## LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: April 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 282 / BDR 13-266

	FY	FY	
	2006	2007	Comments
Churchill County	\$80,000	\$85,000	\$174,670 effect on future biennia. This legislation appears to tighten controls on private guardians requiring minimum qualifications and mandatory training. It also establishes set fees for some services and indicates what is not an allowable expense. The major issue for Churchill County is that the legislation requires the county to establish a guardianship office which should be viewed as an unfunded mandate with a significant fiscal impact. For Churchill County the fiscal impact will include the establishment of a guardianship office and provide for at least one employee plus operating expenses. Viewed another way, mandating a public guardian will incur expenses equivalent to nearly 2-cents of ad valorem rate.
Clark County			Collection of \$1 will not fully cover costs of training sessions.
Douglas County			The fiscal impact of the "public guardians" to provide training appear to be offset by the ability to charge fees.
Eureka County			No impact.
Lincoln County			No impact.
White Pine County	(\$1,200)	(\$2,100)	(\$300) in FY 2004-05; (\$4,000) effect on future biennia.

The following counties did not provide a response: Carson City, Elko County, Esmeralda County, Humboldt County, Lander County, Lyon County, Mineral County, Nye County, Pershing County, Storey County and Washoe County.