

**NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**LEGISLATIVE FISCAL NOTE**

**BILL NUMBER:** SB 1054 (Third Edition)

**SHORT TITLE:** Judicial Campaign Reform Act

**SPONSOR(S):** Sen. Gulley

	<b>FISCAL IMPACT</b>				
	<b>Yes ( X )</b>	<b>No ( )</b>	<b>No Estimate Available ( )</b>		
	<b><u>FY 2001-02</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2002-03</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2003-04</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2004-05</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2005-06</u></b>
<b>REVENUE</b>					
<b>Fair Elections (F/E) Fund</b>					
Transfer from Candidates'					
Financing Fund	<b>\$440,459</b>				
Privilege License/Voluntary Contribution			Up to \$544,700 annually but see assumptions and methodology		
43.4 % Taxpayer Designation	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,163,059</b>	<b>\$2,163,059</b>	<b>\$2,163,059</b>
<b>OR</b>					
7.64 % Taxpayer Designation	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$380,778</b>	<b>\$380,778</b>	<b>\$380,778</b>
<b>General Fund</b>					
43.4 % Taxpayer Designation					
To F/E Fund			<b>(\$2,163,059)</b>	<b>(\$2,163,059)</b>	<b>(\$2,163,059)</b>
<b>OR</b>					
7.64% Taxpayer Designation					
To F/E Fund	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$380,778)</b>	<b>(\$380,778)</b>	<b>(\$380,778)</b>
<b>EXPENDITURES</b>					
<b>Fair Elections (F/E) Fund</b>					
Public Financing Distributions			<b>\$2,529,200</b>		<b>\$2,529,200</b>
<b>General Fund</b>					
State Bd of Elections					
		<b>\$18,000NR</b>			
		<b>56,518</b>	<b>\$56,518</b>	<b>\$806,518</b>	<b>\$56,518</b>
<b>POSITIONS:</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Department of Revenue	<b>\$359,600</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**FY 2006-07    FY 2007-08**

**REVENUES**

**Fair Elections (F/E) Fund**

Transfer from Candidates'

Financing Fund	\$0	\$0
----------------	-----	-----

Privilege License/Voluntary Contribution		Up to \$544,700 annually but see assumptions and methodology
--	--	---

43.4% Taxpayer Designation		
	\$2,163,059	\$2,163,059

**OR**

7.64 % Taxpayer Designation		
	\$380,778	\$380,778

**General Fund**

43.4 % Taxpayer Designation		
To F/E Fund	(\$2,163,059)	(\$2,163,059)

**OR**

7.64 % Taxpayer Designation		
To F/E Fund	(\$380,778)	(\$380,778)

**EXPENDITURES**

**Fair Elections (F/E) Fund**

Public Financing		
Distributions	\$0	\$2,529,200

**General Fund**

State Bd. of Elections	\$806,518	\$56,518
------------------------	-----------	----------

<b>POSITIONS:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
-------------------	----------	----------

**PRINCIPAL DEPARTMENT(S) & PROGRAM(S) AFFECTED:** State Board of Elections,  
Department of Revenue

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** 2004 Elections for Supreme Court, Court of Appeals

**BILL SUMMARY<sup>1</sup>:**

*Beginning in 2004, the bill would provide what is intended to be full public financing for candidates in the general election for Court of Appeals and Supreme Court who accept fundraising and spending limits. The chief funding mechanisms would be a \$50 voluntary contribution requested from lawyers who pay a privilege license fee and a \$1 designation on the State income tax form (unless the taxpayer says no). This bill also requires the State Board of Elections to publish and distribute a judicial voters' guide to every residence.*

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from Committee Counsel Summary

## ASSUMPTIONS AND METHODOLOGY:

### *NC Democracy Fund.*

This bill establishes the NC Fair Elections Fund (Fund) from which candidates for the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals may choose to have their campaigns financed. If the State Board of Elections certifies a candidate to participate in public financing, the candidate can receive from the Fair Election Fund:

