

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: March 3, 2015

Agency Submitting: Local Government

Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both	Fiscal Year 2014-15	Fiscal Year 2015-16	Fiscal Year 2016-17	Effect on Future Biennia
Total	0	0	0	0

Explanation

(Use Additional Sheets of Attachments, if required)

See attached.

Name Michael Nakamoto

Title Deputy Fiscal Analyst

The following responses from local governments were compiled by the Fiscal Analysis Division. The Fiscal Analysis Division can neither verify nor comment on the figures provided by the individual local governments.

Local Government Responses
A.B. 177 / BDR 24 - 627

City/County: Churchill County Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager Comment: BDR 24-627 is not estimated to have a significant fiscal impact.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Clark County Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Assistant Director of Finance Comment: Fiscal impact cannot be determined. There are multiple items in this bill that carry a fiscal impact and without specific information relating to how the County filing officer will be required to comply, it is impossible to determine the cost of supporting the requirements. In the last presidential election year, the County Election Department spent \$926,000 in printing and \$431,000 in postage costs. Any requirement that would require reprinting and/or remailing the ballot, the County would expect a significant financial burden.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Elko County Approved by: Cash A. Minor, Assistant County Manager/CFO Comment: Has Impact				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$10,000

City/County: Humboldt County Approved by: Sondra Schmidt, Comptroller Comment: Potential for impact but unable to determine at this time.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: **Washoe County**

Approved by: Liane Lee, Government Affairs Manager

Comment: This bill removes the deadline for removing a name from a ballot and puts the discretion in the hands of the Registrar of Voters to determine whether there is time to remove the candidates name from the ballot. On the surface this seems rather simple, but would increase the pressure on our office to remove a name, even after ballot set up and proofing has occurred and sample ballots design has been completed. The vendor may require an additional payment to redesign a ballot set up and the time it takes to proof is rather lengthy. The cost associated with proofing would be staff time for up to two weeks to do so. Overtime may be required in order to meet production and print deadlines as well. Also in this bill is the increased residency requirements at the State and local levels as well as increased penalties for violations, and the burden again is shifted to us to verify accuracy of the declaration of candidacy and the investigation of the same if needed or if candidate challenged. Again, the deadline for filing the challenge is removed, which could burden our ballot setup and production timeframes.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: **City of Henderson**

Approved by: Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager

Comment: No identifiable fiscal impact to the City of Henderson.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: **City of Las Vegas**

Approved by: Michelle Thackston, Administrative Secretary

Comment: If the City Clerk's Office receives evidence indicating that a candidate does not meet any qualifications required by the office, the Clerk shall conduct an investigation to determine whether the candidate is eligible to hold the office. The Clerk's Office is unsure what the "investigation" would entail, but there would be a cost associated with this investigation that would impact the City. At this time it is difficult to determine what those cost would be.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: **City of Reno**

Approved by: Ryan High, Budget/Strat. Initiatives Mgr.

Comment: After initial review, there will be minimal to no fiscal impact to the City of Reno for posting requirements required in Section 18 as a result of a candidate's death, being adjudicated insane or mentally incompetent, or being found to not be eligible to be on the ballot after candidate filing. The fiscal impact in Section 20 requiring the filing officer to verify the accuracy of all information contained in a person's declaration or acceptance of candidacy cannot be determined at this time as the procedure is yet to be adopted through regulation. Lastly, the fiscal impact for the investigation required in Section 20 where a city clerk receives credible evidence indicating that a candidate does not meet any qualification required for the office cannot be determined without further specifics as to what is required for the investigation.

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: **City of Sparks**

Approved by: Jeff Cronk, Financial Services Director

Comment: No Impact

Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

The following cities and counties did not provide a response: Carson City , Douglas County, Esmeralda County, Eureka County, Lincoln County, Lander County, Lyon County, Mineral County, Nye County, Pershing County, Storey County, White Pine County, Boulder City, City of Elko, City of Mesquite, and City of North Las Vegas.