

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: April 3, 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  
**A.B. 462 / BDR 24 - 615**

City/County: **Churchill County**  
 Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager  
 Comment: This clean-up bill would likely result in financial savings to Churchill County, as we would no longer be required to publish the full text of any proposed constitution, constitutional amendment, statewide measure, and referendum with explanations. The savings is estimated to be around \$5,000 every two years (election cycle).

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

City/County: **Carson City**  
 Approved by: Nickolas A. Providenti, Finance Director  
 Comment: No major fiscal impact to Carson City

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 undeterminable, there are multiple items in this bill that would save the County Election Department money. There are numerous variables that will determine the extent of the savings. But no exact amount can be determined as voter preferences will dictate the amount of the savings from this bill.

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

City/County: **Humboldt County**  
 Approved by: Tami Spero, Clerk  
 Comment: Impact may result in the portion that requires the sample ballot to be delivered by electronic means but until that concept is clarified the impact is unknown. By changing the manner in which we publish the questions there should be a significant cost savings for both local and state governments.

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

City/County: **Lincoln County**  
 Approved by: Denice Brown, Adm Assistant  
 Comment: No Impact

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

City/County: **Washoe County**

Approved by: Liane Lee, Government Affairs Manager

Comment: The majority of this BDR is clean-up language for the election officials of the State.

It will, however, allow us to discontinue publishing the full text of any Statewide Ballot Questions as is currently required. The savings will be minimal as the requirement to publish these questions three times is still in place. It would also be dependent on how many questions are on a ballot at any time.

It gives permission for Sample Ballots to be delivered by electronic means, if opted for by the voter (same as AB94). Over time, moving this direction will create printing and postage savings.

Another section of this bill would allow the size of precincts to move from 1500 voters to 3000.

The final possible savings would relate to allowing us to post the lists of those who have voted on election day, to our website as opposed to having them printed at the polling place. We are currently looking for alternatives to this as our polling place printers are at the end of their life-spans. There will be an initial outlay to connect all polling places electronically as well as an ongoing contract with a wifi service provider. Being able to move toward larger precincts could mean fewer polling places which might also create a savings.

<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	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000

City/County: **White Pine County**

Approved by: Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director

Comment: It appears there is a required increase to legal advertising which will have adverse impact on the County in the form of increased expense. An exact amount cannot be reasonably determined.

<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: **City of Henderson**

Approved by: Mike Cathcart, Business Operation Manager

Comment: The proposed legislation would have a possible positive fiscal impact to the City of Henderson. If 10% of potential voters opted out of having paper sample ballots the City could save approximately \$10,000 in the first election cycle.

<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	(\$10,000)	(\$10,000)

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

Approved by: Michelle Thackston, Administrative Secretary

Comment: Changes in this bill include definition and assignment of duties for election board members for polling locations, which falls upon the Clark County Election Department and the Registrar of Voters. Any fiscal impact to implement these changes would be incurred by the Clark County Election Department and then passed down to the City, therefore we are unable to determine the exact 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 Reno**

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

Comment: 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: **City of Sparks**

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, Lyon County, Mineral County, Nye County, Pershing County, Storey County, Boulder City, City of Elko, City of Mesquite, and City of North Las Vegas.