

FISCAL NOTE
 LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ANALYST ESTIMATE

ESTIMATE OF FISCAL IMPACT – STATE AGENCIES (See narrative for political subdivision estimates)				
	FY 2020-21		FY 2021-22	
	EXPENDITURES	REVENUE	EXPENDITURES	REVENUE
GENERAL FUNDS				
CASH FUNDS				
FEDERAL FUNDS				
OTHER FUNDS				
TOTAL FUNDS				

Any Fiscal Notes received from state agencies and political subdivisions are attached following the Legislative Fiscal Analyst Estimate.

LB 744 eliminates the requirement that a county engineer in counties having a population of at least 150,000 inhabitants be elected and provides that the county board is able to appoint a county engineer. Additionally, appointed county engineers are required to appoint a full-time county surveyor.

A fiscal impact at the state level is absent.

The Secretary of State provided a fiscal note (see attached) indicating no fiscal impact.

Sarpy County provided a fiscal note (see attached) indicating that current statutory duties of county boards and county engineers related to road improvements are in conflict. Further, the proposed legislation would resolve the conflicting duties and facilitate the ability of the county to fully expend their annual budgeted amounts for road projects (which have been historically underspent due to the conflicting duties). A basis to disagree is absent.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES STATE BUDGET DIVISION: REVIEW OF AGENCY & POLT. SUB. RESPONSE			
LB: 744	AM:	AGENCY/POLT. SUB: Nebraska Secretary of State	
REVIEWED BY: Lucas Martin	DATE: 1/13/2020	PHONE: (402) 471-4181	
COMMENTS: No basis to disagree with the Secretary of State's assessment of no fiscal impact.			

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES STATE BUDGET DIVISION: REVIEW OF AGENCY & POLT. SUB. RESPONSE			
LB: 744	AM:	AGENCY/POLT. SUB: Sarpy County	
REVIEWED BY: Lucas Martin	DATE: 1/17/2020	PHONE: (402) 471-4181	
COMMENTS: No basis to disagree with Sarpy County's assessment of fiscal impact and efficiencies.			

Please complete ALL (5) blanks in the first three lines.

2020

LB⁽¹⁾ 744

FISCAL NOTE

State Agency OR Political Subdivision Name: ⁽²⁾ Secretary of State

Prepared by: ⁽³⁾ Joan Arnold Date Prepared: ⁽⁴⁾ 1/13/2020 Phone: ⁽⁵⁾ 402-471-2384

ESTIMATE PROVIDED BY STATE AGENCY OR POLITICAL SUBDIVISION

	<u>FY 2020-21</u>		<u>FY 2021-22</u>	
	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>REVENUE</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>REVENUE</u>
GENERAL FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
CASH FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
FEDERAL FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
OTHER FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL FUNDS	=====	=====	=====	=====

Explanation of Estimate:

No Fiscal Impact

BREAKDOWN BY MAJOR OBJECTS OF EXPENDITURE

Personal Services:

<u>POSITION TITLE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF POSITIONS</u>		<u>2020-21</u>	<u>2021-22</u>
	<u>20-21</u>	<u>21-22</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Benefits.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Operating.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Travel.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Capital outlay.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Aid.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Capital improvements.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL.....	_____	_____	_____	_____

Please complete ALL (5) blanks in the first three lines.

2020

LB⁽¹⁾ 744

FISCAL NOTE

State Agency OR Political Subdivision Name: ⁽²⁾ Sarpy County

Prepared by: ⁽³⁾ William E. Conley Date Prepared: ⁽⁴⁾ 1/10/2020 Phone: ⁽⁵⁾ 402-593-5958

ESTIMATE PROVIDED BY STATE AGENCY OR POLITICAL SUBDIVISION

	<u>FY 2020-21</u>		<u>FY 2021-22</u>	
	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>REVENUE</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>REVENUE</u>
GENERAL FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
CASH FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
FEDERAL FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
OTHER FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL FUNDS	_____	_____	_____	_____

Explanation of Estimate:
See attached.

BREAKDOWN BY MAJOR OBJECTS OF EXPENDITURE

Personal Services:

<u>POSITION TITLE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF POSITIONS</u>		<u>2020-21</u>	<u>2021-22</u>
	<u>20-21</u>	<u>21-22</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Benefits.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Operating.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Travel.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Capital outlay.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Aid.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
Capital improvements.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL.....	_____	_____	_____	_____

See attached.

