

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 6269 S SB	Title: Alt. voter verification
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Estimated Cash Receipts

NONE

Agency Name	2023-25		2025-27		2027-29	
	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total
Local Gov. Courts						
Loc School dist-SPI						
Local Gov. Other	No fiscal impact					
Local Gov. Total						

Estimated Operating Expenditures

Agency Name	2023-25				2025-27				2027-29			
	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total	FTEs	GF-State	NGF-Outlook	Total
Office of the Secretary of State	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0	.0	0	0	0
Total \$	0.0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0

Agency Name	2023-25			2025-27			2027-29		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Local Gov. Courts									
Loc School dist-SPI									
Local Gov. Other	No fiscal impact								
Local Gov. Total									

Estimated Capital Budget Expenditures

Agency Name	2023-25			2025-27			2027-29		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Office of the Secretary of State	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Total \$	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0

Agency Name	2023-25			2025-27			2027-29		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Local Gov. Courts									
Loc School dist-SPI									
Local Gov. Other	No fiscal impact								
Local Gov. Total									

Estimated Capital Budget Breakout

NONE

Prepared by: Cheri Keller, OFM	Phone: (360) 584-2207	Date Published: Final 2/15/2024
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 6269 S SB	Title: Alt. voter verification	Agency: 085-Office of the Secretary of State
-------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Operating Expenditures from:

NONE

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Connor Schiff	Phone: 360-786-7093	Date: 02/12/2024
Agency Preparation: Bonnie Luntzel	Phone: 360-570-5575	Date: 02/13/2024
Agency Approval: Mike Woods	Phone: (360) 704-5215	Date: 02/13/2024
OFM Review: Cheri Keller	Phone: (360) 584-2207	Date: 02/13/2024

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Significant provisions of the bill and any related workload or policy assumptions that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency by section number.

Changes in SSB 6269 compared to previous version (SB 6269)

Would add Section 1(2)(iv) which would require the county's application for alternative voter verification be compatible with the centralized statewide voter registration list maintained by the secretary of state.

Would add Section 1(2)(g) which would allow the secretary of state to establish reasonable rules related to the standards and procedures for the examination and testing of alternative voter verification systems.

Would add Section 1(2)(h)(i) which would require the county to notify each city, town or special taxing district of the approval by the secretary of state of the alternative voter verification system.

Would add Section 1(2)(h)(ii) which would allow each unit of local government to petition the legislative authority of the county for a waiver to opt-out of the pilot project for alternative voter verification.

Would add Section 1(2)(h)(iii) which would prohibit any precinct within the unit of local government to use the alternative voter verification option if a waiver has been granted.

Summary

This bill would have the Secretary of State establish an alternative voter verification options pilot project with any county that chooses to participate. OSOS would review the applications of participating counties for feasibility and compliance with the standards established by OSOS. The Secretary of State would provide reports on the progress of the pilot program to the Governor, committees of the legislature and county auditors.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency with the cash receipts provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of the revenue sources. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

II. C - Expenditures

Agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), with the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings) identified by section number. Description of the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explanation of how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguished between one time and ongoing functions.

The OSOS would be able to absorb the cost of establishing the alternative verification options if the alternative verification options are in-line with the OSOS standards and procedures for the examination and testing of alternative verification systems. OSOS does not anticipate that the Annual Report will require significant additional staff time and can be absorbed within existing resources.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

NONE

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

III. C - Operating FTE Detail: *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA.*

NONE

III. D - Expenditures By Program (optional)

NONE

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

IV. A - Capital Budget Expenditures

NONE

IV. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

NONE

IV. C - Capital Budget Breakout

Acquisition and construction costs not reflected elsewhere on the fiscal note and description of potential financing methods.

NONE

IV. D - Capital FTE Detail: *FTEs listed by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals agree with total FTEs in Part IVB.*

NONE

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Provisions of the bill that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Commerce

Bill Number: 6269 S SB

Title: Alt. voter verification

Part I: Jurisdiction-Location, type or status of political subdivision defines range of fiscal impacts.

