NORTHERN NEVADA
LEGISLATIVE BUILDING
401 S. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701
(775) 684-6821
fiscal@lcb.state.nv.us

SOUTHERN NEVADA
LEGISLATIVE OFFICES
7120 Amigo Street
Las Vegas, NV 89119

THE STATE OF NEVADA
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

FISCAL ANALYSIS DIVISION

SARAH COFFMAN
Assembly Fiscal Analyst

WAYNE THORLEY
Senate Fiscal Analyst

MEMORANDUM

C.T.

DATE: December 2, 2025

TO: Members of the 36th Special Session of the Legislature

FROM: Christian Thauer, Principal Program Analyst
Fiscal Analysis Division

SUBJECT: Fiscal Note for Assembly Bill 1 – Local Governments

Pursuant to NRS 218D.430, the following counties, cities, and school districts have submitted the following fiscal notes to the Fiscal Analysis Division on Assembly Bill 1 of the 36th Special Session.

cc: Roger Wilkerson, Acting Director, Legislative Counsel Bureau
Bryan Fernley, Legislative Counsel
Wayne Thorley, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Sarah Coffman, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Michael Nakamoto, Chief Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst

Local Government Responses
AB 1 / BDR 19 - 22

City/County: Churchill County
Approved by: Alexa G Robinson, Executive Assistant
Comment: No Impact.

City/County: Elko County
Approved by: Susan Paprocki, Comptroller
Comment: No fiscal impact anticipated for Elko County.

City/County: Humboldt County
Approved by: Weston Noyes, Comptroller/Auditor
Comment: This bill has a fiscal impact which cannot be reasonably determined. While the bill as it is written would provide resources which could benefit the county, we cannot provide a reasonable estimate of how these resources would impact the county.

City/County: Lincoln County
Approved by: Denice Brown, Commissioners Asst/Grants
Comment: I find that there is no concrete way to determine if this will impact us. It will depend 100% on how the law is actually written AND how the GTO acts on those statutes. The simple fact is the GTO has the authority to do numerous things and acquire grant funding that may alter how/if Lincoln County is eligible for such grants

I'm satisfied that this will likely not have any indirect fiscal requirements for Lincoln.

City/County: Lyon County
Approved by: Josh Foli CPA CGMA, Comptroller
Comment: Cannot be Determined
Lyon County may have increased fees, IT requirements (staffing or hardware/software) from the State to maintain access to various software used by Lyon County that are housed by the State. Since the bill doesn't have the specific requirements that will be imposed, we are not able to quantify a fiscal impact.

City/County: Pershing County
Approved by: Karen Wesner, Administrative Assistant/HR Rep.
Comment: Pershing County has Cyber-Security software in place. It is not the same software as the State of Nevada. If the counties have to have the same software as the State of Nevada, there would possibly be a fiscal impact.

City/County: City of Elko
Approved by: Annette Robinson, City Clerk
Comment: The City of Elko has reviewed this BDR and has determined that there is no fiscal impact.

City/County: City of Las Vegas
Approved by: Brian Lovelin, Grant Administrator
Comment: No Impact.

City/County: City of Reno
Approved by: Jason Gortari, MBA, M.S.
Comment: No Impact

City/County: City of Sparks
Approved by: Jeff Cronk, Chief Financial Officer
Comment: No Impact.

City/County: City of West Wendover
Approved by: Yesenia Pacheco, Administrative Assistant
Comment: Cannot be determined- we currently don't have a Security Operations Center administered by the Chief and we don't have an account under the general fund for it.

School District: Carson City School District
Approved by: Spencer Winward, Chief Financial and Operations Officer
Comment: Carson City School District cannot determine the fiscal impact of this proposed legislation. Coordination of cybersecurity at the statewide level could provide support in the ever-increasing realm of cybersecurity. This support could result in future cost savings depending on the amount of support provided to school districts and the policies and regulations put in place by the Chief Information Officer. Conversely, it could also create additional demands for financial resources.

School District: Elko County School District
Approved by: Cassandra Stahlke, Chief Financial Officer
Comment: There is no fiscal impact to Elko County School District.

School District: Lyon County School District
Approved by: A. Lilliana Camacho-Polkow, Chief Financial Officer
Comment: No Impact

School District: Nye County School District
Approved by: Alma Wright, Executive Secretary to Assistant Superintendents
Comment: The fiscal impact of BDR 19-22 on Nye County School District is indeterminate at this time because it relies on future operational decisions and third-party insurance requirements that are not yet defined.

School District: Pershing County School District
Approved by: Dennis Holmes, Superintendent
Comment: I do not anticipate any financial impact on the district.

