

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 0039-03
Bill No.: Perfected HCS for HB 110
Subject: Attorney General; State; Elections; Governor and Lieutenant Governor; Secretary of State
Type: Original
Date: January 22, 2013

Bill Summary: This proposal fills a vacancy in the office of the United States Senator, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, State Auditor, or State Treasurer by appointment by the Governor or special election.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.
This fiscal note contains 7 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
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 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials from the **Attorney General's Office** assume any potential cost arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials from the **Office of the State Auditor** and **Office of the State Treasurer** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a previous version (0039-01), officials from the **Governor's Office** assumed there should be no added cost to their office as a result of this measure.

Officials from the **Lieutenant Governor's Office** did not respond to our request for fiscal impact.

House Amendment 1

Officials from the **Office of the State Auditor** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight assumes this proposal, which moves the presidential primary from February to March of each presidential election year, will have no fiscal impact to the state.

House Amendment 2

Officials from the **Office of the State Auditor** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

Oversight assumes this amendment will have no fiscal impact.

House Amendment 3

Officials from the **Office of the State Auditor** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 54), officials from **Buchanan County, Office of the Secretary of State, Platte County Board of Election Commission** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organizations.

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 54), officials from **Johnson County** assumed a recount would cost \$4,000 in staff and judges. However, it is unclear if a recount would ever be necessary.

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 54), officials from the **Kansas City Board of Election Commission** assumed it costs the taxpayers in their jurisdiction between \$10,000 - \$15,000 to conduct a recount. They usually have one recount every two years. By reducing the percentage, the number of recounts and the costs should be cut in half.

In response to a similar proposal from this year (HB 54), officials from the **St. Louis County Board of Election Commission** assumed that between 2006 and 2012 they had 16 recounts. If this lower percentage had been in place at that time 37% fewer recounts would have occurred for a savings of \$4,900.

Oversight assumes no impact to local government funds. Savings would be realized because there might be fewer recounts.

House Amendment 4

Officials from the **Office of the State Auditor** assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

In response to a similar proposal from 2012 (HB 1250), officials from the **City of Monett (COM)** assumed this proposal would allow certain cities with a commission-form of government which are currently required by state law to hold a primary election in February to cancel the primary election prior to the general municipal election in April. Primary elections are held every four years.

COM states its share of the two previous February primary elections to be:
2008: \$6,744
2004: \$5,977

COM states the 2012 primary election will cost \$7,500.

KC:LR:OD

ASSUMPTION (continued)

COM states, the February primary will not serve the intended purpose of narrowing the field of candidates because the number of candidates for the offices up for election do not exceed the number that would proceed to the general election in April.

COM assumes a savings of \$7,500 every four years as a result of this proposal since the office of mayor and councilman have four year terms. The next scheduled primary election for these elected offices will occur in FY 2016.

In response to a similar proposal from 2012 (HB 1250), officials at the **City of West Plains** stated the office of Mayor and City Councilman have 4 year terms of office. Primary elections are held each year if enough candidates have filed for the elected office. This proposal would allow the city to cancel the primary if two or fewer candidates file for the elected office. The city would realize a savings if the primary is cancelled.

Officials from the **Office of Secretary of State (SOS)** state, the City of West Plains and the City of Monett are the only two 3rd class cities with a commission form of government that have a primary election.

SOS assumes that there is no fiscal impact from this proposal.

Oversight assumes the City of West Plains and the City of Monett would realize minimal savings, dependent upon the cancellation of the February primary when the number of candidates that file for the office of mayor and councilman does not exceed the number required to proceed to the general election.

Oversight assumes the City of West Plains and the City of Monett may or may not choose to have a primary election for the office of mayor and councilman.

Oversight assumes the only cities effected by this legislation are the City of West Plains and the City of Monett.

Oversight assumes no impact to local government funds as this amendment is permissive.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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 proposal contains an emergency clause.

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 Governor
Office of the Secretary of State
Office of the State Auditor
Office of the State Treasurer
Attorney General's Office
City of Monett
City of West Plains
St. Louis County Board of Election Commission
Platte County Board of Election Commission

SOURCES OF INFORMATION (continued)

Kansas City Board of Election Commission
Buchanan County
Johnson County

Not Responding:

Lieutenant Governor's Office



Ross Strope
Acting Director
January 22, 2013