BDR 11-1020
AB 365

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

FISCAL NOTE

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: April 3, 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
A.B. 365 / BDR 11 - 1020

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: **Clark County**
Approved by: David Dobrzynski, Asst Director of Finance
Comment: Several components to this bill that could be a cost to Clark County County.
Establishing a course, the costs are unknown on what it would cost to establish the course, teach the course, hold the course, and advertise for the course. The fee of $100 may not cover the overall cost.
Currently there is not a renewal fee/process in place, the only time someone would get recertified is if they move from one church to another and then would pay the full application fee.
Renewal Vows are currently not administered/processed by the Clerk this would be a new process that would need to be developed additionally the record of vow renewal would have to be kept which it currently is not. The bill states a fee can be collected but does not state a maximum amount.
Additional language would need to be added to the application which would cost to change/reprint.
Additional language would need to be added to the “souvenier” copy the officiant gives the couple which would cost to change/reprint.
By promoting vow renewals as another aspect of wedding tourism additional revenue could be generated. But the overall fiscal impact of this bill cannot be determined at this time.

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

City/County: **Churchill County**
Approved by: Eleanor Lockwood, County Manager
Comment: No fiscal impact

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

City/County: **Esmeralda County**
Approved by: Robert E. Glennen III, Esmeralda District Attorney
Comment: No Impact

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

City/County: **Mineral County**
Approved by: Christopher Nepper, Clerk-Treasurer
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: While the bill allows for a $100 fee charged to those who wish to become marriage officiants we are not able to determine if that charge would cover the costs incurred by the county. There would be a cost for a new document series for the "Renewal of Vow" certificate, which can cost up to $10,000 from a third party vendor. There would also be cost incurred by the county for the creation and presentation of the marriage officiant training as well as possible software modifications which at this time we cannot determine.

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

The following counties did not provide a response: Douglas County, Elko County, Humboldt County, Eureka County, Lander County, Lyon County, Lincoln County, Nye County, Pershing County, Storey County, and White Pine County.