- In a contested primary, rescue funds to match opposition spending that exceeds about \$50,000 -- up to a total of about \$100,000 in rescue funds. A candidate in a second primary may receive the same amount of rescue funds for the second primary campaign.
- In the general election, an initial amount of 175% of the position's salary for Supreme Court candidates ( $\$115,336 * 1.75 = \$201,800$ ) and 125% of the position's salary for Court of Appeals candidates ( $\$110,530 * 1.25 = 138,200$  rounded to the nearest hundred).
- In the general election, rescue funds to match opposition spending that exceeds the initial award, up to twice that amount.

Based on information provided by the State Board of Elections (SBE) and Democracy South, the amount needed to fund publicly financed campaigns for the Appellate Judiciary for each election year is \$2,529,200 assuming 100% participation. See the table below:

<b>SUMMARY OF FUNDS NEEDED UNDER DIFFERENT SCENARIOS FOR JUDICIAL CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT</b>					
		<i>Scenario 1</i>		<i>Scenario 2</i>	
	Base \$\$ For A JCR Act Candidate	Assume That 100% of Candidates Currently Running Qualify		125% Candidates Qualify, Or 25% Extra Funds	
		# Cand.	Funding Needed	# Cand.	Funding Needed
Supreme Court Contested General	\$201,800	5	\$1,009,000	6	\$1,261,250
Court Appeals Contested General	\$138,200	11	\$1,520,200	14	\$1,900,250
<b>Total for Appellate Judiciary</b>			<b>\$2,529,200</b>		<b>\$3,161,500</b>

Assuming only 75% of the candidates participate in publicly financed campaigns, the total required would be \$1,896,900.

Democracy South used the following assumptions <sup>2</sup> in its calculation of the estimates:

- Data on number of candidates come from the State Board of Elections.
- The base-level for the Appellate Judiciary is 175 times the filing fee for the Supreme Court seats and 125 times the filing fee for the Court of Appeals. The filing fee is 1% of the salaries for the seats.

<sup>2</sup> Bulleted assumptions taken from May 29, 2001 memo prepared by Democracy South.

- Totals are given for two scenarios. The first anticipates 100% participation in the public funding program of all candidates expected to run for office. The second assumes that 25% more candidates will decide to run and will qualify for public funding, which puts the total cost at 125% of the first scenario.
- No assumptions were made about how much additional public funding would be required if privately funded candidates exceeded spending limits and triggered the release of matching or “rescue” funds to publicly funded candidates. However, it should be noted that if fewer candidates opt for public funding, the money anticipated for their campaigns in the scenarios above would be available for rescue funds. For example, if 33% of the candidates in a typical election year are privately funded, then 33% of the funds anticipated in Scenario #1 could be tapped for rescue money to help the publicly funded candidates without exceeding the program’s estimated total cost.
- The total costs are based on salaries for the Appellate Judiciary for fiscal year 2001-2002. Public financing of campaigns would be in effect for the 2004 election for candidates for the Appellate Judiciary. Thus, any increases in the salaries of the Appellate Judiciary will alter the estimated costs.

The Fiscal Research Division believes the formula is consistent with the requirements of the bill and the estimates for the amount needed for the NC Fair Elections Fund appear reasonable. The bill requires the SBE to advise the Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations of the funds received and the expected needs of the Fund during the next election cycle. The first report is due before October 1, 2003 and subsequent reports are due every two years thereafter.

The bill specifies that the source of funding will be unspent NC Fair Elections Fund grants; monies transferred from the NC Candidates Financing Fund, tax return designations of \$1 from each taxpayer that does not oppose making the designation, and voluntary donations. The bill also requires that a \$50 voluntary contribution for the Fund be requested from attorneys who pay the \$50 privilege license.

