

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: March 25, 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
S.B. 335 / BDR 20 - 710

City/County: Carson City Approved by: Nickolas A. Providenti, Finance Director Comment: No major fiscal impact to Carson City.				
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: Fiscal impact cannot be calculated as the frequency of relocation and associated costs determined to be the County's responsibility are unknown.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Churchill County Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager Comment: If passed, BDR 20-710 would increase the cost of construction of public facilities if it is determined that the County would be responsible for the relocation of certain telecommunications facilities. There is no accurate way to estimate the fiscal impact as it would occur on a specific project by project basis as they move forward.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Humboldt County Approved by: Sondra Schmidt, Comptroller Comment: This has no impact to the County.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Washoe County Approved by: Liane Lee , Government Affairs Manager Comment: Relocation of utilities is generally accomplished for Washoe County in the manner described in this BDR. Timeframes may be different, but currently meetings are held to determine the responsible party based on existing franchise agreements, the type of work, and the general nature of the work.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: White Pine County Approved by: Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director Comment: The County should not be responsible for relocating telecommunication equipment of a private provider. This can potentially add tens of thousands of dollars to capital projects and will result in 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: City of Henderson Approved by: Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager Comment: The fiscal impact of this legislation cannot be determined. If the City were to be required to pay for relocation of telecommunications infrastructure it would be project specific and cannot be projected.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: City of Las Vegas Approved by: Michelle Thackston, Administrative Secretary Comment: This bill would have a significant fiscal impact on the City. Virtually every one of our major street/storm-drain/sewer jobs involves coordination with electrical or telecom lines and in most cases we have prior rights and they are financially responsible per our franchise agreements. As it relates to cities, on Page 2, Section 2, Subsection 1(b), the 2nd sentence says that the work can't start on the project until both parties have agreed on who's paying for what. City projects could be "held hostage" by a telecommunication company's unwillingness to reach agreement. This could create huge delays and fiscal impacts. Currently, for pole attachment agreements we have with telecommunications companies it only requires us to give 60 days' notice prior to removal and they are fully responsible for any costs with the relocation. This bill opens the door to cause the City (as the controller of the right of way) to incur costs we formerly did not have on our projects. The phrase "in order to determine which party is responsible for paying for the costs of relocation" implies that there is some potential to move the relocation costs to us. Financial Impacts could be as much as \$9 Million per year from project delays due to required negotiations and potential added construction costs, however it is extremely difficult to estimate the fiscal impact for this.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: City of Sparks Approved by: Jeff Cronk, Financial Services Director Comment: No Impact				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: **City of Reno**

Approved by: Ryan High, Budget/Strat. Initiatives Mgr.

Comment: After initial review, the fiscal impact to City of Reno will likely be higher prices in public works projects involving roads and public rights of way for the movement of utilities. A specific dollar amount for the fiscal impact cannot be determined at this time due to not knowing what projects after the effective date of this legislation will involve the relocation of utilities.

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

The following cities and counties did not provide a response: Douglas County, Elko County, Esmeralda County, Eureka County, Lincoln County, Lander County, Lyon County, Mineral County, Pershing County, Nye County, Storey County, Boulder City, City of Elko, City of Mesquite, and City of North Las Vegas.