BDR 49-826
SB 476

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. 476 / BDR 49 - 826

City/County: **Carson City**
Approved by: Nickolas A. Providenti, Finance Director
Comment: No 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: The impacts of BDR 49-826 would be the administrative costs and programming costs involved in collecting (on tax bills) and distributing the $25 fee for each parcel in the County for conservation districts. However, the initial cost would come in to play if we developed a question for voter approval. The impact would also be dependent on our decision to bring this forward for voter approval, however, the cost is not anticipated to be significant. The $25 fee per parcel would primarily impact the tax payer.

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 fiscal impact, unless the BCC chooses to call a special election, the election costs would be minor.

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, Assesssor
Comment: There will be an initial expense to enter the fees on the roll, but it appears to be minimal.

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: 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: This requires the County to develop ballot questions for the primary election as requested in certain circumstances, advertise the ballot questions and impose and remit fees if the ballot initiative is approved. This will increases costs for the County related to staff salaries and benefits, legal advertising, reprogramming of the County's billing software and increase the checks running through finance and the treasury. The result will be an adverse financial impact to the County. An exact amount cannot be determined as the number of requests for the ballot question cannot be reasonably estimated.

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

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