

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT
FISCAL NOTE**

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: April 4, 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
S.B. 433 / BDR 24 - 1145

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: Clark County already follows almost all the changes noted in this bill. The fiscal impact is negligible.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Churchill County Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager Comment: BDR 24-1145 may have minimal fiscal impact to Churchill County, but it cannot be determined at this time. During early voting, we currently submit nightly turnout numbers to the Lahontan Valley News and SOS. LVN will publish that information twice per week (Wednesday & Friday) at their own accord and SOS posts all counties early voting numbers on their website daily/nightly. Our website election page can include a link for early voting numbers to the SOS page as simple as that. If LVN requires us to pay for a twice per week publication, that would be the only cost. As I understand, our polling place for early voting and election day are fine based on anything else stated in this bill.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Humboldt County Approved by: Tami Spero, Clerk Comment: As the bill stands there would be a fiscal impact in relation to the need to locate Early Voting sites in all "geographic" regions of the County which would potentially require us to put EV sites in Grass Valley, Lambert, Delaney, Paradise Valley & Orovada. On a positive note they are reducing the hours we have to remain open by one hour a day which would result in a savings if we didn't have all of those new EV sites.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: Lincoln County Approved by: Denice Brown, Adm Assistant Comment: Has Impact				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$0

City/County: Washoe County Approved by: Liane Lee, Government Affairs Manager Comment: BDR 1145 includes numerous mandates regarding early voting – some of which Washoe County already has in place. The only section that could have a small fiscal impact would be: Sec 3 (3) must have an early voting site in each Assembly District. It could require us to add two or three early voting sites for each election. The cost of the above requirement could be somewhat offset by Sec 5 (2c) which prohibits having sites open on Sundays. This is something we currently have in place.				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
Has Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

City/County: White Pine County Approved by: Elizabeth Frances, Finance Director Comment: This will require additional time in the Clerk's Office each day of early voting to prepare and disseminate reports. Depending on the interpretation of "to the extent possible" in the requirement to locate a temporary polling in every geographic are of the county, this could result in significant additional cost to the County as it has only one temporary polling location currently established. The need to provide additional polling places will require additional staff, travel and equipment. The outcome of these changes will be an adverse financial impact to the County in the form of increased expense. An accurate estimate cannot be determined at this time.				
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: No Impact				
Impact	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	Future Biennia
No Impact	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

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