



SOUTH CAROLINA REVENUE AND FISCAL AFFAIRS OFFICE

STATEMENT OF ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT

WWW.RFA.SC.GOV • (803)734-3793

This fiscal impact statement is produced in compliance with the South Carolina Code of Laws and House and Senate rules. The focus of the analysis is on governmental expenditure and revenue impacts and may not provide a comprehensive summary of the legislation.

Bill Number:	H. 3556	Introduced on January 14, 2025
Subject:	Political Parties and Primaries	
Requestor:	House Judiciary	
RFA Analyst(s):	Welsh	
Impact Date:	March 4, 2025	

Fiscal Impact Summary

This bill modifies the process for protesting and contesting the election of county officers, less than county officers, and municipal officers. This bill also allows the state executive committee to require a bond of surety of no more than \$750 as payment for reasonable costs of hearing a protest in the event the election challenge is denied. Appeals from decisions by the state executive committee must be taken directly to the Supreme Court.

The State Election Commission anticipate being able to manage any additional responsibilities due to this bill with existing staff and within existing appropriations. Therefore, this bill will have no expenditure impact.

The Revenue and Fiscal Affairs Office (RFA) contacted all counties and the Municipal Association of South Carolina (MASC) to determine the potential expenditure impact this bill may have for local governments. We received a response from Chesterfield County and MASC. Chesterfield County anticipates this bill will have no expenditure impact. MASC also anticipates this bill will have no fiscal impact for municipalities. Based on these responses, RFA anticipates this bill will have no local expenditure impact.

Explanation of Fiscal Impact

Introduced on January 14, 2025

State Expenditure

This modifies the process for protesting and contesting the election of county officers, less than county officers, and municipal officers. Currently, these protests and contests are heard by the county party executive committee. This bill eliminates the county party executive committee protest process and repeals all relevant code sections. The state executive committee will hear these protests and contests. This bill also allows the state executive committee to require a bond of surety of no more than \$750 as payment for reasonable costs of hearing a protest in the event the election challenge is denied. Appeals from decisions by the state executive committee must be taken directly to the Supreme Court.

The State Election Commission anticipates being able to manage any additional responsibilities due to this bill with existing staff and within existing appropriations. Therefore, this bill will have no expenditure impact.

State Revenue

N/A

Local Expenditure

This bill modifies the process for protesting and contesting the election of county officers, less than county officers, and municipal officers. Currently, these protests and contests are heard by the county party executive committee. This bill eliminates the county party executive committee protest process and repeals all relevant code sections.

RFA contacted all counties and MASC to determine the potential expenditure impact this bill may have for local governments. We received a response from Chesterfield County and MASC. Chesterfield County anticipates this bill will have no expenditure impact. MASC also anticipates this bill will have no fiscal impact for municipalities. Based on these responses, RFA anticipates this bill will have no local expenditure impact.

Local Revenue

N/A



Frank A. Rainwater, Executive Director