

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: March 31, 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. 398 / BDR 35 - 580

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: Churchill County Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager Comment: Costs to Churchill County would include administrative costs associated with petitions to close/open/maintain abandoned roads. The anticipated impacts would be less than \$5,000 per year for the County to inspect roads maintained by residents to assure public safety.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000

City/County: Clark County Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Assistant Director of Finance Comment: There would be fiscal impact because more resources would be needed for oversight to ensure conditions (construction, repair, and maintenance) and safety of these roads. Amount undetermined. This would include additional staffing and funding, even if basic maintenance was taken upon the residents that requested and BCC approved these roads.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Douglas County Approved by: Carl Ruschmeyer, Public Works Director Comment: It is anticipated that this legislation would have no additional fiscal impact on 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: Ben Garratt, Roads Supervisor

Comment: Depending on the number of petitions generated and put over to public hearing will dictate the impact on the local governing board. The assurance of long term accessibility to public lands may have a positive economic value.

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

City/County: **Washoe County**

Approved by: Liane Lee , Government Affairs Manager

Comment: The proposed additions and changes in Section 1, No 2. are expected to increase the taxpayers costs associated with maintenance and operation of “accessory roads” and/or “public roads”, roads which are not maintained roads. For example there are approximately 2,283 miles of personal “Public Roads” in Washoe County alone which are not built to County standards, are not accepted as County roads and therefore not maintained as County roads. Wording in Section 1 also requires the inspection and/or assurance that these accessory and/or public roads are maintained in an undefined safety standard. It is anticipated there are additional costs associated if this action were required.

The proposed wording in Section 5 1 (a) is unclear as to who and what process would be followed for “formalizing and finalizing title to accessory roads....” and requires clarification as to the intent.

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 County is limited pursuant to NRS on the amount of funding available to maintain the County roads. This would require additional services from the County to assist residents to develop plans for road maintenance and to provide reasonable inspections of the roads to ensure safety. The outcome would be an adverse impact on the County in the form of higher expense in a fund that is capped on revenues. An exact amount cannot reasonably be determined.

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: No identifiable fiscal impact to the City of Henderson.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: City of Las Vegas Approved by: Michelle Thackston, Administrative Secretary 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, there is no fiscal impact to the City of Reno.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: City of Sparks Approved by: Jeff Cronk, Financial Services Director Comment: This may have a financial impact resulting in higher expenditures, but it's uncertain how, or even if, this would be implemented in the City of Sparks.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

The following cities and counties did not provide a response: Elko County, Esmeralda 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, and City of North Las Vegas.