

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Business Impact Statement

The following Business Impact Statement was prepared pursuant to Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 237.080 and 237.090 to address the proposed impact of adoption of amendments to:

Clark County Code Title 4, Chapter 4.35 – 9-1-1 Telephone Line Surcharge

Description of the proposed ordinance or rule:

The proposed amendments to the Clark County Code will add a new Chapter 4.35 to impose a surcharge on telephone lines, including mobile telephone service, for the purpose of ensuring that the 9-1-1 emergency response system provides efficient, interoperable, and technologically advanced public safety communications.

Intent of the proposed ordinance or rule including issues to be resolved or other factors to be considered:

The intent of this proposed ordinance is to impose a surcharge on telephone lines and mobile telephone numbers as provided for in Nevada Revised Statutes Sections 244A.7641 through 244A.7648. This proposed ordinance will also create a 9-1-1 Emergency Response Advisory Committee to develop, maintain, and annually review the County's Five-Year Master Plan for 9-1-1 services and recommend surcharge expenditures to the County Board. Subject to the approval of this proposed ordinance, all telecommunication service providers, including wireless cell phone providers, that provide service to customers located within Clark County will need to be notified of this surcharge so that they can prepare to add this surcharge to their customers bills.

Description of the manner in which public comment, data or arguments was solicited from affected businesses and/or community stakeholders:

On November 6, 2025, the County sent a Notification of Proposed Amendments to Clark County Code, Title 4, Chapter 4.35 – 9-1-1 Telephone Line Surcharge (Notification Letter, Attachment #1) and the Proposed Ordinance to various chambers of commerce, trade associations, licensed telecommunication providers, and other interested parties. The Notification was published in the Las Vegas Review-Journal on November 12 and 19, 2025 (Attachment #2). The Notification and proposed ordinance were also available on the Department of Business License's website. Recipients of the Notification Letter were encouraged to respond with any comments or concerns regarding the proposed ordinance.

Summary of public comment, data or arguments including the number of public comments received:

Following a comment period that lasted 20 working days, nineteen (19) written comments were received. **[County responses to comments are in bold text and bracketed.]**

Responses in Opposition – (Attachment #3)

Several commenters expressed the following comments:

1. This new surcharge unfairly burdens those that are struggling with increased costs;
2. Residents with large families would be paying the new surcharge on multiple lines; and
3. The County should use funds from other sources to pay for 9-1-1 upgrades.

CTIA (Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association) stated that this proposed ordinance would impose a new burden on wireless consumers disproportionately impacting working families and small businesses, especially those with multiple wireless lines. Many low- and moderate-income families are struggling with the impact of inflation and an additional fee increase on wireless consumers is problematic. CTIA suggests that this fee sunset after 5 years to coincide with the 5-year master plan.

Responses in Support – (Attachment #4)

Among three of the comments that were received in support of this proposed ordinance, it was expressed that if the \$1/month charge will make things safer and more efficient for the community that the charge is more than fair; that the current system is outdated and as we grow we desperately need this; and it will help to keep us safe and save lives.

NRA (Nevada Resort Association) stated that a reliable, efficient 9-1-1 telephone system is essential to protecting public safety and ensuring that Clark County remains both a premier global tourism destination and a preferred place to live and work. Clarification was sought regarding “trunk lines” and if that means a single line to the telephone customer or does it include each downstream or room-level telephone line as a separate trunk line. If it is the latter, the proposed surcharge could have a substantial financial impact on resort properties due to the significant number of internal telephone lines maintained by the resorts. [**“Trunk line” is defined as “a line which provides a channel between a switchboard owned by a customer of a telecommunications provider and the local exchange of the telecommunications provider.” Extension lines or internal numbers, such as telephone numbers in hotel rooms, that route calls within a business’ main phone number (PBX), are not “trunk lines” nor are they “access lines” and should not be subject to this surcharge.**]

Responses Neutral – (Attachment #5)

One comment was received asking how the cell phone carriers will know to send particular line fees to Clark County and stated that, if properly executed, a great deal of revenue would be generated to improve the 911 system. [**The location of the customer is determined by the service**

address of the customer. If that service address is within Clark County, then the service provider would be responsible for collecting the surcharge and remitting it to the County.]

Another commenter wanted to know if the customers need to provide details on their trunk and business lines or will the County work directly with the carriers. **[The telecommunication service provider is responsible for properly charging the surcharge on its customers' bills and being able to determine whether the service provided is for access lines or trunk lines or both without the customer having to provide any information]**

Public availability of the Proposed Ordinance and Business Impact Statement:

Upon request, a copy of the proposed ordinance and Business Impact Statement can be obtained from the Clark County Department of Business License and such requests should be sent to:

Clark County Department of Business License
Chapters 8.20 & 8.24
500 S. Grand Central Pky., 3rd Flr
Box 551810
Las Vegas, NV 89155-1810

or a copy may be obtained from the following website:

www.clarkcountynv.gov/businesslicense

Number of businesses likely to be affected by the proposed ordinance:

There may be as many as 200 telecommunication companies that operate or have customers within Clark County that may have to collect and remit the surcharge imposed by this proposed ordinance. Additionally, it is estimated that there are nearly 3 million access telephone lines, telephone trunk lines and mobile phone numbers assigned to customers located within Clark County that could be subject to this surcharge.