Legislation Impacts:

- Cities:
- Counties:
- Special Districts:
- Specific jurisdictions only:
- Variance occurs due to:

Part II: Estimates

- No fiscal impacts.
- Expenditures represent one-time costs:
- Legislation provides local option: Counties would have a local option to participate in the alternative voter verification options pilot program.
- Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time:

Estimated revenue impacts to:

None

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

None

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Kate Fernald	Phone: 564-200-3519	Date: 02/15/2024
Leg. Committee Contact: Connor Schiff	Phone: 360-786-7093	Date: 02/12/2024
Agency Approval: Allan Johnson	Phone: 360-725-5033	Date: 02/15/2024
OFM Review: Cheri Keller	Phone: (360) 584-2207	Date: 02/15/2024

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

Description of the bill with an emphasis on how it impacts local government.

This fiscal note compares SSB 6269 to SB 6269.

CHANGES BETWEEN THIS VERSION AND PREVIOUS BILL VERSION:

The substitute version of the bill would require pilot project approved counties to notify each city, town or special taxing district within the county that an alternative voter verification option would be used in the upcoming election, and local jurisdictions would be able to petition the county's legislative authority for a waiver to opt-out of the pilot project.

These amendments would not change the fiscal impacts discussed below.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT BILL:

Sec. 1. would add a new section to chapter 29A.40 RCW.

(1) would require the Secretary of State (SOS) to establish the alternative verification options pilot project. The purpose of the pilot project would be to allow for the development and testing of supplemental methods, other than signature verification, to verify that a ballot was filled out and returned by the intended voter.

(2) would allow any county to apply to participate in the pilot project. The county auditor would be required to submit an application to the SOS. The SOS would be required to approve the county auditor's application before the county could be allowed to participate in the pilot project.

(2)(a) outlines what the auditor's application would be required to include:

- (i) The alternative verification method(s) the county auditor plans to utilize, and how the method or methods comply with the requirements of (b) of this subsection;
- (ii) Details on how the proposed alternative verification method(s) will be implemented; and
- (iii) Which election the county plans to use the proposed alternative verification method or methods in.

(2)(b) Each proposed alternative verification method would be required to:

- (i) Allow the voter to submit clear evidence which can be verified by the county auditor indicating that the intended voter was the one who filled out and returned the ballot;
- (ii) Establish criteria for determining accepted and failed verifications; and
- (iii) Require the voter to attest to the ballot declaration.

(2)(c) would stipulate when counties can participate in the pilot project.

(2)(d) would limit each application to participate in the pilot project to the special election or elections held on a single date. A county would be allowed to participate in the pilot project during multiple special election dates, but the county auditor would be required to submit a separate application for approval by the SOS for each special election date.

(2)(e) would require the SOS to review each application analyzing the feasibility of each proposed alternative verification method and whether each proposed method complies with the requirements of (b) of this subsection before determining whether to approve or deny the application.

(2)(h) If a county's pilot project application is approved by the Secretary of State, the county auditor would be required to notify each city, town, or special taxing district located wholly within the county that an alternative verification option will be used no later than 90 days before the election.

(2)(h) would also provide each unit of local government the option to petition the legislative authority of the county for a waiver to opt out of the pilot. The legislative authority of the county may provide a waiver if it does so not later than 60 days before the election and it finds that the waiver is reasonable. If a waiver is granted, no precincts within the unit of

local government can use the alternative verification option.

(3) would detail when a county participating in the pilot project may use the alternative verification project, and the participating county's required actions.

(4)(a) would list counties' required actions after the certification of each special election when they are participating in the pilot project.

Sec. 2 would amend RCW 29A.40.110 to add that a county participating in the alternative verification options pilot project may also verify a voter's ballot using an alternative verification method approved by the office of the secretary of state.

B. SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE IMPACTS

Expenditure impacts of the legislation on local governments with the expenditure provisions identified by section number and when appropriate, the detail of expenditures. Delineated between city, county and special district impacts.

This legislation would provide counties with a local option to apply for the alternative voter verification options pilot project. Because these measures would be elective, they would not create a local government fiscal impact.

C. SUMMARY OF REVENUE IMPACTS

Revenue impacts of the legislation on local governments, with the revenue provisions identified by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of revenue sources. Delineated between city, county and special district impacts.

The proposed legislation would not impact local governments' revenue.

SOURCES:

Washington State Association of County Auditors