

SMC 2.04.165	<p>Replace thresholds for reporting financial interests with thresholds in place at the State and with the City prior to the passage of I-122. (It appears the drafters of I-122 took the thresholds from the SMC, instead of the rules adjusting those thresholds that had been adopted by the Commission in the years subsequent to the codification of SMC 2.04.165.) For example, checking and savings accounts of more than \$24,000 would have to be listed if this change is adopted, not \$5,000. This does not eliminate the new reporting “bands” put in place by I-122 – e.g., \$100,000 to \$200,000, \$200,000 to \$1,000,000 – nor does it eliminate the requirement that filers reasonably estimate their net worth.</p>
SMC 2.04.370	<p>Replaces requirement that the Commission adjust the contribution limit to the nearest \$5 or \$10 with language that the Commission adjust the limits to amounts “convenient for public understanding.”</p>
SMC 2.04.620	<p>Changes the date of mailing vouchers from the first business day of January to the first business day of March, per recommendation from BERK Consulting, based on public input gathered. This also is responsive to what Commission staff heard anecdotally throughout 2017. Caution: It does mean that the earliest a candidate could expect to receive voucher proceeds would be the second half of March.</p>
SMC 2.04.620	<p>Requires mailing vouchers to all <i>active</i> registered voters, instead of all registered voters. King County Elections places a registered voter on inactive status either when (1) a piece of mail sent by King County Elections to the individual is returned undeliverable, or (2) the individual files a change of address form with the U.S. Postal Service.</p> <p>The Commission mailed to inactive voters in 2017, and vouchers went as far away as North Carolina, threatening public confidence in the program. It was also expensive. The Commission spent in excess of \$34,000 mailing to inactive voters in 2017, and 29 inactive voters returned vouchers.</p>

Substantive Changes to the Elections Code

SMC 2.04.624	Eliminates requirement that the person assigning the voucher write the name of the candidate. The only way to prove a violation of that requirement in the vast majority of cases would be to conduct a handwriting analysis.
SMC 2.04.630	Reformatted to make it possible to assess a monetary penalty on a candidate who does not participate in three debates. As worded previously, the only option available was to disqualify a candidate from the program.
SMC 2.04.634	Replaces the phrase “campaign spending limit” with the phrase “maximum campaign valuation” and simplifies the definition. The phrase “spending limit” is misleading, because campaign fundraising also counts toward the limit.
SMC 2.04.634	Clarifies that a candidate released from the maximum campaign valuation cannot redeem vouchers once they have reached that valuation. This responds to the Commission’s concerns about candidates “banking” vouchers in future elections.
SMC 2.04.694	Adds to the list of crimes created by I-122 the crime of falsifying qualification information.