This bill abolishes the Candidates Financing Fund. However, currently, that fund has a balance of \$440,458.67 that would be transferred to the new NC Fair Elections Fund.

The bill provides that each taxpayer will be deemed to make a \$1 designation to the Fund unless they indicate that they are against making the designation. Currently, taxpayers may designate \$1 of their liability for the NC Political Parties Fund; however, in 1999 only 7.64% chose to make the designation. Data indicates that 56.6% of the tax returns were prepared by paid preparers. It is reasonable to believe that a paid preparer will formally ask the individual taxpayer if they wish to make a designation and indicate accordingly on the return (i.e., “for,” “against,” or “no opinion”). Based on the low number (7.64%) of taxpayers who have affirmatively designated a portion of their tax liability for the Political Parties Fund, the Fiscal Research Division (FRD) believes that those who are required to make a designation (56.6%) are likely to indicate that they are against making a designation. The remaining 43.4% who are self-preparers may indicate “for” or “no opinion,” thereby indicating their desire to designate. If only 43.4% of the 4,984,008 taxpayers (including single and joint filers) make the designation, \$2,163,059 of the tax liability will be designated for the Fair Elections Fund ( $4,984,008 * .434 * \$1 = \$2,163,059$ ). However, because of the low number of taxpayers who currently

affirmatively decide to designate \$1 for the Political Parties Fund and considering the expanded use of tax preparation software that will prompt self-preparers to respond to the designation questions, FRD believes that even fewer than 43.4 % will indicate “for” or “no opinion.” If FRD assumes that the affect of having a “reverse check-off” designation would not be significantly different than the current affirmative check-off designation because of the use of paid preparers and tax preparation software, it is possible that only 7.64% would choose to make the designation. If such were the case, the tax liability designated for the Fair Elections Fund would be approximately \$380,778 ( $4,984,008 * .0764 * \$1 = \$380,778$ ). We believe the number of taxpayers who would designate \$1 of their tax liability to the Fund is between 43.4% and 7.64%. Because we have no basis of estimating that number, we have included a range of estimated revenue. (Based on inquiries made to the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the National League of Municipalities, FRD has not been able to identify any state or municipality that uses a “negative” or “reverse” check-off on tax returns. Further, per the NCSL, the average rate for positive check-offs is between 7% and 8%.)

The bill provides that each attorney who is required by N.C.G.S. § 105-41 to obtain a \$50 privilege license will be requested to pay an additional \$50 to fund the NC Fair Elections Fund. Currently, there are 10,894 attorneys who pay the \$50 privilege license fee. The NC Bar Association believes that a high percentage of the attorneys will make the \$50 voluntary contribution. However, neither the NC Bar Association nor the Fiscal Research Division has a reasonable estimate of what that percentage is. If 100% of the attorneys who pay the privilege license fee choose to make the \$50 contribution, the total revenue to the NC Fair Elections Fund from this source would be \$544,700 annually.

Fiscal Research has no basis for estimating the amounts, if any, that will come from unspent grants from the NC Fair Elections Fund and voluntary donations.

A summary of the required funding and estimated revenue is noted in the tables below. Based on these estimates for revenue and expenditures, it appears that revenue from taxpayer designations would be sufficient to cover the cost of the elections for the Appellant Judiciary if 43.4% of the taxpayers make the designations. However, if only 7.64% of the taxpayers make the designation, there would not be sufficient revenue to cover the elections even if 100% of the attorneys elected to make the \$50 voluntary contribution.

<b>Analysis of Funding Needs and Revenue by Fiscal Year Based on 43.4% Designation</b>					
<b>Election</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Needed Funding</b>	<b>Transfer from Candidate FF</b>	<b>Taxpayer Designation</b>	<b>Voluntary Contribution</b>
2004	2003-04	\$2,529,200	\$440,459	\$2,163,059	\$544,700
	2004-05	\$0	\$0	\$2,163,059	\$544,700
2006	2005-06	\$2,529,200	\$0	\$2,163,059	\$544,700
	2006-07	\$0	\$0	\$2,163,059	\$544,700
2008	2007-08	\$2,529,200	\$0	\$2,163,059	\$544,700
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$7,587,600</b>	<b>\$440,459</b>	<b>\$10,815,295</b>	<b>\$2,723,500</b>

\* Assumes 100% of attorneys paying the privilege license fee (10,894) will make \$50 voluntary contribution.

