

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: March 29, 2017

Agency Submitting: Local Government

| <b>Items of Revenue or<br/>Expense, or Both</b> | <b>Fiscal Year<br/>2016-17</b> | <b>Fiscal Year<br/>2017-18</b> | <b>Fiscal Year<br/>2018-19</b> | <b>Effect on Future<br/>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. 305 / BDR 38 - 926**

City/County: **Carson City**

Approved by: Nancy Paulson, CFO

Comment: Currently, 12% of juveniles are being appointed an attorney in these types of cases. We are anticipating a \$220,000 fiscal impact. This number is based on current caseload. We also considered current ratio of attorney to juvenile appointments. We understand that initially some of the costs would be absorbed by the Public Defender Agreement and the current Conflict Counsel Contract. At some point, the Public Defender would request additional funding. The Court would need to appoint additional attorneys for these cases as the Conflict Counsel would not be able to absorb all of these clients in their existing contract. The legislation is also unclear if the Court would need to appoint a separate attorney for each juvenile or if one attorney could represent all of the juveniles in the family. We computed the fiscal impact based on per juvenile.

| <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               | \$220,000         | \$220,000         | \$440,000             |

City/County: **Clark County**

Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Asst Director of Finance

Comment: This bill requires a court to appoint an attorney to represent a child in certain proceedings; providing that a guardian ad litem appointed for a child who may be in need of protection is not entitled to compensation; excluding certain persons from appointment as a guardian ad litem.

There is 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: **Churchill County**

Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager

Comment: This Bill will have a fiscal impact which could be significant. The Court will be required to appoint counsel to all children involved in 432B matters and under certain circumstances to children in TPR cases. CC only has 3 Public Defenders under contract; the Bill would require hiring Court-Appointed Attorney's who charge \$100/hour:estimating 6 hearings in 432B cases in a 12 month period, and 5 hours per case, cost totals \$3,00-\$5,00o. But if we average 20 new cases a year the cost could potentially be \$60,000-\$1000,000

| <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                   |



| City/County: <b>Esmeralda County</b><br>Approved by: LaCinda Elgan , Esm Co Clerk and Treasurer<br>Comment: Since it states that the attorney would not be compensated, I see no fiscal impact to the Court. |                   |                   |                   |                       |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| <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><br>Approved by: Jamie Rodriguez , Management Analyst<br>Comment: The BDR does not require the court to pay for the attorney. If the court must pay for the attorney, it will have fiscal impact. Social Services will have a fiscal impact but we don't have enough information to estimate the amount. |                   |                   |                   |                       |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| <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                   |

| City/County: <b>White Pine County</b><br>Approved by: Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director<br>Comment: The requirement that the court "shall" as opposed to the court "may" appoint an attorney to represent the child has the potential to result in increased expense to the County for attorney costs. The increased expense cannot be reasonably estimated 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, Eureka County, Humboldt County, Lander County, Lyon County, Lincoln County, Mineral County, Nye County, Pershing County, and Storey County.