

Andrea Gyger

From: Al Kolwicz [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 4:07 PM
To: Wayne Williams
Cc: SoS Rulemaking; Colorado Voter Group [REDACTED]; Laura Woods; Senator Lundberg [REDACTED]; Senator Tim Neville; Ted Harvey; Steve House
Subject: COMMENT Re: Revised rule 16.2.1.(c) - Please Post, and Please Respond.

Dear Secretary Williams:

RE: COMMENT re: Revised rule 16.2.1(c)

Too frequently hackers successfully invade email and other Internet-based applications. The press is filled with such reports.

We have forwarded copies of numerous such articles to members of the Department. You have been provided with written comments and testimony by Colorado Voter Group members and other members of the public. You have also been provided with various technical reports written by highly regarded systems engineers.

We are confident that the Department has been undeniably notified of the reckless risks to election integrity should the Department implement election-system applications based on Internet-transport. You have received very strong recommendations to take time out until all concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of the public.

The department persists in ignoring these warnings and appeals. And the Department does not release plausible evidence that revised draft rule 16.2.1(c) can be implemented without violating the purity of elections.

We believe that the Department is placing you, as Secretary, into the position of violating your official obligation to fulfill your powers and duties which provisions are enacted, pursuant to [section 11 of article VII of the state constitution](#), to secure the purity of elections and to guard against the abuses of the elective franchise.

The draft rule is massively defective. It is missing enforceable standards and controls, and fails to specify critical facts needed for uniform implementation and enforcement.

1. The draft does not specify by what means the purity of an election will be protected from ineligible ballots that are falsely sworn to have been cast before the deadline, but that are actually cast after the deadline for voting?
2. Who is accountable for detecting such falsely sworn ballots?
3. Who is accountable for identifying the person who actually submitted a falsely sworn ballot?
4. Who is accountable for prosecuting cases dealing with falsely sworn ballots?

5. What is the penalty for submitting a falsely sworn ballot?

Once again we appeal to you. You can still block disenfranchisement of eligible voters and ensure equal application of this rule. Override the Department's fascination with Internet-based vote-casting until such time as all open questions have been adequately debated and resolved, and detailed procedures have been documented and approved by a public process.

Al Kolwicz

Colorado Voter Group

██████████
██████████
██████████
██████████

www.ColoradoVoterGroup.org

<http://coloradovotergroup.blogspot.com>