

Department of Planning and Budget 2006 Fiscal Impact Statement

1. **Bill Number:** HB46

House of Origin Introduced Substitute Engrossed

Second House In Committee Substitute Enrolled

2. **Patron:** Dance

3. **Committee:** Privileges and Elections

4. **Title:** Voter registration; copy of application at DMV and registration records.

5. **Summary/Purpose:** This bill provides that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) shall maintain a copy of any completed voter registration application received by it until 30 days after the next general election and that the copy may be transmitted by facsimile or electronic means to a general registrar, local electoral board, or the State Board of Elections (SBE) for the purpose of determining the validity of a provisional ballot.

6. **Fiscal impact estimates are preliminary.** (See item 8)

6a. Expenditure Impact:

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Dollars</i>	<i>Positions</i>	<i>Fund</i>
2006-07	\$900,000	-	NGF

7. **Budget amendment necessary:** Yes. Item 435.

8. **Fiscal implications:** DMV sends an average of 395,106 voter registration applications to SBE each year. Based on 274 days a year that DMV customer service centers are open, this would mean an average of 1,442 applications daily. Neither the DMV headquarters facility nor its individual customer service centers have the capacity to physically store copies of the voter registration applications, eliminating the facsimile transmittal alternative called for by the bill. In order to implement the bill, voter registration applications would have to be scanned and stored electronically.

Time can be a critical factor in voter registration. A voter is not registered until the application is approved by the local registrar. Currently, as voter registration applications are received, the majority of customer service centers bundle them up and mail them to SBE, where they are scanned before being sent on to the appropriate local registrar. Approximately 10 local registrars prefer to go directly to their local DMV and pick up the applications personally.

One scanning and storage option would involve centralizing the process at DMV headquarters. The DMV headquarters scanning section routinely schedules and scans a high volume of work. Even if the voter registration application batches were processed ahead of other DMV work, there would likely be a processing lag time of 1 to 2 days. This would be in addition to the transmittal delays (conventional mail) of 3-5 days between the customer

service centers and DMV headquarters, and then between DMV headquarters and SBE, where the applications are also currently being scanned. The addition of an incremental step (scanning at DMV headquarters) would add further delay to the application ultimately being received by the appropriate local registrar.

However, if the documents had to be scanned at DMV headquarters, there would be both personnel and equipment costs. DMV would require an additional employee at an annual cost of \$51,764 (\$37,655 salary with \$14,009 benefits) to minimize the increase in transmission time. A multi-function scanner capable of bar coding, storing documents, and transmitting the images to the On-Base (new digital imaging program) system would also have to be purchased at a cost of approximately \$48,440.

Due to the time delays inherent in the headquarters scanning option and the criticality of registration deadlines, scanning the applications at the individual customer service centers would be the preferred alternative. To scan the applications at each customer service center, programming changes to the DMV automated system to accommodate the scanning process would be required at a cost of approximately \$50,000. An additional \$850,000 would be needed to equip each customer service center and DMV Select with a high-end, multi-function scanner capable of using all of the features provided by the On-Base system in support of this proposal.

9. Specific agency or political subdivisions affected: State Board of Elections, General Registrars, Department of Motor Vehicles.

10. Technical amendment necessary: No.

11. Other comments: None.

Date: 01/24/06/ mtb-jlv

Document: G:\2006session\Fis\Hb46.Doc Mike Barton

c. Secretary of Administration
Secretary of Transportation