FISCAL NOTE

Bill #	Bill #: SB0154			Title:		:	Local vendor preference for municipal contracts	
Prima Spons	•	Vicki Cocchiarella			Statu	IS:	As Introduced	
Sponsor signature			Date		Chuc	Chuck Swysgood, Budget Director Date		
Fiscal Summary FY2002 FY2003								
Expenditures:				Ī	Differe		Difference 0	
Revenue:						0	0	
Net Impact on General Fund Balance:						0	0	
<u>Yes</u>	No X	Significant Local Gov. Impact	-	<u>Yes</u> X	<u>No</u>		Technical Concerns	
	Х	Included in the Executive Budget			X		Significant Long-Term Impacts	
	Х	Dedicated Revenue Form Attach	ed		Х]	Family Impact Form Attached	

Fiscal Analysis

ASSUMPTIONS:

- 1. The Department of Commerce, Local Government Assistance Division, has reviewed the proposed legislation and determined the specific fiscal impacts are not quantifiable.
- 2. However, it is thought the proposed legislation would have a marginal impact on the cost of procurement by municipalities in situations where a city or town exercises the optional preference for the lowest and best responsible bidder that is a city or town resident, that makes a bid that is not more than \$500 or 3% higher, whichever is less, than the bid of the lowest responsible bidder that is not a city or town resident.
- 3. The optional bid preference for city or town resident bidders would not apply if there were one or more out of state bidders.

Fiscal Note Request, <u>SB0154</u>, <u>As Introduced</u> Page 2 (continued)

EFFECT ON COUNTY OR OTHER LOCAL REVENUES OR EXPENDITURES: None

TECHNICAL NOTES:

1. A November 1987 Attorney General Opinion determined that state contractor preference statutes are not applicable to contracts which are funded, in whole or in part, by federal funds. It is assumed that any local preference statutes that might be enacted would also not apply to federally funded contracts.