LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: April 3, 2015

Agency Submitting: White Pine County School District

Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both	Fiscal Year 2014-15	Fiscal Year 2015-16	Fiscal Year 2016-17	Effect on Future Biennia
(Revenue)		(\$1,797,262)	(\$1,797,262)	(\$3,594,524)
Total	0	(\$1,797,262)	(\$1,797,262)	(\$3,594,524)

Explanation

(Use Additional Sheets of Attachments, if required)

Apportioning 80% of basic support funding based on student population and allocating the remaining 20% through the Nevada Plan formula would cause significant changes and, in most cases, the consequences would be significantly adverse. In order to determine the potential impact. I applied the current proposed changes to FY2015 financial information. I used DSA spreadsheets provided by the Department of Education and added columns for the 80% proposal and the remaining 20% was apportioned based on the current funding formula. Based on my estimates, reallocating money based on the proposed changes would essentially shift \$40.5 million from 12 school districts to 5 districts. The major beneficiaries of the change would be Clark and Washoe. Clark would receive \$32.7 million more (2.35%) and Washoe \$6.3 million (2.26%). Three other counties would receive an increase of \$1.5 million collectively. Decreases in funding in the other 12 counties would range from a low of -3.40% (Douglas) to a high of -171.32% (Esmeralda). The average percent decrease would be approximately -47%. This means that on average 12 counties would realize a decrease in funding of -47% in order to provide Clark and Washoe with an increase between 2.26 to 2.35%. In White Pine's case, the District would lose approximately \$1,797,262 per year which is roughly 28.37% of its operating revenue (refer to attached). Limiting the percent of fund balance that could be carried forward would ultimately diminish the school districts ability to accumulate fund reserves locally to hedge for financial stress. This could leave school districts more vulnerable to significant short-term budget changes that would affect the value of education and services offered from year-to-year.

Name	Paul Johnson	
Title	CFO	

P. Johnson

3/30/2015

White Pine County School District

BDR 34-995 Fiscal Note
Based on FY2015 Appropriations

Information from DOE Spreadsheets Information and factors added from BDR 34-995 Per Pupil HOLD Allotment using TOTAL HARMLESS: BASIC GROSS (Per Pupil WEIGHTED 20% of basic Audited FYI: OUTSIDE 80% of Total Per Pupi **SUPPORT** Basic support **SCHOOL** APPORTIONME support and **Estimated Funding** Total General Weighted REVENUE (For Basic Support based Wealth Wealth RATE Per Calculation weighted based on 20% Fund Basic % Winner/(Losers) \$ Winners/(Losers) Charter School on % of student Redistribution Redistribution inrollment for **DISTRICTS ENROLLMENT** enrollment allotment SB522 -(BEFORE Support population PRIOR YEAR. support) FOR SY 2014based on deductions) Revised unless 5% loss 2015 Nevada Plan or greater Formula Carson City 7,327.0 7,271.6 6,637 1,002.26 48,629,299 33,343,495 1,340 9,747,215 43,090,710 \$ (5,538,589 -16.61% (5,538,589.17 Churchill 3,363.2 3.582.2 \$ 6,621 1,100.17 \$ 23,717,746 16,425,968 1,337 4,790,184 21,216,151 \$ (2,501,595 -15.23% (2,501,594.78) Clark 307,112.4 303,435.6 5,527 978.63 \$ 1,697,410,235 1,391,386,119 1,116 338,715,252 1,730,101,370 \$ 32,691,136 2.35% 32,691,135.51 -3.40% 5,883.9 \$ 34,956,250 26,980,278 34,040,260 \$ Douglas 5,838.4 5,941 2,466.40 \$ 1,200 7,059,982 (915,990 (915,990.14) Elko 9,435.8 9,496.4 \$ 6,707 1,302.09 \$ 63,692,355 43,545,184 1,355 12,863,705 56,408,889 \$ (7,283,466 -16.73% (7,283,465.77 Esmeralda 64.2 64.2 \$ 15,590 7,866.76 \$ 1,000,878 294,385 3,149 202,144 496,529 \$ (504,349 -171.32% (504,349.12 Eureka 235.8 238.2 \$ 5,653 26,219.73 \$ 1,332,977 1,092,252 1,142 271,957 1,364,209 \$ 31,231 2.86% 31,231.24 Humboldt 3,333.2 3,363.2 \$ 5,738 2,269.19 \$ 19,298,042 15,421,756 1,159 3,897,553 19,319,309 \$ 0.14% 21,267.11 21,267 Lander 1,003.0 1,064.2 3,955 6,062.66 4,208,911 4,879,827 799 850,058 5,729,884 \$ 1,520,973 31.17% 1,520,973.47 Lincoln 934.0 \$ 10,369 1,498.05 \$ 9.974.978 4.282.802 2.094 6,238,774 \$ (3,736,204 -87.24% 962.0 1,955,971 (3,736,204.44) 7,813.6 7,813.6 \$ 7,150 927.77 \$ 55,867,240 35,828,804 1,444 11,283,296 47,112,100 \$ (8,755,140 -24.44% (8,755,140.44 Lyon 439.2 9,561 1,644.35 \$ 4,340,694 2,013,926 1,931 2,862,021 \$ -73.42% Mineral 454.0 848,095 (1,478,673 (1,478,673.39) 4,997.2 5,035.5 \$ 7,104 1,457.96 \$ 35,772,192 23.089.989 1.435 7,224,775 30,314,764 \$ (5,457,428 -23.64% (5,457,427.85) Nye Pershing 667.2 681.3 \$ 8,964 2,662.15 \$ 6,107,173 3,124,061 1,810 1,233,443 4,357,504 \$ (1,749,669 -56.01% (1,749,669.33) 388.2 8,309 5,783.24 \$ 3,225,554 1,764,478 1.678 645,747 2,410,225 \$ (815,329 -46.21% (815,328.74) Storey 384.8 \$ Washoe 61,074.6 60.780.7 \$ 5.582 1,151.87 \$ 340.918.417 278.706.329 1.127 68.522.671 347.229.001 \$ 6,310,583 2.26% 6.310.583.43 White Pine 1,209.8 1,381.6 \$ 7,376 1,677.06 \$ 10,190,682 6,335,246 1,490 2,058,174 8,393,419 \$ (1,797,262 -28.37% (1,797,262.43) 1,888,514,898 1,146 TOTALS: 415,279.6 411,850.2 \$ 5,676 1,085.27 \$ 2,360,643,623 472,170,220 2,360,685,118 -46.88% (40,533,695.61 40,575,190.76 20% Average 20% 100% 7.76% State Avg. State Avg. Total Basic Support 80% 12.00 5.00

> Average decraese Average increase

80% \$ 1,888,514,898 20% \$ 472,128,725

Total

2.360.643.622.5