COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4738-02

Bill No.: SCS for SB 569

Subject: Elections; Secretary of State

Type: Original

Date: March 2, 2011

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies the dates available for public elections.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

L.R. No. 4738-02 Bill No. SCS for SB 569

Page 2 of 4 March 2, 2011

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	
Total Estimated Net Effect on All Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)				
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	
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 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0	

L.R. No. 4738-02 Bill No. SCS for SB 569 Page 3 of 4 March 2, 2011

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials at the **Office of the Secretary of State** and **St. Louis County Board of Election Commission** assume that there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Officials at the **Platte County Board of Election Commission** assume a savings would be realized by districts calling for an election, as with fewer elections, more district would be placing issues/candidates on the few remaining election dates. Thus the costs for the elections would be shared by more districts. Savings would range from \$50-\$15,000.

Officials at the **Kansas City Board of Election Commission** assume a savings of \$350,000 to \$400,000 per election omitted. Eliminating the February election would save these costs. The June election is seldom held so eliminating it would have no effect.

Oversight assumes that changing the date of the presidential primary election would not affect the cost of the election. Oversight assumes no impact from this provision.

Oversight assume this proposal eliminates the June election date which was only used as a special election on rare occasions. Oversight assumes no impact from this provision.

Oversight assumes this proposal eliminates the February election which may result in some savings to certain entities while others may experience costs from bond elections allowed in February. Oversight assumes that having the February election is permissive and will not reflect an impact from this provision.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2013 (10 Mo.)	FY 2014	FY 2015
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2013 (10 Mo.)	FY 2014	FY 2015
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

L.R. No. 4738-02 Bill No. SCS for SB 569 Page 4 of 4 March 2, 2011

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

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

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no fiscal impact.

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

Kansas City Board of Election Commission Office of the Secretary of State Platte County Board of Election Commission St. Louis County Board of Election Commission

Mickey Wilson, CPA

Mickey Wilen

Director

March 2, 2011