

CERTIFICATION OF ENROLLMENT

**SENATE BILL 6493**

Chapter 268, Laws of 2004

(partial veto)

58th Legislature  
2004 Regular Session

ELECTIONS--NONCHARTER CODE CITIES

EFFECTIVE DATE: 7/1/04

Passed by the Senate March 9, 2004  
YEAS 47 NAYS 0

BRAD OWEN

**President of the Senate**

Passed by the House March 3, 2004  
YEAS 96 NAYS 0

FRANK CHOPP

**Speaker of the House of Representatives**

Approved March 31, 2004, with the  
exception of section 1, which is vetoed.

GARY F. LOCKE

**Governor of the State of Washington**

CERTIFICATE

I, Milton H. Doumit, Jr.,  
Secretary of the Senate of the  
State of Washington, do hereby  
certify that the attached is  
**SENATE BILL 6493** as passed by the  
Senate and the House of  
Representatives on the dates  
hereon set forth.

MILTON H. DOUMIT JR.

**Secretary**

FILED

March 31, 2004 - 3:19 p.m.

**Secretary of State  
State of Washington**

---

SENATE BILL 6493

---

AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

Passed Legislature - 2004 Regular Session

State of Washington                      58th Legislature                      2004 Regular Session

By Senators Horn, Kastama, Roach, Haugen and Esser

Read first time 01/21/2004.      Referred to Committee on Government Operations & Elections.

1            AN ACT Relating to costs of elections; amending RCW 29A.04.410 and  
2 35A.060.050; and providing an effective date.

3 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

4            *\*Sec. 1. RCW 29A.04.410 and 2003 c 111 s 146 are each amended to*  
5 *read as follows:*

6            *Every city, town, and district is liable for its proportionate*  
7 *share of the costs when such elections are held in conjunction with*  
8 *other elections held under RCW 29A.04.320 and 29A.04.330. The*  
9 *proportionate share of each city, town, and district shall not include*  
10 *any costs associated with the election of any statewide officer or*  
11 *ballot measure in even-numbered years.*

12            *Whenever any city, town, or district holds any primary or election,*  
13 *general or special, on an isolated date, all costs of such elections*  
14 *must be borne by the city, town, or district concerned.*

15            *The purpose of this section is to clearly establish that no city,*  
16 *town, or district is responsible for any election costs involved in*  
17 *electing statewide officers or ballot measures. Costs associated with*  
18 *the election of statewide officers and ballot measures in even-numbered*

1 years shall be borne by the county. The county is not responsible for  
2 any costs involved in the holding of any city, town, or district  
3 election.

4 *In recovering such election expenses, including a reasonable pro-*  
5 *portion of administrative costs, the county auditor shall certify the*  
6 *cost to the county treasurer with a copy to the clerk or auditor of the*  
7 *city, town, or district concerned. Upon receipt of such certification,*  
8 *the county treasurer shall make the transfer from any available and*  
9 *appropriate city, town, or district funds to the county current expense*  
10 *fund or to the county election reserve fund if such a fund is*  
11 *established. Each city, town, or district must be promptly notified by*  
12 *the county treasurer whenever such transfer has been completed.*  
13 *However, in those districts wherein a treasurer, other than the county*  
14 *treasurer, has been appointed such transfer procedure does not apply,*  
15 *but the district shall promptly issue its warrant for payment of*  
16 *election costs.*

*\*Sec. 1 was vetoed. See message at end of chapter.*

17 **Sec. 2.** RCW 35A.06.050 and 1994 c 223 s 29 are each amended to  
18 read as follows:

19 The proposal for abandonment of a plan of government as authorized  
20 in RCW 35A.06.030 and for adoption of the plan named in the resolution  
21 or petition shall be voted upon at the next general (~~municipal~~)  
22 election (~~(if one is to be held within one hundred and eighty days or~~  
23 ~~otherwise at a special election called for that purpose)~~) in accordance  
24 with RCW (~~(29.13.020)~~) 29A.04.330. The ballot title and statement of  
25 the proposition shall be prepared by the city attorney as provided in  
26 RCW 29.27.060 and 35A.29.120.

27 NEW SECTION. **Sec. 3.** This act takes effect July 1, 2004.

Passed by the Senate March 9, 2004.

Passed by the House March 3, 2004.

Approved by the Governor March 31, 2004, with the exception of  
certain items that were vetoed.

Filed in Office of Secretary of State March 31, 2004.

Note: Governor's explanation of partial veto is as follows:

"I am returning herewith, without my approval as to section 1, Senate  
Bill No. 6493 entitled:

"AN ACT Relating to costs of elections;"

This bill addresses the allocation of election costs for statewide  
officers and ballot measures. It also provides that non-charter code  
cities, when making changes in their form of governance, place that

decision before voters at the next general election, rather than calling a special election within 180 days.

This bill was adopted unanimously by the Legislature. However, following its delivery to me, King County and the associations that represent county officials and county governments recognized its potential impacts and requested that section 1 be vetoed.

Section 1 would have affected the sharing of election costs in even-numbered years. It would have prohibited counties from prorating any portion of the costs of statewide races or ballot measures to cities, towns, or special purpose districts. Currently, counties can distribute those costs among all jurisdictions that participate in an election.

This section would have had particularly severe effects in King County, which could have faced added costs of \$600,000 to \$700,000 in the 2004 election alone. The biggest beneficiary of the county's increased expense would have been the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID). This is unfair because RTID received close to \$2 million in the 2003-05 operating budget specifically for election-related costs. The cities and towns in King County also would have experienced savings, but with a cumulative total of \$270,000, these would have been relatively small for each of them.

For these reasons, I have vetoed section 1 of Senate Bill No. 6493.

With the exception of section 1, Senate Bill No. 6493 is approved."