

LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FISCAL NOTE

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: March 3, 2005

Agency Submitting: Local Government

Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both	Fiscal Year 2004-05	Fiscal Year 2005-06	Fiscal Year 2006-07	Effect on Future Biennia
Total				

Explanation (Use Additional Sheets of Attachments, if required)

See attached.

Name Chris Janzen

Title Deputy Fiscal Analyst

SUMMARY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT RESPONSES
AB 61 / BDR 32-974

	FY 2006	FY 2007	Comments
City of Henderson			The City of Henderson will have no significant fiscal impact from the proposed legislation.
City of Las Vegas			There is no way to estimate this loss in state revenue collected and is part of the consolidated tax distribution.
City of North Las Vegas			This legislation is not expected to impact the city in any material way.
City of Reno			The City of Reno Finance Dept. has determined that the changes proposed in this BDR would have a minimal impact on the revenue stream of the City.
City of Sparks			Any entity that contains a reservation has the potential for lost revenues on each vehicle that is exempted. But I doubt that for Sparks the loss would be noticeable.
Carson City			Fiscal impact unknown.
Churchill County			Negligible impact.
Clark County			Indeterminate impact.
Douglas County			Limited impact.
Eureka County			No impact.
Humboldt County			No significant impact.
Lincoln County			No impact.
Washoe County	\$6,600	\$7,300	\$6,000 in FY 2004-05; \$16,900 effect on future biennia. This bill has nominal impact on Washoe County. Note: Apparently this GST has not been collected in the past by DMV from the Tribal Governments, so the County will realize a gain if the bill is not approved (assuming DMV will begin collecting this GST). Analysis assumes 10% increase in GST per year.
White Pine County			No impact.

The following local government entities did not provide a response: Elko County, Esmeralda County, Lander County, Lyon County, Mineral County, Nye County, Pershing County and Storey County.