BDR 27-936
SB 317

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

FISCAL NOTE

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: April 2, 2017

Agency Submitting: Local Government

Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both	Fiscal Year 2016-17	Fiscal Year 2017-18	Fiscal Year 2018-19	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. 317 / BDR 27 - 936

City/County: **Carson City**
Approved by: Nancy Paulson, CFO
Comment: No fiscal impact to Carson City.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **Churchill County**
Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager
Comment: This Bill addresses the vetting process used by a CMAR.It does not appear to have a Fiscal Impact to Churchill County

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **Clark County**
Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Asst Director of Finance
Comment: Similar to BDR 27-1060
Bill will grant preference to businesses that reside or mostly reside in the State of Nevada for state purchasing contracts. If the business meets the criteria detailed in the bill they will receive a 5% preference.
Bill only discusses State contracts and does not affect the County's bidding system.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **Douglas County**
Approved by: Carl Ruschmeyer, Public Works Director
Comment: The fiscal impact of the proposed bill cannot be determined.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **Esmeralda County**
Approved by: Kelly Jo Eagan, Administrative Asst
Comment: No Impact

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **Humboldt County**
Approved by: Gina Rackley, Comptroller
Comment: No Impact

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **Pershing County**
Approved by: Karen Wesner, Admin. Assist.
Comment: No Impact

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **Washoe County**
Approved by: Jamie Rodriguez, Management Analyst
Comment: Could cost as much as $5,000 per project bid that takes advantage of the 10% preference in staff time to track, monitor, and enforce the requirements. Each project bid has a chance of costing up to 10% more when the preference is utilized.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Has Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **City of Henderson**
Approved by: Mike Cathcart, Business Operations Manager
Comment: The fiscal impact of this legislation cannot be calculated. It cannot be determined how often the provisions of this bill would come into consideration during a public work bidding process.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **City of Las Vegas**
Approved by: Michelle Thackston, Administrative Assistant
Comment: Based on the last 3 years of contract bid awards for the City of Las Vegs, we would see an average of a $25,000 increase in award amounts per year.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Has Impact	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000	$25,000

City/County: **City of Reno**

Approved by: Tillery Williams , Management Analyst

Comment: The change from a preference of 5% to 10% in the proposed bill for a contractor, applicant to serve as a construction manager at risk, or design-build team that wishes to receive a preference in bidding for a public work contract could have a fiscal impact to the City of Reno regarding those projects awarded on the basis of preference. When preference does come into play, an agency could pay up to 10% more for the project in order to award to a contractor that has preference.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Has Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

City/County: **City of Sparks**

Approved by: Jeff Cronk, Financial Services Director

Comment: The expectation is that this will have a fiscal impact with the effect of increasing construction costs, but it's impossible to determine to what extent.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	$0	$0	$0	$0

School District: **Carson City School District**

Approved by: Andrew J Feuling, Director of Fiscal Services

Comment: No Impact

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

School District: **Clark County School District**

Approved by: Dillon Kay, Assistant Budget Director

Comment: Does not appear to have a material impact on CCSD. CCSD had only one instance in the last 10 years where the 5% preference was an issue and it did not involve competition from an out of state company.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

School District: **Douglas County School District**
Approved by: TWhite, Superintendent
Comment: No Impact

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

School District: **Lincoln County School District**
Approved by: Pam Teel, Superintendent
Comment: Unclear on impact

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	$0	$0	$0	$0

School District: **Nye County School District**
Approved by: Kelly Wood, Executive Secretary
Comment: This would most likely have a fiscal impact on Nye County School District. There could be up to a 5% cost increase on any project where a "bidder" preference submits a responsive bid up to 5% higher than the lowest responsive bid. It is not possible to determine the exact amount.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	$0	$0	$0	$0

School District: **Pershing County School District**
Approved by: Russell D. Fecht, Superintendent
Comment: Cannot determine

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	$0	$0	$0	$0

School District: **Washoe County School District**
Approved by: Lindsay E. Anderson, Director of Government Affairs
Comment: As is does not include NRS 332, Washoe County School District does not expect impact from this legislation.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
No Impact	$0	$0	$0	$0

School District: **White Pine County School District**

Approved by: Paul Johnson, CFO

Comment: The District has had very few contracts awarded to out of state contractors. Based on prior contracts, this should not have a material impact.

Impact	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	Future Biennia
Cannot Be Determined	$0	$0	$0	$0

The following cities/counties/school districts did not provide a response: Elko County, Eureka County, Lander County, Lyon County, Lincoln County, Mineral County, Nye County, Storey County, White Pine County, Boulder City, City of Elko, City of Mesquite, City of North Las Vegas, Churchill County School District, Elko County School District, Esmeralda County School District, Humboldt County School District, Eureka County School District, Lander County School District, Lyon County School District, Mineral County School District, and Storey County School District.