

LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FISCAL NOTE

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: April 3, 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. 481 / BDR 20 - 1114

City/County: Carson City Approved by: Nickolas A. Providenti, Finance Director Comment: This bill would have a fiscal impact. It would increase project costs on 75% of projects within the right of way. Also would increase lawsuit costs because if a contractor hit a telecommunications facility that wasn't shown on the plans because of the confidential non digital clause, it's not their fault. We can't estimate a cost.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Clark County Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Assistant Director of Finance Comment: No apparent fiscal impact on Clark County as the inefficiencies required by this bill cannot be quantified.				
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: No fiscal 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: No Impact				
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: No Impact				
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 components of this BDR require the County to review all current records to identify if it has any information on facilities or critical infrastructure related to public utilities within the County, redact it once identified, provide for its security and indemnify the public utility if any information is released to the public. This will result in staff time, data encryption and increased security and most likely higher insurance rates. These increased costs will result in a negative financial impact to the County in an amount that cannot be reasonably estimated.

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: Electronic files of underground utility installations provide immediate, accurate information for the design and construction of projects. If entities are forced to use the old method of requesting data, there will be substantial costs due to inaccurate locations and delays due to the time it takes to provide the information. Costs are also incurred during the design and construction phase for potholes that are required to actually determine where the lines are located. Costs per project are expected to range from \$5 thousand to \$50 thousand. Public Works completes 40 projects per year on average so with an average additional cost of \$25 thousand per project, costs would exceed \$1,000,000 per year, which would be \$3,000,000 for 3 years.

This proposed bill will also result in delays in design and construction due to unknown utility locations which will lead to extended project completion dates causing additional costs.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000

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

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