

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: March 29, 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. 391 / BDR 32 - 825

City/County: Carson City Approved by: Nickolas A. Providenti, Finance Director Comment: We anticipate this would have a minor reduction in Property Tax Revenue - \$3,000 per year.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	(\$3,000)	(\$3,000)	(\$6,000)

City/County: Churchill County Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager Comment: BDR 32-825 proposes exempting both developed and undeveloped parcels used exclusively for worship. This BDR does not provide a definition for "used exclusively for worship" and how an organization would prove a parcel is used as such. There would be a negative fiscal impact if parcels owned by religious organizations without a chapel were deemed exempt, however, the impact cannot be determined at this time.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Clark County Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Assistant Director of Finance Comment: Revenue loss, if any, would be negligible.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Esmeralda County Approved by: Ruth P Lee, Assessor Comment: No impact				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Humboldt County Approved by: Jeff Johnson, Assessor Comment: Impact is very minimal. The larger impact would be determining if religious worship takes place on a vacant parcel of land. Total impact assumes every parcel would be used for worship.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$13,075	\$13,075	\$0	\$0

City/County: **Washoe County**

Approved by: Liane Lee , Government Affairs Manager

Comment: This bill would increase the amount of taxes exempted on church owned properties. The projected impact is based on current information available for religious organizations that currently have a partial exemption because some of their land is undeveloped. Washoe County Assessor does not currently track religious organizations that do not qualify for exemption under current law - therefore some assumptions were used to determine "probable religious organizations" for the purposes of estimating.

The amount noted in the table represents the ad valorem property tax impact to Washoe County only. Anticipated impact to all taxing entities in Washoe County is a loss of revenue of \$74,879 of the 2016/17 roll and \$78,623 for 2017/18 fiscal year.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	(\$30,673)	(\$32,207)	\$0

City/County: **White Pine County**

Approved by: Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director

Comment: The County is experiencing a loss of ad valorem revenues even though total appraised values are increasing. This is due to the increasing number of exemptions and abatements being granted by statute. This proposal will only exacerbate the existing problem the County is facing. An exact amount cannot be determined at this time. However, this will result in adverse financial impact to the County in the form of lost revenues.

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 calculated at this time. Participation rates for the abatement program would have to be analyzed before a true cost could be calculated.

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 revises provisions governing the exemption from property taxes of certain property used for religious worship. If this bill should pass, it will have an impact on Property Tax Revenue but Finance does not have the appropriate data to determine the fiscal impact. Finance further states that they do not feel the impact would not be significant.

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

City/County: **City of Reno**

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

Comment: While an accurate fiscal impact cannot be determined, the City of Reno anticipates a minimal negative fiscal impact due to reduction of tax revenues as a result of the newly exempted parcels of land.

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

School District: **Carson City School District**

Approved by: Andrew J Feuling, Director of Fiscal Services

Comment: There may be some reduction in revenue, but it is impossible to know to what extent.

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

School District: **Clark County School District**

Approved by: Nikki Thorn, Deputy CFO

Comment: This would have an impact on property tax revenue. For every million in exemption granted, the effect is to CCSD is \$7,500. Property tax effects can be mitigated to CCSD if the state continues to honor the decrease with an offsetting increase to the state guarantee within the DSA formula that currently exists. It is not certain if additional new exemptions will continue to allow the offsetting increase in revenue at the state level.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$15,000

School District: **Douglas County School District**

Approved by: HOLLY LUNA, CFO, BUSINESS SERVICES

Comment: Douglas County School district is a recipient of a portion of receipts from property taxes. Such receipts would be influenced by this BDR. However, there is not sufficient information to determine or calculate the effects or to provide a meaningful or substantial submittal on behalf of the school district.

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

School District: **Esmeralda County School District**

Approved by: Monie L. Byers, Superintendent

Comment: Cannot determine fiscal impact as current property taxes for religious use today are unknown.

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

School District: **Lincoln County School District**

Approved by: Steve Hansen, Superintendent

Comment: It may have a fiscal impact because of land owned by churches in Lincoln County that are currently paying taxes and then could receive an exemption. The accuracy of the data is undetermined and the fiscal impact cannot be determined.

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

School District: Lyon County School District Approved by: Philip Cowee, Director of Finance Comment: The fiscal impacts of BDR 32-825 cannot be determined. The fiscal impact if any would most likely be immaterial based on the number of parcels that would be exempt from property tax				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

School District: Nye County School District Approved by: Kerry Paniagua, Executive Secretary Comment: Don't know how many churches there are in Nye County & how much assessed valuation there would be on lost revenue.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

School District: Pershing County School District Approved by: Dan Fox, Superintendent Comment: The district does not maintain records to calculate possible loss of revenue for this proposal.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

School District: Storey County School District Approved by: Robert Slaby , Superintendent Comment: Possible loss of property tax for DSA.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

School District: Washoe County School District Approved by: Lindsay E. Anderson, Director of Government Affairs Comment: Washoe County School District cannot anticipate the amount of lost revenue due to this proposed property tax exemption.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: White Pine County School District Approved by: Paul Johnson, CFO Comment: Unable to determine impact.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

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