## COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

### **FISCAL NOTE**

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 5043-01 Bill No.: HB 2153

Subject: Elections, Secretary of State

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: March 9, 2010

Bill Summary: Changes the laws regarding elections and establishes the Election

Consolidation Act of 2010.

## **FISCAL SUMMARY**

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND       |         |         |         |  |  |
|--|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
| FUND AFFECTED                                      | FY 2011 | FY 2012 | FY 2013 |  |  |
|  |         |         |         |  |  |
|  |         |         |         |  |  |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund | \$0     | \$0     | \$0     |  |  |

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS       |         |               |               |  |
|---|---------|---------------|---------------|--|
| FUND AFFECTED                                   | FY 2011 | FY 2012       | FY 2013       |  |
| State Election<br>Subsidy Fund                  | \$0     | (\$2,150,000) | (\$2,150,000) |  |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds | \$0     | (\$2,150,000) | (\$2,150,000) |  |

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 9 pages.

L.R. No. 5043-01 Bill No. HB 2153 Page 2 of 9 March 9, 2010

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS                        |         |     |     |  |
|--|---------|-----|-----|--|
| FUND AFFECTED  | FY 2013 |     |     |  |
|  |         |     |     |  |
|  |         |     |     |  |
| Total Estimated<br>Net Effect on <u>All</u><br>Federal Funds | \$0     | \$0 | \$0 |  |

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) |                          |   |   |  |  |  |
|--|--------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| FUND AFFECTED                                      | ECTED FY 2011 FY 2012 FY |   |   |  |  |  |
|  |                          |   |   |  |  |  |
|  |                          |   |   |  |  |  |
| Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE                  | 0                        | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |

- □ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).
- □ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS |  |                          |                          |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| FUND AFFECTED FY 2011 FY 2012 FY 20 |  |                          |                          |  |  |
| Local Government \$0                |  | Greater than \$2,058,822 | Greater than \$2,058,822 |  |  |

### FISCAL ANALYSIS

### **ASSUMPTION**

Officials at the **Office of the Secretary of State** (**SOS**) assume this bill requires the state to share the cost of state and federal elections with the local election authorities. Based on the cost of previous special elections paid for by the state, it could cost up to \$2,150,000 million per election.

The bill becomes effective on January 1, 2011. FY 2012 = 2012 primary/presidential primary (June)-\$2,150,000 FY 2013 = 2012 general-\$2,150,000

Officials at the **Missouri Ethics Commission** assume that there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **Platte County Board of Election Commission** assume no impact as the costs are already passed to the municipality holding the election.

Officials at the **St. Louis County Board of Election Commission** assume that under current law, in a four year election cycle, they conduct 9 major/county-wide elections (4 April Municipal General - each year, 2 August Primary - even years, 2 November General -even years and 1 February Presidential Primary) and up to 11 additional smaller elections.

As proposed they would conduct, in a four year election cycle, only 6 major/county-wide elections (2 April Municipal General -odd years, 2 June Primary- even years, 2 November General -even years and possibly 2 smaller February Municipal Primary -odd years with 1-3 polls. This would be a reduction of three major/county-wide elections each of which costs \$800,000 to \$1,000,000 and the elimination of at least 9 other elections which could be a county-wide election as it was in November 2009.

If the requirements of this proposal had been in effect for the election cycle 2006-2009, with current electronic equipment utilized, they would have had \$3,835,000 less in election costs.

**Oversight** assumes this proposal becomes effective January 1, 2011.

Officials at the following counties: Atchison, Audrain, Benton, Boone, Cape Girardeau, Carroll, Cole, Cooper, Daviess, Lewis, Linn, Moniteau, Monroe, Newton, Scott, Texas and Wayne County Clerks Offices responded using identical tables with actual election costs for

L.R. No. 5043-01 Bill No. HB 2153 Page 4 of 9 March 9, 2010

### <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

each election conducted 2006 through 2009. There is an assumption that the primary and general elections would be shared 50/50 by state and county so it represents the maximum costs and minimum savings for county/state.

