BALLOT PROOFING

House Bill 5258 (H-1) as reported from committee Sponsor: Rep. Matt Koleszar Committee: Elections and Ethics Complete to 1-19-22



Phone: (517) 373-8080 http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa

Analysis available at http://www.legislature.mi.gov

(Enacted as Public Act 94 of 2022)

SUMMARY:

House Bill 5258 would amend the Michigan Election Law to change the timetable for filing, processing, and distributing proof ballots for elections.

Currently under the act, before final ballots for elections are printed, proof copies of the ballot are returned from the printer to the county election commission, whose members proofread them for errors and omissions.¹ The commission must send the proof ballots to the Department of State's Bureau of Elections and to each candidate on the ballot at least 14 days before a primary election. Candidates have two business days after receiving the proposed ballot to contact the county clerk with any necessary corrections. After they are finalized and printed, the ballots are given a final inspection by the county election commission and then delivered to the county clerk for distribution to the local jurisdictions within the county.

The current timetable requires that, at least 14 days before a primary election and at least 15 days before an election, proof copies of the ballot must be filed with the county clerk and a proof copy of the ballot must be mailed to the secretary of state and each candidate on the ballot.

The bill would move the deadline for all of those actions to at least 58 days (eight weeks and two days) before the primary election or election and would require that the proof copy be sent by email to the secretary of state and by first-class mail to the candidates. The bill would remove a requirement that the proof copy be sent by registered or certified mail in counties with a population over 1.5 million (i.e., Wayne County). In addition, if the candidate provided an email address on his or her affidavit of identity, the clerk could also send a proof copy by email.

Additionally, the bill would revise the deadline for corrections by candidates from two days after receipt of the proof to 4 p.m. on the fifth day after the proof is mailed.

Finally, while current law requires the Board of Election Commissioners to mail two copies of the proof ballot to the secretary of state, the bill would require that the proof ballot be emailed. If needed, a corrected ballot would also have to be emailed to the secretary of state rather than mailed.

MCL 168.565, 168.710, and 168.711

¹ Bureau of Elections memorandum on ballot proofing: <u>https://www.michigan.gov/documents/sos/BallotInstruc_519187_7.pdf</u>

FISCAL IMPACT:

The bill would provide cost savings to Wayne County each year, ranging between approximately \$900 to \$2,500. The bill would remove the requirement that the county clerk in counties with a population of 1.5 million or more must send proof copies of ballots to each candidate appearing on the ballot by registered or certified mail, with return receipt demanded. Wayne County is the only county in the state with over 1.5 million residents and to which the current requirement applies. County clerks in all remaining Michigan counties are required to only mail proof copies of ballots by first-class postage.

As of August 29, 2021, the United States Postal Service (USPS) cost of one-ounce certified mail with return receipt is \$7.35, while the USPS cost of first-class postage is \$0.58. Annual cost savings would vary annually according to the number of candidates appearing on that year's primary ballots. The Wayne County Clerk's office reports that in the 2021 primary election there were 139 candidates running for local government offices and in the 2020 primary election there were 348 candidates running for federal, state, and local offices, which would have resulted in savings of \$941 and \$2,356, respectively.

POSITIONS:

The Michigan Association of County Clerks indicated support for the bill. (9-28-21)

A representative of the Department of State testified and indicated a neutral position on the bill. (9-21-21)

Legislative Analyst: Jenny McInerney Fiscal Analyst: Michael Cnossen

[■] This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House Fiscal Agency staff for use by House members in their deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.