

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: February 20, 2015

Agency Submitting: Local Government

<b>Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2014-15</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2015-16</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2016-17</b>	<b>Effect on Future Biennia</b>
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  
**S.B. 166 / BDR 18 - 424**

City/County: <b>Carson City</b> Approved by: Nickolas A. Providenti, Finance Director Comment: No major fiscal impact to Carson City.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Churchill County</b> Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager Comment: In review of BDR 18-424, there may be an opportunity for grant funds, although, to what extent the funds will be available is uncertain. If Churchill County were to receive funding for the preservation and promotion of arts and museums on a one-time basis, we would be responsible for the on-going cost. However, this is not likely to be significant. The proposed bill does not appear to have a direct impact to our museum's annual operating budget, but it may help enhance future programs, exhibits, and/or activities.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Clark County</b> Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Assistant Director of Finance Comment: Section 7 is silent on what resources will be used to repay the amount of State bonds issued. As such, it cannot be determined if this BDR will have an effect on Clark County until the source of those funds is identified as not reducing any program supporting local governments.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Esmeralda County</b> Approved by: Karen Scott, Auditor/Recorder Comment: No Impact				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Humboldt County</b> Approved by: Sondra Schmidt, Comptroller Comment: No Impact				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Washoe County</b> Approved by: Liane Lee, Government Affairs Manager Comment: No Impact				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>White Pine County</b> Approved by: Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director Comment: The issuance of \$10,000,000 of general obligation bonds by the State up to \$100,000,000 over a 10 year period will create additional debt service for the State. In order to provide for the debt service other items in the State budget will be sacrificed. Until such time as it is identified what will be eliminated in order to provide for the debt service it is impossible to quantify how this will impact the County. However, in the past, as State revenues fall larger burdens have been placed on the Counties. Therefore, although specifically unquantifiable, this will result in adverse impact on the County.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

**The following counties did not provide a response:** Douglas County, Elko County, Eureka County, Lander County, Lincoln County, Lyon County, Mineral County, Nye County, Pershing County, and Storey County.