<b>Analysis of Funding Needs and Revenue by Fiscal Year Based on 7.64% Designation</b>					
<b>Election</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Needed Funding</b>	<b>Transfer from Candidate FF</b>	<b>Taxpayer Designation</b>	<b>Voluntary Contribution</b>
2004	2003-04	\$2,529,200	\$440,459	\$380,778	\$544,700
	2004-05	\$0	\$0	\$380,778	\$544,700
2006	2005-06	\$2,529,200	\$0	\$380,778	\$544,700
	2006-07	\$0	\$0	\$380,778	\$544,700
2008	2007-08	\$2,529,200	\$0	\$380,778	\$544,700
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$7,587,600</b>	<b>\$440,459</b>	<b>\$1,903,890</b>	<b>\$2,723,500</b>

\* Assumes 100% of attorneys paying the privilege license fee (10,894) will make \$50 voluntary contribution.

Please note that the estimates assume the number of taxpayers would remain constant and there would be no change in base level based on salary increase.

Also, Fiscal Research estimates that between 7.64% and 43.4% of taxpayers would designate \$1 of their tax liability to the Fund. Any funds that would be designated for the Fund would normally go to the General Fund. Thus, any amount designated for the Fund would decrease General Fund availability.

### ***Administration of the Legislation***

#### **State Board of Elections:**

This bill requires the State Board of Elections (SBE or Board) to administer the Voter Owned Elections Act (Act). The Board estimates that administration of the Act will require changes to their campaign reporting system to facilitate capture of income and expenditures by type as well as by election (i.e., primary vs. general). For example, the bill requires participating candidates to obtain qualifying contributions and it would limit the expenditure of participating candidates. The current system would have to be modified to capture the income and expenditure data. The estimated cost for modifying the system is \$12,000 nonrecurring.

The Board also estimates that they will need to hire a full-time accounting employee at a grade 77 (Accountant III) to manage the fund. The minimum salary for a grade 77 position is \$42,594 and the benefits total \$8,924 for a total of \$51,518. The nonrecurring operating cost is estimated to be \$6,000 for office furniture and equipment and computer equipment.

The bill establishes a 5-member Voter-Owned Elections Advisory Council that would be responsible for advising the Board on the rules and opinions it adopts for the enforcement and administration of this Act and the funding needs of the NC Fair Elections Fund. The Board estimates that the expenditures of the Council will include the per diem and travel cost incurred to attend meetings scheduled to accomplish its statutory responsibilities. The members will receive the legislative per diem pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 120-3.1, which is currently \$104 plus mileage at 29 cents per mile. Assuming the Council meets quarterly for 2 days each meeting, the estimated cost is approximately \$5,000 ( $\$104/\text{day} * 2 \text{ days for each meeting} * 5 \text{ members} * 4 \text{ meetings/year}$ ) including an estimate for mileage.

The bill also requires the State Board of Elections to publish and distribute a voters' guide to each residence in the state. Per the 2000 Census, there are 3.1 million households in the state. The Board estimates that it will cost them between \$750,000 and \$1,500,000 to produce and distribute the guide. This would include cost for printing which is estimated to be \$734,980 for 3 million copies of a 24-page guide as well as the cost for postage and for temporary help to prepare the guides for mailing or contracting with a mailing house. Because the estimate lacked sufficient detail, the Fiscal Research Division cannot determine the reasonableness of their estimate. However, based on information on the costs to other states to publish the guide, the Fiscal Research Division estimates that the guide can be published and distributed to each household for \$750,000. (The state of Washington publishes and distributes approximately 3 million copies of its 48-page guide for approximately \$740,000.)

