

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: April 1, 2015

Agency Submitting: Local Government

<b>Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2014-15</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2015-16</b>	<b>Fiscal Year 2016-17</b>	<b>Effect on Future Biennia</b>
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  
**S.B. 421 / BDR 24 - 1148**

City/County: <b>Carson City</b> Approved by: Nickolas A. Providenti, Finance Director Comment: No major fiscal impact to Carson City.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Churchill County</b> Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager Comment: It appears that the cost of any presidential preference primary election is a charge against the State and must be paid from the Reserve for Statutory Contingency Account in the State General Fund.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Clark County</b> Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Assistant Director of Finance Comment: Fiscal impact cannot be determined. This moving target approach to an election does not allow Clark to properly plan for an election, prepare registration/polling books, etc. Costs will escalate as we have to make contingency plans for dates of an election that can possibly change.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>Humboldt County</b> Approved by: Tami Spero, Clerk Comment: Potential impact-this is one that has already been amended. It now reads that the presidential preference will be in January and the primary will remain in June which would add a third election in our presidential years therefore it would have a fiscal impact BUT the rumor is that the parties will have to pay for the preference elections if they want to have them so theoretically there will be no cost to the counties. The question would be whether they will have to pay all associated costs and since that is probably a long shot I believe this will have an impact plus it does not identify if all election items (such as early voting) will occur.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: **Washoe County**

Approved by: Liane Lee, Government Affairs Manager

Comment: This bill allows for a major political party to request that the state hold a presidential preference primary election in January of a presidential year. There are numerous considerations regarding fiscal impact dependent upon final language.

Strict deadlines surrounding elections are in place for a reason. The deadline dates mentioned in this bill and AB302 (Oct 15 deadline for Presidential Candidate filing) do not allow sufficient time to process, set-up, proof, print and mail ballots to the UOCAVA voters. That deadline is 45 days prior to each Election Day. In order to comply there would be additional vendor costs related to having to rush the processes and overtime for staff involved in the set-up, proofing and testing processes.

Costs could increase even more if the date of the primary election were suddenly shifted from late January to early January because another Western state decided to hold a primary earlier. There does not appear to be a clear deadline in this bill for deciding on the exact date of the election.

<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
Has Impact	\$0	\$25,000	\$0	\$0

City/County: **White Pine County**

Approved by: Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director

Comment: It appears that the preference primary is to be paid by the Secretary of State from a State Reserve. However, there will be regulations adopted to carry this out. Absent the regulations, how this may impact the County financially cannot be determined as there may not be direct costs but there could be indirect costs.

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

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

Approved by: Michelle Thackston, Administrative Secretary

Comment: No Impact

<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>City of Henderson</b> Approved by: Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager Comment: No identifiable fiscal impact to the City of Henderson.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>City of Reno</b> Approved by: Ryan High, Budget/Strat. Initiatives Mgr. Comment: After initial review, there is no fiscal impact to the City of Reno.				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: <b>City of Sparks</b> Approved by: Jeff Cronk, Financial Services Director Comment: No Impact				
<b>Impact</b>	<b>FY 2014-15</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>FY 2016-17</b>	<b>Future Biennia</b>
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

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