School District: Washoe County School District
Approved by: Mark Mathers, Chief Financial Officer
Comment: There is no fiscal impact to Washoe County School District since we do not utilize the State's IT services.

The following counties/cities/school districts did not provide a response: Carson City, Clark County, Douglas County, Esmeralda County, Eureka County, Lander County, Mineral County, Nye County, Storey County, White Pine County, City of Boulder City, City of Fallon, City of Fernley, City of Henderson, City of Mesquite, City of North Las Vegas, Churchill County School District, Clark County School District, Douglas County School District, Esmeralda County School District, Eureka County School District, Humboldt County School District, Lander County School District, Mineral County School District, Storey County School District.

BDR 19-22

AB1 – AS INTRODUCED

LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FISCAL NOTE

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: November 16, 2025

Agency Submitting: Washoe County

Fiscal Impact: No Impact

<u>Explanation</u>

The provisions of BDR 19-22 pertaining to local governments are enabling rather than mandatory and therefore this measure would have no direct impact on Washoe County.

Name <u>Cadence Matijevich</u>

Title <u>Government Affairs Liaison</u>

Subject: Fiscal Note Response – BDR 19-22 (Lincoln County School District)

Dear Fiscal Staff,

Lincoln County School District has reviewed **BDR 19-22**, which revises provisions relating to governmental administration and creates a Security Operations Center (SOC) within the Governor's Technology Office, including the option for local governmental agencies and school districts to use the services and equipment of that Office.

Under BDR 19-22, participation by a school district is **permissive, not mandatory**. A district only becomes a "using agency" – and thus subject to associated service fees, cybersecurity standards, reporting requirements, and potential audit/oversight – if it elects to enter into an agreement to use the services or equipment of the Governor's Technology Office and SOC.

Lincoln County School District will **not opt in** to use the services or equipment of the Governor's Technology Office or the Security Operations Center. Because LCSD will not become a "using agency" under the bill:

- The District will **not incur any service or equipment fees** to the Fund for Information Services.
- The District will **not be subject to new SOC-driven cybersecurity standards, reporting, or audit requirements**.
- The District will **not bear any costs** related to the appropriations or loan mechanisms established in the bill for the Governor's Technology Office, which operate at the state level.

Accordingly, **the enactment of BDR 19-22 will not produce any direct or indirect fiscal impact on Lincoln County School District**.

Matthew Cameron
Superintendent
Lincoln County School District

Outlook

Re: REQUEST FOR FISCAL NOTE - BDR 19-22 (36th Special Session)

From Terrill Trask <terrill.trask@wpcnvadmin.com>
Date Fri 11/14/2025 8:31 AM
To Fiscal Division, LCB <LCBFiscal@lcb.state.nv.us>
Cc Nakamoto, Michael <mnakamoto@lcb.state.nv.us>; Thauer, Christian <Christian.Thauer@lcb.state.nv.us>

Dear Fiscal Division, LCB,

Pursuant to your request and the requirements of **NRS 218D.435** and **NRS 218D.470**, the White Pine County School District (WPCSD) has reviewed Bill Draft Request **BDR 19-22** and submits the following fiscal note.

FISCAL NOTE: BDR 19-22

(White Pine County School District)

Item of Revenue or Expense, or Both	Fiscal Year 2025-26	Fiscal Year 2026-27	Effect on Future Biennia
Total	Indeterminate Negative	Indeterminate Negative	Indeterminate Negative

---

Explanation of Fiscal Impact

This bill draft request has an **Indeterminate Negative Fiscal Impact** on the White Pine County School District (WPCSD) that is **optional and contingent** upon a decision by the Board of Trustees.

Details of Potential Expense

1. **Optional Services and Fees:** BDR 19-22 authorizes the **board of trustees of a school district** to use the services and equipment of the **Governor’s Technology Office (GTO)**, which now includes the new **Security Operations Center**.
2. **Statutory Fee Requirement:** The bill requires any local governmental agency that uses the GTO's services or equipment to **pay a fee for such use**.
3. **Indeterminate Amount:** The amount of the fee is not specified in the BDR, but is required to be **"determined by the Chief"** of the GTO.

The negative fiscal impact (expense) to WPCSD is indeterminate because:

- The District's decision to contract with the GTO for services (such as cybersecurity support) is **optional** and dependent on the Board of Trustees' determination of need.

- The actual cost (the fee) for any services utilized is **not yet established**, making it impossible to provide a reliable dollar estimate.

If the District chooses to use the GTO services, an expense would be incurred; otherwise, there would be no fiscal impact.

Approved by:

Terrill Trask, CFO

Date Prepared: November 14, 2025

Agency Submitting: White Pine County School District

BDR/Bill No.: BDR 19-22
Thanks.
Terrill Trask, CFO
White Pine County School District