



Agenda Item No.: 73.

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY
DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT: BILL NO. 2010-23
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE: ELIGIBLE FOR ADOPTION AT THIS MEETING:

Bill No. 2010-23 Clarifies that the license fees imposed on a public utility pursuant to LVMC Chapter 6.67 may not be collected from a governmental entity that is a customer of the public utility.
Proposed by: Bradford R. Jerbic, City Attorney

Fiscal Impact

☐

No Impact

☐

Augmentation Required

☐

Budget Funds Available

Amount:

Funding Source:

Dept./Division:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

Pursuant to LVMC Chapter 6.67, the City imposes license fees on public utilities, which in turn are passed through to customers of those public utilities. Recently, there has been a challenge to the authority under which local governments, including the City, have authorized or mandated the payment of those fees by utility customers that are governmental entities. This bill will clarify that such entities are (and have been) subject to the payment of City-imposed utility license fees to the same extent as other utility customers.

RECOMMENDATION:

ADOPTION at 6/16/2010 City Council meeting pursuant to the 6/15/2010 Recommending Committee.

First Reading - 6/2/2010; First Publication - 6/5/2010

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Bill No. 2010-23
2. Business Impact Statement

Motion made by RICKI Y. BARLOW to Approve

Passed For: 6; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 0

RICKI Y. BARLOW, LOIS TARKANIAN, STEVE WOLFSON, OSCAR B. GOODMAN,
GARY REESE, STAVROS S. ANTHONY; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-
STEVEN D. ROSS); (Excused-None)

Minutes:

Second reading and bill adopted as first introduced as Ordinance No. 6097.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: **73.**

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF: JUNE 16, 2010

At the request of COUNCILMAN BARLOW, CITY ATTORNEY BRAD JERBIC explained that adoption of this bill does not mean there will be an impact to the residential fees. The City has been collecting fees from governmental entities, and there has been some dispute raised by one of those entities. Therefore, his staff felt it necessary to clarify the ordinance language.