The identical tables included the following information:

- Column A- Election Date excluded April elections in odd numbered years as there would be no cost increase or decrease in those elections
- Column B- "Cost Savings to Taxpayers" this reflects cost savings from not holding elections. The costs would be saved by the jurisdictions that would not have had elections on those dates (i.e. counties, schools, cities, fire etc).
- Column C Cost savings to Counties this would reflect minimum savings to counties under the proportional costs distribution. The actual savings will probably be greater as more jurisdictions will be holding elections on the same dates therefore spreading the cost amongst a greater number of jurisdictions.
- Column D Reflects the cost savings/increase to the state through the proportional costs changes. This reflects a maximum increase as in most cases. The state/county costs would be reduced in most cases when other public entities share the cost of the primary/general. For example, if the City of Columbia had a ballot issue on a general election ballot (as they did in 2006 and 2008) that would decrease the state/county share by 40%. These cost savings were not included as the are speculative

Column E - total primary/general election costs for computing column C & D

**Oversight** has printed Boone County's table which details out the savings and costs for the four election years as an example of the information provided.

| Column A   | Column B | Column C | Column D | Column E |
|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Feb 2006   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| April 2006 | 136,828  | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| June 2006  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| Aug. 2006  | 0        | 161,636  | 161,636  | 323,271  |
| Nov. 2006  | 0        | 155,043  | 155,043  | 310,086  |
| Feb. 2007  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| June 2007  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |

L.R. No. 5043-01 Bill No. HB 2153 Page 5 of 9 March 9, 2010

| Aug. 2007  | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0       |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Nov. 2007  | 188,277 | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Feb. 2008  | 301,042 | 0       | 301,042 | 301,042 |
| April 2008 | 234,609 | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| June 2008  | 0       | 215,809 | 215,809 | 431,618 |
| Aug. 2008  | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Nov. 2008  | 0       | 204,148 | 204,148 | 408,296 |
| Feb. 2009  | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| June 2009  | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Aug. 2009  | 3,500   | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Nov. 2009  | 10,300  | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| TOTAL      | 874,556 | 736,636 | 432,594 | 0       |

Totals over a 4 year cycle based on historical costs - minimum savings to taxpayers (through cities, schools, counties consolidating elections) 874,556 minimum savings to County General Revenue 736,636 maximum increased cost to state 435,594

In addition to cost savings outlined above the county will have additional reduced costs by moving the primary to June. This is because they currently have to pay considerable overtime and hire temps to handle the petition verification process concurrent with the primary election. Moving the primary to June would make those expenditures unnecessary because we would have staffing levels sufficient to process the petitions after the primary without hiring temps or paying overtime.

Cost savings from 2008 petition ot/temp hires Overtime 15,000 Temp help 12,000 Total 27,000 L.R. No. 5043-01 Bill No. HB 2153 Page 6 of 9 March 9, 2010

## ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** has created a table using the total line from the submitted tables to show the above listed Counties responses:

| Name of County | Savings to Taxpayer | Savings to County | Cost Increase to State |
|----------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Atchison       | \$34,758            | \$20,958          | \$8,778                |
| Audrain        | \$81,096            | \$71,332          | \$49,235               |
| Benton         | \$73,043            | \$44,336          | \$26,287               |
| Boone          | \$874,556           | \$736,636         | \$435,594              |
| Cape Girardeau | \$179,444           | \$132,704         | \$77,999               |
| Carroll        | \$65,008            | \$81,440          | \$55,861               |
| Cole           | \$285,411           | \$177,309         | \$123,019              |
| Cooper         | \$103,608           | \$84,530          | \$46,288               |
| Daviess        | \$34,682            | \$26,013          | \$13,669               |
| Grundy         | \$24,115            | \$23,453          | \$12,276               |
| Lewis          | \$40,680            | \$60,481          | \$45,944               |
| Linn           | \$69,439            | \$44,603          | \$21,402               |
| Moniteau       | \$58,896            | \$95,075          | \$77,666               |
| Monroe         | \$22,630            | \$30,059          | \$14,429               |
| Newton         | \$155,653           | \$96,500          | \$52,473               |
| Scott          | \$104,589           | \$78,522          | \$43,958               |
| Texas          | \$63,146            | \$183,070         | \$183,070              |
| Wayne          | \$88,122            | \$71,801          | \$40,625               |
| TOTAL          | \$2,358,876         | \$2,058,822       | \$1,328,573            |

No other Board of Election Commission or Local Election Authority responded to Oversight's

L.R. No. 5043-01 Bill No. HB 2153 Page 7 of 9 March 9, 2010

JH:LR:OD

# <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

request for fiscal impact.

