

25

## Assembly

### MINUTES OF MEETING - COMMITTEE ON STATE, COUNTY AND CITY AFFAIRS 54th Session, February 8, 1967

Meeting was called to order at 10:45 a.m.

Present: Hilbrecht, Garfinkle, Dini, Tyson, Bryan Hafen, Smith, McKissick, Roy Young.

Absent: Wooster.

Chairman Hilbrecht announced the agenda for Friday, February 10, meeting to include consideration of AB 60, AB 83 with a report from the subcommittee, and AB 54 and 59 with report from the subcommittee. He asked that members give consideration to AB 143, 144, 145, and 146 particularly with reference to hearings that may be necessary on them. Also he called attention to AB 141, the urban renewal bill, and asked for a review of AB 167 pending.

The committee members' attention was further directed to three bills that have been assigned to the committee relating to qualifying of, creation of salaries for court reporters, and matters pertaining thereto.

Mr. Curtis Blyth, Executive Director of the Nevada Municipal Association, was asked by the Chairman if he would be able to report to the next meeting of the committee on the progress being made with reference to AB 48 and AB 49 and other pending legislation involving publication matters.

Mr. Blyth said that he would have a report at that time.

Chairman Hilbrecht then stated the purpose of this meeting being consideration of proposed political subdivision mergers or consolidations throughout the state from a broad basis. He stated that the committee had considered that there may be a statewide solution to the problems, or that enabling legislation may be possible that would do away with specific enactments for each specific problem. This meeting was being held to hear particularly from the interested parties from Clark County. He stated that he would call on them each to make whatever presentation they desired. In doing so he realized that the only specific legislation before the committee was A.J.R. 28 from the 53rd Session allowing the legislature to consolidate Carson City and Ormsby County. With this preface he called upon Mr. Clay Lynch.

Mr. Lynch, City Manager of North Las Vegas, stated that his sole purpose before the committee was to find out what is proposed.

Mr. Sidney R. Whitmore, City Attorney of Las Vegas, stated that Mayor Gragson, who was not able to be present, had been asked by the Clark County Commissioners to investigate the possibility of merging the police and fire departments of some of the entities in Clark County. He said that Mr. Jim Heald, of the Local Government Budget Division had supplied him with a sheet showing how reductions might be effected by such action. He stated that in recent discussions Mayor Gragson had expressed interest in the formation of some form of metropolitan government as a means of

consolidating various services. The suggestion had been entertained that by "carving out an area" in Southern Nevada elections might be set up for consolidation.

Mr. William E. Dial, Ormsby County Commissioner, and Mr. Henry Etchemendy, Carson City Manager, both stated their presence was on behalf of A.J.R. 28 pending, but indicated their joint interest in the subject of the hearing.

Mr. Dick Hanna, Carson City Attorney, also stated his interest in protecting A.J.R. 28's provisions in that if it were not passed at this session they would not get it on the ballot.

Mr. Ray Gubser, of the Clark County Sheriff's department, was introduced, and indicated he was there to look into the problem on behalf of the Sheriff. He said the Sheriff felt that perhaps some saving could be derived from a consolidation of services but that at the present time there was no facility that could administer such a change. He stated that currently North Las Vegas and Las Vegas had effected consolidation in training and in the manning of the Hospital Detail.

Chairman Hilbrecht inquired whether there was a current serious problem which had resulted in curtailing the size of both the Sheriff's office and the Las Vegas Police Force, or the provision of adequate jail facilities.

Mr. Gubser indicated that there was an ever present money problem but that he was not experienced enough to know. He stated he felt the problems were the direct result of fast growth and dealing with tax collection whereby levies presently available were not commensurate with present population increases. He said he had asked for 43 additional people and had had no reply to the request.

Mr. David Henry, Clark County Administrator, stated that he had been instructed to make two statements. First, the Clark County Commissioners have not been advised of what is being proposed by the legislature. Second, they favor a serious study approach to the problem prior to any legislative action. He stated that from studies made to date that paper-savings indicated prior to consolidation to not materialize following actual consolidation.

Mr. Hilbrecht asked if Mr. Henry would have objection to enabling legislation as such. Mr. Garfinkle also asked whether if enabling legislation were passed which would allow entities to get together, would it be acceptable.

Mr. Henry stated that would be reasonable but reiterated his emphasis on a study approach.

Mr. George Franklin, District Attorney of Clark County, stated that for 19 years the City of Las Vegas had been trying to annex the "strip". He stated that the present objectives of consolidation could be accomplished through the use of N.R.S. 277 now on the books.

Mr. Curtis Blyth volunteered that the problems of annexation

or mergers or consolidations boiled down problems of taxation and the availability of funds. He stated that his association had drafted a bill the details of which would be available at the next meeting of the committee. 27

Mr. John Fadgen, City Attorney of North Las Vegas, stated that he felt as Mr. Blyth did and that if specific proposals are presented whereby merged services could be shown to save money he would favor them at that time.

Mr. Russell McDonald of the Legislative Counsel was called upon for his suggestions. He directed himself to members of the committee, explained the differentiation to be understood between special city charter governments and other types. He suggested that the committee direct itself to a reexamination of N.R.S 277 and also to the statutes 266, 267, and 268. He pointed out service mergers already in effect between the City of Winnemucca and Humboldt County that had been possible because of the existing statutes.

Mr. McKissick inquired whether any existing laws dealt with proposed metropolitan plans of government and Mr. McDonald stated there were none.

Mr. Bryan Hafen, speaking with reference to tax revenue relegating to the county and those available to the city, stated that consideration should be given the fact that the highly valuable "strip" area in Clark County provided Clark County with revenue--not any of the cities.

Chairman Hilbrecht outlined the Friday agenda again and the meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.