

BDR 32-304 AB 56

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: February 6, 2015

Agency Submitting: Local Government

Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both	Fiscal Year 2014-15	Fiscal Year 2015-16	Fiscal Year 2016-17	Effect on Future Biennia
Total	0	0	0	0

Explanation

(Use Additional Sheets of Attachments, if required)

See attached.

Name Michael Nakamoto

Title Deputy Fiscal Analyst

The following responses from local governments were compiled by the Fiscal Analysis Division. The Fiscal Analysis Division can neither verify nor comment on the figures provided by the individual local governments.

Local Government Responses A.B. 56 / BDR 32 - 304

City/County: Churchill County

Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager

Comment: BDR 32-304 changes the procedure in which the Department of Taxation audits the counties and the procedure for equalization if determined by the Department. The impacts are primarily to the State, and any fiscal impacts to the County are not anticipated to be material or significant.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Clark County

Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Assistant Director of Finance

Comment: No Fiscal Impact anticipated.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Douglas County

Approved by: Douglas W. Sonnemann, Assessor

Comment: The bill will change the method of review for the ratio study. I don't foresee any

additional revenue or expense to Douglas County.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: **Humboldt County**

Approved by: Sondra Schmidt, Comptroller

Comment: No way to calculate an impact as there are too many variables in any given year.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Lander County

Approved by: Lura Duvall , Assessor

Comment: The impact would be that each year, rather than every 3 years, it puts a strain on the Assessor and staff in smaller counties with skeletal staffing levels, this would be an impact.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Pershing County

Approved by: Karen Wesner, Admin. Assist.

Comment: Pershing County Assessor stated that the impact is unknown at this time.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Washoe County

Approved by: Liane Lee, Government Affairs Manager

Comment: If the changes to the assessment values are prior to the printing of the tax bills there will not be a fiscal impact. If changes occur to previously billed taxes there would be an impact to refund or charge additional amounts to the taxpayer effected.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: White Pine County

Approved by: Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director

Comment: The proposal includes the ability of Nevada Tax Commission to order the County Assessor to reappraise groups of properties. This could result in additional salaries and benefits being paid to the staff of the County Assessor's Office. An exact amount cannot be determined but an increase of expense would be an adverse impact to the County.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Lincoln County

Approved by: Denice Brown, Admin Assistant

Comment: No Impact

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

The following counties did not provide a response: Elko County, Esmeralda County, Eureka County, Lyon County, Mineral County, Nye County, and Storey County.