

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: March 29, 2017

Agency Submitting: Local Government

<b>Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2016-17</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2017-18</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2018-19</b>	<b>Effect on Future Biennia</b>
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. 274 / BDR 38 - 925**

City/County: <b>Carson City</b> Approved by: Nancy Paulson, CFO Comment: No significant fiscal impact to Carson City.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Clark County</b> Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Asst Director of Finance Comment: This bill draft revises provisions governing certain reports of an agency which provides child welfare services concerning a child who is need of protection; requiring a court to allow a sibling of a child who is found to be in need of protection to inspect certain records; revising provisions governing a hearing to determine whether to include an order for visitation with a sibling in a decree of adoption. No fiscal impact to Clark County.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Churchill County</b> Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager Comment: BDR 38-925 appears to be more procedural in nature, however it would create the need for additional hearings related to certain adoptions and therefore would create additional work for staff and agencies in order to comply with these new requirements. Without knowing how many siblings are adopted by different parties who would need a visitation order established, it is difficult to determine if there is any significant fiscal impact.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Esmeralda County</b> Approved by: LaCinda Elgan , Esm Co Clerk and Treasurer Comment: I would refer to the Court Judges				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Washoe County</b> Approved by: Jamie Rodriguez, Government Affairs Comment: Could possibly have some impact but expected to be minimal.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>White Pine County</b> Approved by: Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director Comment: This will require additional hearings for Child Protective Services. Any additional costs for this are passed onto the County in the form of a State Assessment. Additionally, there will be additional work required in the Clerk's office related to records maintenance, disclosure and notifications as well as additional mailing costs. These issues will result in additional expense to the County. A reasonable estimate cannot be made at this time.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>FY 2017-18</b>	<b>FY 2018-19</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

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