In addition to the administrative cost discussed above, the Board may incur cost to hear any complaints that present themselves as a result of implementation of this bill. The Board estimates that, for each hearing held during a regularly scheduled meeting, it would incur \$650 in administrative expenses for scheduling, sending certified or special delivery of notices or subpoenas, preparing the correspondence and case file, and the cost of a court reporter. Fiscal Research believes the number of additional complaints will be minimal and therefore, has not estimated the cost of hearings in the fiscal impact.

The total cost to the State Board of Elections for administering the Voter-Owned Elections Act is estimated to be \$18,000 nonrecurring for modifying the campaign reporting system (\$12,000) and start-up cost for additional accounting personnel (\$6,000) and \$56,518 recurring for the salary and benefits for the accounting personnel (\$51,518) and for the meetings of the Advisory Council (\$5,000). Though the bill is effective for the 2004 election of the Appellate Judiciary races, the Board is expected to determine the needs of the NC Fair Elections Fund by October 1, 2003 and to report to the Joint Legislative Commission on Governmental Operations. The Fiscal Research Division estimates that the Board would begin to prepare for the 2004 election immediately and thus, estimates that they would incur these expenditures beginning in Fiscal Year 2002-2003. Additionally, every even calendar year, the Board will incur approximately \$750,000 for publishing and distributing a judicial voters' guide.

**Department of Revenue:**

Compliance with the directives of the legislation would require non-recurring appropriations to implement changes in several areas. An estimated \$181,000 is needed to make modifications to the Integrated Tax Administration System (ITAS) and to revise the individual income tax forms -- D400EZ and D400. On the processing side, the Department will have to make significant changes to the privilege license tax module for ITAS to be able to process a voluntary payment and split money into separate pots. The estimated non-recurring cost of these computer changes is \$137,600, which assumes contract programmer payments of \$80/hour and includes all costs for requirements, design, development, testing, and changes to notices. The form will have a line for the tax and a line for the contribution. If a return is filed indicating a contribution but the payment covers only the tax, the Department will apply the payment to tax and will not notify the taxpayer of any deficiency.

Also the additions to the forms required by this legislation will impact the department's forms processing. To be able to capture the information, account for it, and report it accurately, the department estimates a cost of \$36,000. A review of the tax forms indicates there is not enough space on the D400EZ or the computer generated versions of the D400 to put another block as large as the Political Parties Financing Fund block (which this would require because of the separate listings of choices for each spouse). If this were required, it would be necessary to develop three-page forms for these returns. This would result in a significant cost increase as the result of processing three pages as opposed to two for several million tax returns. At this time there is not an estimate for this revision to the tax forms. The department assumes there are enough vacant ELF (electronic filing) fields to incorporate these changes. The last revision is the deletion of the Campaign Financing Fund check-off that will require \$5,000 of processing changes.

Finally in regards to the new check-off for the North Carolina Fair Elections Fund, there are several considerations. First, this concept is contrary to the other contributions and check-offs. Those require a decision to participate. This contribution requires a decision to not participate. Second, the proposed law changes the tax form and requires two verbatim sentences to be repeated on the form. The last item that was mandated on the form (highlighting of information in a contrasting color) could not be carried out because forms come from software packages and from websites where the department has no control over the color. Over 70% of the forms come from software packages now. Taxpayers that use these packages do not read the form and fill it out. They answer questions posed by the computer. Printing the sentence on the form is therefore a waste of space for more than 70% of the forms.

**FISCAL RESEARCH DIVISION 733-4910**

**PREPARED BY:** Marilyn Chism and Michele T. Nelson

**APPROVED BY:** James D. Johnson

**DATE:** November 15, 2001



**Signed Copy Located in the NCGA Principal Clerk's Offices**