The following chambers of commerce and trade associations were notified of the proposed rule:

Chamber of Commerce

African Chamber of Commerce and Tourism
American Vietnamese Chamber
Armed Forces Chamber of Commerce
Asian Chamber
Boulder City Chamber
Filipino American Chamber of Commerce of Greater Nevada
Gay and Lesbian Chamber of Commerce
Henderson Chamber of Commerce

Indian Chamber
Korean American Chamber of Commerce, Nevada
Korean Chamber
Las Vegas Asian Chamber of Commerce
Las Vegas Health & Fitness Chamber of Commerce
Las Vegas Wedding Chamber of Commerce
Latin Chamber
Laughlin Chamber
Mesquite Chamber
Moapa Valley Chamber
Native American Chamber of Commerce
Peruvian Chamber of Commerce
Sin City Chamber
Southern Nevada Veterans Chamber of Commerce
Urban Chamber
Vegas Chamber
Ward 5 Chamber of Commerce Las Vegas
Women's Chamber

Trade Associations

ABC (Associated Builders and Contractors)
Building Owners and Managers Association
Certified Commercial Investment Member Association of Southern Nevada
Clark County Association of Health Underwriters
Clark County Medical Society
Commercial Alliance Las Vegas
Greater Las Vegas Association of Realtors
Las Vegas Hospitality Association
NAIOP (National Association for Industrial and Office Parks)
Nevada Banking Association
Nevada Broadcasters Association
Nevada Business Aviation Association
Nevada Farmers Bureau
Nevada Franchised Auto Dealers Association
Nevada Homebuilders Association
Nevada Hospital Association
Nevada Hotel and Lodging Association
Nevada Legal Services
Nevada Manufacturers Association
Nevada Mining Association
Nevada Petroleum Marketers and Convenience Store Association
Nevada Press Association
Nevada Professional Facility Managers Association

Nevada Resort Association
Nevada Restaurant Association
Nevada Rural Electric Association
Nevada Rural Hospital Partners
Nevada Society of Certified Public Accountants
Nevada Subcontractors Association
Nevada Taxpayers Association
Nevada Telecommunications Association
Nevada Trucking Association
NFIB (National Federation of Independent Businesses)
Public Relations Society of America, Las Vegas Valley Chapter
Realtors
Retail Association of Nevada
Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association
Work Health Solutions

Summary of any workshop(s) held pursuant to NRS 237.080(5):

The County did not receive any request for a workshop from any chambers of commerce and/or trade associations pursuant to NRS 237.080(5). Therefore, no workshop was conducted.

The estimated economic effect of the proposed ordinance or rule on businesses:

1. Adverse effects

The proposed ordinance will increase the cost for residents and businesses located within Clark County for telephone service, including wireless cell phone service, by the number of telephone lines or mobile phone numbers maintained by the residents and businesses.

2. Beneficial effects

The proposed ordinance would provide funds for ensuring that the 9-1-1 emergency response system provides efficient, interoperable, and technologically advanced public safety communications.

3. Direct effects

This proposed ordinance will impose a surcharge on each telephone access line (\$1.00/month), telephone trunk line (\$10.00/month), and each number assigned to a customer by a mobile telephone service (\$1.00/month).

4. Indirect effects.

The proposed ordinance will require each telecommunications service provider providing telephone access lines, telephone trunk lines and mobile phone numbers to customers

located within the County to collect the surcharge imposed by this ordinance and remit the collected fees to the County on a monthly basis.

5. Other economic effects to be considered.

No other economic effects were identified.

Description of the methods that local government considered to modify the proposed ordinance or rule; or otherwise reduce the impact of the proposed rule on businesses, the parties involved, and a statement of the methods used:

Due to the specific requirements in state law (NRS 244A.7641 through 244A.7648) governing the imposition of this surcharge certain recommendations are not possible, such as not assessing the surcharge on all of the multiple cell phone lines that a family may maintain.

The estimated cost to the local government for the enforcement of the proposed ordinance or rule:

It is anticipated that the enforcement of this proposed ordinance will be absorbed by current staff.

If applicable, explanation of a new fee or increase to an existing fee including a projection of the annual revenue expected to be collected and the manner in which the revenue will be utilized:

The proposed ordinance imposes a new fee for customers of telephone services, including wireless telephone services. The new fee is based on a flat rate per month for each telephone access line, trunk line and wireless phone number assigned to customers within Clark County, including the incorporated cities. The amount of revenue cannot be determined at this time, but is estimated to be approximately \$35 million in the first year that is collected. License fees generated by this proposed ordinance would go to a special fund designated for the enhancement and improvement of the 9-1-1 emergency telephone system.

Assessment of provisions of the proposed ordinance or rule, which may duplicate or are more stringent than Federal, State or local standards regulating the same activity:

The proposed amendments do not duplicate and are not more stringent than Federal, State or local standards.

If applicable, explanation of why the duplicative or more stringent provisions are necessary:

Not applicable.

The reasons for the conclusions regarding the impact of the proposed rule on businesses:

The provisions in the proposed ordinance are necessary to ensure that the 9-1-1 emergency response system provides efficient, interoperable, and technologically advanced public safety communications.

Certification of Business Impact Statement

Pursuant to NRS 237.090 (2), I, Kevin Schiller, as County Manager for Clark County, Nevada, hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information contained in this statement was prepared properly and is accurate.



Kevin Schiller
County Manager

12.23.2025

Date

