of a new city and maintain public works, parks, sewer, police, detention, fire, animal control, code enforcement, business license, etc., services would have to be cut, eliminated and/or taxes and fees raised. The opponents have consistently misrepresented the costs and revenues.

The risks associated with no additional “C” tax, the expense to obtain facilities and equipment, continued devaluation of assessed property value, and contracting for services have not been addressed and are additional costs to a newly incorporated city.

If the city became fiscally unsound, Laughlin can’t just ask to be let back into the county. If found not financially sustainable, the Tax Commission could take over the city and raise taxes as they did in White Pine County.

Please act in a fiscally responsible manner and vote “NO.” When, and if, Laughlin becomes financially viable, then incorporation should occur. This ballot question is premature and will be harmful to Laughlin’s citizens.

*The above argument was submitted by the  
Ballot Question Committee as provided for in NRS 295.121*