**Oversight** assumes that any costs transferred to the State will be paid to the local election authority as reimbursement of the election and therefore will have no impact on the local election authority.

**Oversight** assumes this proposal will reduce the number of elections held and therefore result in a savings to the local election authorities.

| FISCAL IMPACT - State Government  | FY 2011<br>(10 Mo.) | FY 2012                                   | FY 2013                                   |
|---|---------------------|---|---|
| STATE ELECTION SUBSIDY FUND   |                     |   |   |
| <u>Transfer Out</u> - Secretary of State<br>Increased election costs        | <u>\$0</u>          | (\$2,150,000)                             | (\$2,150,000)                             |
| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE ELECTION SUBSIDY FUND                         | <u>\$0</u>          | (\$2,150,000)                             | (\$2,150,000)                             |
| FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government  | FY 2011<br>(10 Mo.) | FY 2012                                   | FY 2013                                   |
| LOCAL ELECTION AUTHORITY FUNDS  |                     |   |   |
| <u>Transfer In</u> - Local Election Authority state share of election costs | \$0                 | \$2,150,000                               | \$2,150,000                               |
| <u>Cost</u> - election costs  | \$0                 | (\$2,150,000)                             | (\$2,150,000)                             |
| Savings - Local Election Authority fewer elections held                     | <u>\$0</u>          | Greater than \$2,058,822                  | Greater than \$2,058,822                  |
| ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON   |                     |   |   |
| LOCAL ELECTION AUTHORITY FUNDS  | <u>\$0</u>          | <u>Greater than</u><br><u>\$2,058,822</u> | <u>Greater than</u><br><u>\$2,058,822</u> |

L.R. No. 5043-01 Bill No. HB 2153 Page 8 of 9 March 9, 2010

#### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

### FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill changes the laws regarding elections and establishes the Election Consolidation Act of 2010. In its main provisions, the bill:

- (1) Requires election costs to be paid by the political subdivision, municipality, county, or special district incurring the cost in elections where no other entity has an issue on the ballot;
- (2) Requires entities to share election costs proportionally using the State Election Subsidy Fund in elections where more than one entity has an issue on the ballot. The fund's proceeds will not revert to the General Revenue Fund;
- (3) Changes, beginning January 1, 2011, the primary election day from the first Monday in August of even-numbered years to the first Tuesday after the first Monday in June of even-numbered years;
- (4) Changes, beginning April 2010, the general municipal and special district election day from the first Tuesday after the first Monday in April to the first Tuesday after the first Monday in April of odd-numbered years. Primary elections must be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in February of the year of the general municipal election. A primary election may be held in March if allowed by a city or county with a charter form of government prior to August 28, 1999. A statewide presidential preference primary must be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in June instead of February of each presidential election year;
- (5) Removes other primary election days for the purpose of approving bond issues; and
- (6) Establishes the Election Consolidation Act of 2010 which establishes new terms of office for public officials elected at the general municipal election held in April 2011. The terms for those currently holding public office are specified in the bill. Municipalities, special districts, and political subdivisions are allowed to abolish primary elections held prior to a general municipal election by order or ordinance adopted no later than September 1 of any even-numbered year. These provisions will not prohibit any home rule city or county with a charter form of government from conducting a primary election in March if it was provided for in the city's or county's charter before August 28, 2010. These provisions will not apply to any special election called by the Governor and held in conjunction with a general municipal election.

L.R. No. 5043-01 Bill No. HB 2153 Page 9 of 9 March 9, 2010

## FISCAL DESCRIPTION (continued)

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of the Secretary of State

Missouri Ethics Commission

Platte County Board of Election Commission

St. Louis County Board of Election Commission

**Atchison County** 

**Audrain County** 

Benton County

**Boone County** 

Cape Girardeau County

Carroll County

Cole County

Cooper County

**Daviess County** 

**Grundy County** 

Lewis County

Linn County

Moniteau County

Monroe County

**Newton County** 

**Scott County** 

**Texas County** 

Wayne County

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director

March 9, 2010