Currently, the county board and the county engineer both have statutory duties related to road improvements, which conflict. This proposed legislation will clarify and resolve the conflicting language and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of county government.

The attached schedule shows the annual budget specifically for road projects, by year, from fiscal 2008 through 2019. Notably, a significant portion of the projects that are budgeted are not being completed and funds carry-over the future years. This delay in constructing board-approved projects impacts citizens of the county and their ability to travel conveniently and safely on county roads.

Over the past 10 fiscal years, on average Sarpy County has included \$12,050,000 in the annual budget for road projects, yet only used and spent \$7,134,000. On average over this 10 year period, Sarpy County has not spent 43% of the project dollars budgeted for road projects.

These unspent funds are not "savings" to the county, merely deferrals of funds on projects that will only get more expensive as the project is undertaken.

Sarpy County
Road Projects - Budget vs. Actual
2008 - 2019

Funds	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Highway, Roads, Streets	\$13,630,341	\$9,280,175	\$11,149,399	\$8,766,944	\$9,695,463	\$8,035,584	\$6,459,495	\$2,160,128	\$5,490,308	\$6,386,663	\$7,898,927	\$7,950,909
ROW	\$200,000	\$290,000	\$765,000	\$2,068,830	\$1,270,000	\$426,075	\$558,133	\$397,090	\$240,000	\$130,000	\$200,000	\$0
Bridge buyback	\$609,320	\$465,176	\$247,096	\$190,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Road construction buyback	\$550,059	\$571,489	\$963,420	\$860,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Engineering fees	\$1,258,056	\$920,471	\$1,055,607	\$2,631,709	\$2,405,406	\$1,971,784	\$1,451,373	\$826,722	\$1,226,707	\$744,743	\$205,000	\$0
Consultant management	\$713,326	\$630,557	\$1,017,279	\$888,620	\$244,788	\$551,099	\$35,500	\$75,757	\$193,116	\$0	\$0	\$0
ASIP southeast	\$58,680	\$54,527	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ASIP southwest	\$137,892	\$320,000	\$95,000	\$50,000	\$166,667	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ASIP northwest	\$2,432,959	\$2,300,000	\$1,509,500	\$930,000	\$166,667	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Road project fund	\$1,575,490	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL BUDGET for ROADS	\$21,166,123	\$14,832,395	\$16,822,301	\$16,206,103	\$14,115,657	\$10,984,522	\$8,504,501	\$3,459,697	\$7,150,131	\$7,261,406	\$8,303,927	\$7,950,909

Funds	2019	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Highway, Roads, Streets	\$6,345,725	\$5,800,198	\$9,835,123	\$6,235,105	\$6,289,087	\$5,045,746	\$3,024,469	\$1,092,761	\$4,830,137	\$1,816,095	\$10,894,201	\$7,687,025
ROW	\$504,755	\$357,305	\$1,017,251	\$2,064,864	\$284,477	\$590,796	\$330,929	\$29,750	\$9,313	\$67,714	\$8,455	\$4,453
Bridge buyback	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$190,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Road construction buyback	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Engineering fees	\$574,506	\$601,336	\$792,390	\$2,442,319	\$1,599,476	\$894,881	\$1,015,770	\$275,937	\$207,825	\$162,226	\$117,183	\$209,304
Consultant management	\$311,440	\$142,004	\$1,079,462	\$631,149	\$230,996	\$341,829	\$187,704	\$29,427	\$130,613	\$1,249	\$131,482	\$181,691
ASIP southeast	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ASIP southwest	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
ASIP northwest	\$452,145	\$629,498	\$454,430	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Major priority road fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL SPENT ON ROADS	\$8,188,570	\$9,118,918	\$14,063,160	\$12,476,857	\$8,404,036	\$6,873,253	\$4,558,872	\$1,427,874	\$5,177,887	\$2,047,285	\$11,151,321	\$8,082,473

AMOUNT NOT SPENT	\$12,977,553	\$6,713,477	\$2,759,141	\$3,729,246	\$5,711,621	\$4,111,269	\$3,945,629	\$2,031,823	\$1,972,244	\$5,214,121	\$2,847,394	-\$131,564
10-Year Average Annual Unspent 2010-2019												

PERCENTAGE NOT SPENT	61%	45%	16%	23%	40%	37%	46%	59%	28%	72%	34%	-2%
10-Year Average Percentage Unspent 2010-2019												

*2009 : paid back FEDS for 96th street